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PREFACE

Research into the Kunjen dialects was begun by the author and his wife in July 1964, under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and Wycliffe Bible Translators. It is intended that this research be the first phase of a program which will also embrace vernacular literacy and Bible Translation for the Kunjen people. The over-all aim of the program is to offer the moral strength and ethical values of Christianity to Aboriginal people who are making the tortuous but inevitable transition from their own culture to the way of life espoused by their white neighbors.

Because the research has been underway for a considerable time in a remote area, there have been many contributors to its progress. The tasks of establishing a field station, transporting stores, arranging for access to informants and meeting their needs have been lightened by many willing contributors, a few of whom it is impossible to go further without mentioning.

The confidence and cooperation of the Director of the Queensland Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs, Mr. P. J. Killoran, in permitting the researcher to live and work on the Mitchell River Reserve has been greatly appreciated, as has been the advice and assistance of the Department's Community managers, especially Mr. E. C. Butler. We are grateful too to the Anglican Bishop of Carpentaria for his willingness to allow us to
begin and continue a project of this nature in the Mission Parish
of Mitchell River, among the Anglican communicants there.

Support for the bulk of the research, and in the many
practical matters associated with it, is gratefully recorded;
beside the numerous members and adherents of the Methodist Church
of Australasia, we have appreciated the consistent encouragement
of Mr. and Mrs. L. Boggiss, Mr. J. Chadwick, Mr. and Mrs. A. Coombe,
Mr. K. Craigie, Mr. and Mrs. S. Druce, Mr. and Mrs. G. Dryden,
Mr. and Mrs. M. Nicholls, Mr. and Mrs. G. Sommer, and Mrs. H. Sommer.

My sincere thanks go also to the Australian Institute of
Aboriginal Studies which provided a vehicle for the first field trip
(July 1964) and finances for a subsequent workshop at the Summer
Institute of Linguistics (1965). Funds were also made available for
a six-month field trip, November 1969 to April 1970, when most of
this study took its present form. A computerized concordance of
Kunjen materials, compiled on the IBM 1410 computer at the University
of Oklahoma by the Linguistic Information Retrieval Project of the
Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Oklahoma
Research Institute, was sponsored by National Science Foundation
Grant GS-1605, and contributed materially to this study.

Thanks are due also to the Kunjen people themselves, almost
all of whom have contributed in some way to the research to date.
Whether it was the contribution of new words, the explanation of
customs or idioms, or more formal informant work, their interest
was my encouragement. Willing and able helpers included
Mr. F. Brumby, Mr. and Mrs. C. Rutland, and Mrs. V. Koolatah. The cheerful and helpful assistance offered by Mrs. Elizabeth Henry in the earlier phases of the project enabled the researcher to amass considerable amounts of transcribed Kunjen text material on which to base an analysis. Mrs. Henry's clarity of diction and patience in this task were greatly appreciated. The imagination and insight of Mrs. Kathleen Major is recognized at several points in the text of the study itself. Mrs. Major's creative control of her language, understanding of the researcher's purposes, and quick mind made the researcher assured of insightful progress. Her contribution to this study is recorded with much appreciation. The author recalls with pleasure and gratitude the fishing and hunting trips, campfire discussions, dances, and his inclusion in everyday affairs that must be mentioned in any account of his total contact with the Kunjen people and their language.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks go to my daughter Leanne and wife Elaine, who bore without rancour the heat and burden of the day among the discomforts of a far-northern allocation. I am most of all deeply indebted to my wife, whose devotion to tape-recorder and typewriter was above and beyond the vows of matrimony, and who made this study possible.

B.A.S.
ABSTRACT

Kunjen is the 'popular pidgin name' for a group of Paman dialects spoken by Australian Aborigines who earlier inhabited the central Cape York Peninsular area of North Queensland. Two of these dialects—Oykangand and Olgo—-are accounted for in this study.

The theory of language which has been chosen for this description of Kunjen syntax is that version of transformational-generative grammar proposed by Fillmore in his 1968a article 'The Case for Case'. Fillmore's 'Case Grammar' proposals are only minimally changed, in order that the validity claimed for them may be empirically tested. Kunjen represents an interesting test-case, being a typically ergative language of the suffixing type, with a system of noun classes, and a developing incorporation of the personal pronouns in the verb. The Oykangand dialect is chosen for exemplification of the rules in this conservative treatment of the Transformational and Phonological (sub-)components.

Beside Fillmore's Agentive, Instrumental, Dative, Factitive, Locative and Objective cases, a Purposive and a Causal are proposed. Contrary to Fillmore's claim, sentences embedded as complements of the verb are not found under the Objective, but under the Purposive, Causal and Locative cases. Strong justification for the traditional generative view of relativization is offered by the facts of Oykangand, in which relativization is a highly flexible and productive process.
The Dative is by far the most interesting case, appearing in surface realizations as three possible forms. The surface dative represents the indirect object, and some renditions of the genitive and benefactive. The Dative is also the source of the genitive (via both adnominal and sentential Datives), and of the subject in 'verbless' sentences. The Dative is capable of being 'promoted' from adnominal status to the subject position. The possibility that kin-terms are stative adjectives is examined and rejected on the basis of evidence involving Dative expressions.

There is no 'primary topicalization' (subjectivalization) in Kunjen. Rules of subject choice are simple, and there is no passive construction. Brief mention is made of Hale's view of the passive and ergative in Australian languages insofar as these relate to Kunjen.

It is contended that a case grammar accounts for the facts of Kunjen in a more simple, more principled fashion than either the 'standard' Chomskian theory on the one hand, or than tagmemics on the other.

The noun classifiers of Kunjen are examined, and the syntactic relevance of their insertion is asserted. Earlier works on noun classifiers are briefly reviewed, found deficient, and a rule schema of a general nature is proposed to account for classifier insertion in Australian languages generally.

The classifiers are inserted as (+pro) copies of nouns, and the discussion of these leads on to a consideration of
pronominalization in general. The pronominalization processes of Kunjen are claimed to be accounted for in a sub-cycle of rules which effect 'gapping' and the introduction of the pre-referential pronouns, the reflexive pronoun, the personal pronouns, and the classifiers. Reflexive/reciprocal constructions are found to depend—somewhat unusually—on a reflexive/reciprocal 'auxiliary' verb, erbe-2.

'Infrajections' account for the introduction of sentence adverbs and other particles with sentential function from their source in the Modality constituent. The theory at this point is relatively undeveloped, and open to some question. Interrogative sentences also depend in part on this type of transformation.

An analysis of 'auxiliary' verbs amba-1 and ambe-2 is proposed and the analysis of erbe-2 is defended in a further investigation of reflexive/reciprocal expressions. Evidence is brought forward to show that what have been termed 'Equi-NP' phenomena do not depend in Kunjen solely upon the principle of co-referentiality but also upon that of inclusion of the one NP within the other. Reduplication—both partial and complete—is considered as a syntactic process applicable most frequently to verbs, but other categories are not excluded from the reduplication rules.

Following a discussion of the Imperative and Questions, the rules of Oykangand grammar are assembled by way of review, and a sample text and lexicon is provided. The relationship between Oykangand and Olgol is the subject of the final Chapter.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

To attempt to describe in detail the syntax of some hitherto unknown language is currently a perilous undertaking. This is especially the case if that syntax presumes to be 'generative' in its theoretical orientation. While grammarians may dismiss without a second thought some statement or other based on alternative theories, or cast only a desultory eye over the data, feelings run high as to the validity of various alternatives within the 'generative' school.

This study nevertheless presumes to present the basic syntax of Oykangand and Olgol, Kunjen dialects of which the phonology has already been investigated (Sommer 1969). Not only so, but it presumes to be a 'generative' study, utilizing for its theoretical base those proposals of Fillmore 1968a which have been called 'Case Grammar'. That it will offend the psyche of some is taken for granted. More important than the psychic disturbance of its critics is the fact that the study represents (1) the only statement to date of the grammar of Kunjen, and (2) a straight-forward attempt to evaluate Fillmore's proposals by rigorously applying these to the above task.

Theoretical issues are taken up once more in Chapter II. The remainder of this chapter will provide a brief orientation to the Kunjen people and their language.
The Kunjen People

A review of the names applied to the Kunjen people--both by themselves and by others--has already appeared (Sommer 1969). In that publication the geographical locations of Oykangand and Ol gol are shown (just a little west of the central Cape York Peninsular area) and their relationship to some other Peninsular languages is expressed in subgroupings.

Oykangand and Ol gol families somewhat whimsically refer to themselves as ofoyoR 'river', argøanand 'from the river ti-tree', anbanand 'from the bank', ermbaløand 'from the spear rod', or arndøaløand 'Alice River'. The dialect on which this study is based is Oykangand; Ol gol is accommodated in Chapter XIV. It was found impractical to accommodate Okunjan and Kawarrangg without a more detailed analysis of these two rather different dialects, which have the appearance of being, in any case, dialects of a separate language (Sommer 1969:12).

Kunjen Grammar

A thumb-nail sketch of Oykangand, based on the universals of grammar proposed by Greenberg 1963, will provide both an outline of the language and a usable summary for scholars interested in language universals.

Like most Australian languages (Capell 1956:46), Oykangand is an SOV language with postpositions which take the form of suffixes (universals 1, 4 and 27) in a clear case system (41). This implies
possible preposing of relative expressions (24), which in fact can also be alternatively postposed. The genitive and adjective both follow the governing noun (2, 5, 19) and express its inflection (40); but contrary to the expected, the common noun precedes an appositional proper noun (23). Another unexpected feature is the absence of productive derivational processes, despite case inflection (29).

Verb forms that are subordinate to the verb--as Causal (CSL), Purposive (PRP) cases--usually precede the verb (13, 15) and inflected auxiliaries follow it (16). Adverbial modifiers normally precede the verb (7) and follow any adjective that is modified, but--contrary to (21)--the nominal object most frequently precedes the verb.

In the case system of Oykangand the subject postposition of an intransitive verb is spelled as zero (38). Beside the singular, there are both dual and plural numbers expressed in the pronominal system, and three persons (42), but there are no nominal number morphemes (34, 35).

The details of this grammatical system are worked out in Chapters IV to XII. A sample text and lexicon is given in Chapter XIII, and the Olgoi dialect is treated in Chapter XIV. The grammatical study is introduced by a discussion of theoretical issues (Chapter II) and an orientation to Oykangand phonology and some notational conventions (Chapter III).
Chapter II

CASE GRAMMAR CONSIDERED

Introduction

In the past few years, many linguists have become intrigued with Charles Fillmore's "case grammar", particularly as exemplified in Fillmore 1968a. There is something intuitively pleasing about this conception of syntactic structure, and there is little doubt that many of the insights that underlie it will have to be incorporated in some form in any adequate linguistic theory. We can expect case grammar to be used in a flood of articles and monographs during the next few years, as scholars "work out the details" for languages other than English and test the empirical adequacy of the framework.

With these comments Langacker 1970 summarizes the reaction of many linguists to Fillmore's case grammar. Beginning with 'A proposal concerning English prepositions' 1966a, and continuing in his 'Toward a modern theory of case' 1966b Fillmore developed a series of proposals that are realized in 'The case for case' 1968a. It is on the proposals of this latter article that this study of Kunjen is based.

Fillmore revives the classicists' concept of case, and injects it with new relevance by insisting on the covert nature of case categories. Case categories are made relevant at the deep structure level of the transformationalists' grammar, and surface structure realizations are made dependent on these. Fillmore suggests a minimal inventory of six cases, each case being proposed as a linguistic universal, found in some form in all natural languages.
Fillmore supports his proposals by a lengthy account of historical approaches to case, and critically reviews the contributors to case theory up to the current transformational-generative grammarians. He expends considerable effort in establishing the surface structure relevance of the subject of the sentence, and in questioning its deep structure status.

The arguments he adduces lead Fillmore to reject the traditional subject-predicate dichotomy as an unfortunate 'importation into linguistics from formal logic', and to propose instead a 'Modality' and a 'Proposition' as the primes of a sentence. In the Proposition, the case categories are developed—each one occurring only once, but at least one being chosen in association with each verb.

Operations on these structures follow the pattern of transformations established by Chomsky 1957, 1965 but include an obligatory subject choice rule, which promotes one of the case categories to direct domination by S, and provides a structure more nearly parallel to that of the 'standard' Chomskian theory, with its S + NP VP. What Fillmore develops therefore is a somewhat more abstract deep structure than that proposed by Chomsky. Fillmore's theory claims to effect considerable economies in the semantic component (which interprets the structures generated by the syntactic component) since the cases are semantically defined.

The question that this 'deeper' deep structure raises is this: Is Fillmore's deep structure deep enough? In other words, is
the introduction of semantically defined case categories into the syntax an unnatural restriction on the semantic information utilized in the syntax? G. Lakoff 1969 and other scholars argue for a generative semantics, in which the 'deep structure' is semantic, and Fillmore, in his 'Closing Words' 1968a acknowledges the likelihood that their contentions reflect the truth. For his article, however, which effectively demonstrates the success of semantic information in the consideration of syntactic phenomena, Fillmore argues from the 'centrality of syntax'.

The article—despite the many facets of language it examines in a careful, scholarly fashion—is essentially programmatic. It is a well-documented theoretical statement that invites the investigation of language phenomena from its viewpoint. 'Kunjen syntax: a generative view' is a response to that invitation.

The Aims of 'Kunjen Syntax'

The purpose of this study is threefold. By far the most important motivation for this study is the need to provide an adequate synchronic description of Kunjen. As noted elsewhere, only one fact of Kunjen grammar can be found in the literature on Australian Aboriginal languages. To remedy this lack, and to provide an account of Kunjen syntax of use to comparative linguists and scholars generally, two dialects of Kunjen are described.

The importance of a study of Kunjen has already been asserted (Sommer 1969). Speakers of the Kunjen dialects ranged
over a considerable area of Cape York Peninsula, and some account of
these dialects is essential to a satisfactory classification of Paman
languages. This research cannot wait: the number of Kunjen speakers
is dwindling rapidly.

The second purpose in this study is to attempt to evaluate
Fillmore's case grammar by applying it to the task outlined above.
To this end, Fillmore's proposals are only minimally changed in
accommodating Kunjen, so that the validity of them may be empirically
tested.

Lastly—and perhaps least importantly—it is the aim of this
study to add to the strength of Hale's argument that Australian lan­
guages are not 'primitive in any limiting sense' (1965:32). Since
this topic will not be the subject of comment elsewhere, the evidence
Kunjen provides in favor of Hale's assertion requires mention at
this point.

Not only does Kunjen conform to the greater bulk of Greenberg's
implicational universals of human language (Chapter I), but it also
meets Hale's conditions (a-e) which suggest that Kunjen is no differ­
ent in essence from all human languages. More important are observa­
tions concerning the rules of the grammar. Kunjen requires rules
which are already well established as being necessary to English,
French, Czechoslovakian, Sora and Maori. Among these rules are
operations which effect sentence conjunction, EQUI-NP DELETION,
REFLEXIVIZATION, PRONOMINALIZATION and EXTRAPOSITION—to name just a
few. These rules perform the same operations (formal universals) on
the same categories (substantive universals) in Kunjen as in Mohawk or Huichol.

The rules and discussion of them in the chapters that follow support Hale's contention: neither Kunjen nor any Australian language can be regarded as primitive in any non-trivial, meaningful sense.

Why Case Grammar?

The primary requirement on any grammatical description is that it characterize the linguistic competence of a speaker of a given language.

At the lowest level of 'adequacy', or success in this endeavor, a grammar recognizes the well-formedness of certain sentences but rejects others as being deviant. Thus for English, (i-iii) are acceptable, but (iv) is not.

(i) John expected Harry to leave.
(ii) John persuaded Harry to leave.
(iii) It was expected by John that Harry would leave.
(iv) *It was persuaded by John that Harry would leave.

A grammar which notes such facts is 'observationally adequate' (Chomsky 1964). In its reductio ad absurdum it consists of lists of sentences like (i-iii) in a given language, without comment or explication. And since the sentences of any natural language are infinite in number (as pointed out frequently in the literature) such lists would be infinitely long and utterly devoid of linguistically significant information—particularly generalizations—about the language.
At a higher level of adequacy, the acceptability of (i-iii) is accounted for, and the relationship between (i) and (iii) made explicit. This is Chomsky's 1964 'descriptive adequacy' at which level structural descriptions are assigned to each sentence of the language, and rules (of one sort or another) account for all the regularities.

That (iv) cannot occur as an English sentence is not a matter of an 'accidental gap' but of specific exclusion achieved by precise formulations about the language. That is to say, the linguistic competence of a native speaker has been characterized by the grammar if it excludes such sentences.

If this characterization is correct, and if the grammar captures significant generalizations in a concise way, some degree of 'explanatory adequacy' has been achieved. At this level, the intuition of the speaker can be explained by 'well motivated' rules on a 'principled basis' set up to account for the language data. The grammar boasting the greatest explanatory adequacy contains the most germane, significant generalizations about a language, which lesser grammars do not contain. That is to say that the ungrammaticality of (iv) can be accounted for by reference to a 'principled basis' which accounts for its exclusion from the data of English.

At this level of adequacy, the grammar is making statements about the nature of language itself. If, of two grammars A and B of a language L, A makes fewer valid generalizations than B, then it must be assumed that B has not only achieved a greater explanatory
adequacy than A, but it has also made claims (trivial or otherwise) about language itself and/or about the form that a grammar of L must take. Such claims are the source of the substantive and formal universals of language.

An observationally adequate description of Kunjen would necessarily include an account of the following sentences:

(2.1) il uralary ukel oRtan alol.¹
[She wife-AG] peg chop go-RPAST
'(His) wife went and chopped pegs.'

(2.2) il udal ifom onelbmban atar iqun.
[He dog-AG] that neck bite-RPAST him
'The dog bit that (animal's) neck.'

(2.3) arog anguañand iyalmen ambamn aliq.
[Child young-AG] play cause-RCUST ours
'The young children were playing with our (opossum).' 

(2.4) iq albmb ilimb aden udal atar.
meat opossum then my [dog-AG] bite-RPAST
'Then the dog bit my opossum.'

These sentences might for convenience be referred to as 'transitive'. The subject of these sentences is formally marked by a postposition having a variety of spellings; the object is unmarked. Kunjen is thus an 'ergative' type language as suggested by Hale (n.d.).
A second type of construction is the 'middle' sentence, examples of which follow:

(2.5) \text{ergel\ ay\ oRaŋar\ ağen\ undamay...}
\text{say-RPAST\ I\ [husband\ my\ E-DAT]}
'I said to my husband,..'

(2.6) \text{alkar\ il\ iqun\ uraŋaray...}
\text{shout-RPAST\ he\ [to\ him\ wife-DAT]}
'He shouted to his wife,..'

(2.7) \text{agOAraay\ ergel\ il...}
\text{[white-man-DAT]\ say-RPAST\ he}
'He said to the white man,..'

The 'object' of these sentences is marked by \text{-ay}, but the 'subject' remains unmarked, or is spelled zero. The 'object' here may be considered the dative, or indirect object.

Yet another construction is that involving the 'intransitive' sentence, in which the subject is again unmarked.

(2.8) \text{iq\ itom\ odndol\ il.}
\text{meat\ that\ float-RPAST\ he}
'That animal floated (to the top).'

(2.9) \text{odnd\ amb\ elkel\ ul\ ital.}
\text{just\ still\ return-RPAST\ they\ hungry}
'They had to return home still hungry.'
These constructions are typical of their type; each may occur with negatives, embedded sentences, locatives, interrogatives, wh- words, etc. and in various transformational derivations. For the purposes of our discussion, however, the above data will suffice; a descriptive grammar of Kunjen must account (at least) for all the above examples in order to be descriptively adequate, and must do so in a meaningful, principled fashion in order to achieve any explanatory power.

On the other hand, it must not derive, or must mark as deviant, sentences such as the following:

(2.11) *in ǐgom agqar odndol il.

[meat that] [w.man] float-RPAST he

(in which neither NP is marked and an intransitive verb appears)

(2.12) *in ǐgomiw odndol il.

[meat that-AG] float-RPAST he

(in which the subject NP of an intransitive sentence is marked)
Three descriptive models will be considered in turn. All are, or can be made to be, descriptively adequate so far as the above data are concerned. The problem at this level is to characterize the intuition of the native speaker with respect to the sentence types given. Not only must the relationship between the verb and its appropriate sentence type be shown, but also the correlation with noun phrase affixation must be established.

The Tagmemic Theory—Longacre 1964. In the tagmemic approach of Longacre, or Pike 1967, three contrastive sentence (or clause) level syntagmemes would be recognized. A tagmemic formulation would be assigned to each, represented approximately by the following:

- **Clause\text{tr} = +S:NP subj +O:NP +Pred:VP\_tr**
- **Clause\text{mid} = +S:NP +O:NP dat +Pred:VP\_mid**
- **Clause\text{intr} = +S:NP +Pred:VP\_intr**

In the lexicon, verbs are marked for their membership in one of the classes \text{tr}, \text{mid} or \text{intr}, according to their potential for occurrence in \text{VP\_tr}, \text{VP\_mid} or \text{VP\_intr} respectively.

- **ata-1** \text{V\_tr}
- **erge-2** \text{V\_mid}
- **igu-1** \text{V\_intr}
On the next level down the grammatical hierarchy, further formulations account for the phrases.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{VP}(z) &= \ldots +\text{Head:verb}(z), \text{ where } z \text{ is the class of verb} \\
\text{NP}_{\text{subj}} &= \ldots +\text{Head:noun}_{\text{AG}} \ldots \\
\text{NP}_{\text{dat}} &= \ldots +\text{Head:noun}_{\text{DAT}} \ldots \\
\text{NP} &= \ldots +\text{Head:noun} \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

This description aligns each verb with the correct sequence of sentential complements, correctly marked as to sentential function. It claims to be descriptively adequate.

The Standard Theory—Chomsky 1965. The interesting claim made by this model is that the difference in the sentences above can be attributed to the strict subcategorization of the verb. That is to say, the syntactic features associated with the verb in its representation in the lexicon will only permit insertion of that verb in syntactically well-formed sentences. In Chomsky's own words,

\[
\ldots \text{every frame in which \textit{V} appears, in the VP, is relevant to the strict subcategorization of \textit{V}, and} \\
\ldots \text{no frame which is not part of the VP is relevant to the strict subcategorization of \textit{V}. (1965:96)}
\]

Ignoring at this stage the problem of order, the expansion of the VP constituent for Kunjen might be represented thus:

\[
\text{tns V NP PP } \ldots
\]

For the three verbs outlined above, the relevant strict subcategorizations would be
ata-1 'bite' [+V, tns_NP]
derge-2 'speak' [+V, tns_PP]
ingu-1 'go' [+V, tns__]

The base structure could be modified, no doubt, to accommodate a DP (dative phrase) instead of a PP (postpositional phrase, to include locative, directional and dative), or alternatively the PP could be assigned the feature [+Dative]. Either would ensure the necessary -ay affixation.

The subject of ata-1 could be assigned the appropriate marker by a transformation either triggered by a feature attached to the verb, or alternatively by one assigned to the NP subject by the verb.

When this has been decided, descriptive adequacy has been achieved, and the data satisfactorily accounted for.

'Case' Theory--Fillmore 1968a. Fillmore's case theory rejects the traditional subject-predicate dichotomy preserved by Chomsky (S + NP~VP) as an unwarranted residue inherited by linguistics from philosophy. Instead, the 'subject', 'object', dative, locational phrase and verb are subsumed under a single node, P (for proposition) which comprises, with M (modality), the sentence S.

More important is the assertion that P dominates a set of cases, with respect to the verb, each having its own distinctive case marker K associated with the respective NP. These cases are
semantically defined and present to the semantic component considerable simplification in its interpretive function.

The theory also gains from the subcategorization of verbs now possible under the P node, since the grammatical subject of all sentences will now be included in the 'case frame' specification of each verb. The same three verbs are characterized by distinct case frames.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ata-1} & \quad 'bite' \quad [\text{AO}___] \\
\text{erge-2} & \quad 'speak' \quad [\text{OD}___] \\
\text{igu-1} & \quad 'go' \quad [,0___] \\
\end{align*}
\]

The cases are easily specified by further rules.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{K (A)} & = \text{AG} \\
\text{K (O)} & = \emptyset \quad (\text{i.e. is spelled zero}) \\
\text{K (D)} & = \text{DAT} \quad (= -\text{ay}) \\
\end{align*}
\]

These 'deep structure' cases appear on the surface as the grammatical 'subject', 'object', 'indirect object', etc. according to the rules of the grammar, including the subject choice hierarchy rules.

Hence a level of descriptive adequacy is claimed also for case grammar.

**Explanatory Adequacy.** The above descriptions characterize--or caricature--the intuitions of a native speaker about certain parts of his language. Each description defines the basis of a well-formed set of sentences in the language. For any to have achieved explanatory adequacy, however, it must have discovered 'significant
generalizations' that help to explain the speaker's intuition rather than merely describing it.

The differences between the three models outlined above are not very great, but are nevertheless sufficient to allow a reasoned choice of one as being greater in explanatory power than the others. Consider first the tagmemic model. There is no strict subcategorization here, in the Chomskian sense, but if we read

$$\text{ata-1} = \text{V}_{tr}$$

to mean 'insert this verb in the \text{VP}_{tr} which cooccurs with +S:NP_{subj} and +0:NP' then in actuality the differences are merely notational. The entire clause is thus 'relevant to the subcategorization of V', and hence capable of differentiating the verbs ata-1 and erge-2 without difficulty, by reference to their S and O fillers.

But other difficulties arise. Under this theory, the differences between NP, NP_{subj} and NP_{dat} are in the fillers of the heads of the respective phrases. ud 'dog' appears in an NP as the unmarked ud, in an NP_{subj} as udal, and in an NP_{dat} as uday. If this exhausted the necessary subclassification of word classes then the theory would be not nearly so embarrassed. In fact, however, the functional markers are postpositions to the phrase, so that the last word of the phrase is usually fused with the functional marker phonologically.

Not only does this fact render the above formulations inadequate, but implies that the difference in noun phrases is not always due to the form of the head noun. ([5.7] exemplifies variations
based on ud 'dog' in what tagmemics would recognize as an NP_{subj}.)
The word-morphology noted above is not treated by tagmemics on the clause level, where it is responsible for functional differences, but on the word level. On the phrase level these morphological differences become responsible for numerous phrase types that are scarcely economical, and a vast multiplication of word classes or phrases embedded within the phrase concerned, when these occur with the function marker. To take the subject of a transitive verb alone,

\[
\begin{align*}
noun_{AG} \\
adjective_{AG} \\
comitative phrase_{AG} \\
and
genitive phrase_{AG}
\end{align*}
\]

occur (in order) in (5.7) without exhausting all the possibilities.

An alternative would be to rewrite the offending phrases on the clause level, e.g.

\[C_{1\text{tr}} = +S:NP +K:AG +O:NP (+X:\emptyset) +\text{Pred:VP}_{\text{tr}} \ldots\]

This is justifiable, since AG is a marker pertinent to the clause level, and the NP and VP(2) phrases can be dealt with on the phrase level.

'What you gain on the swings you lose on the roundabouts' however. What the theory now lacks is a convenient notation for indicating 'subject of', 'object of' etc. for the purposes of describing stylistic permutations of sentence constituents, where these sentence constituents obviously operate as a unity. That is, there is no way to denote 'subject' but by S + K, and so on. But
this violates the 'functional' definition of the clause level
tagmemes 'subject' or 'object', and only causes other embarrassment
to the theory.

The 'standard' theory of Chomsky's Aspects of the theory of
syntax suffers from a defect of another nature. Because 'no frame
which is not part of the VP is relevant to the strict subcategori-
zation of V' we must resort to some purely ad hoc device to ensure
that the subject NP of ata-1 'bite' is assigned its 'agentive'
affix, while the subject of erge-2 remains unmarked. The alternative
is to reject the Chomskian formulation of strict subcategorization.

The subjects of ata-1 and of erge-2 differ in only this one
respect. To account for it, a transformational triggering device is
necessary to either (1) derive a node A in the right place for ata-1,
or (2) delete an obligatory A postposition for verbs like erge-2
where A is derived by base rules.

Not only so, but the 'dative object' of erge-2 must be speci-
fied similarly. The strict subcategorization feature [+V, tns__NP^dat]
would perhaps suffice, where NP dat is dominated by PP, provided
that no rule operates on such an NP within the verb phrase that does
not operate on a similar NP in a transitive sentence, or vice versa.

Neither of the two descriptions discussed this far have suc-
cceeded in stating elegantly two important generalizations:

1. The verb alone is the sentence constituent which requires
both the form and occurrence of certain other sentence
constituents.
2. The sentence constituents that complement the verbs under discussion comprise in all cases an NP and—in some instances—an affix or postposition.

The description achieved by case theory meets these requirements. That is, it effects the generalizations (1) and (2) above without the awkwardness that attends the other two theories, by combining the advantages of each. The subject choice hierarchy rules choose the marked Agentive (A) case as subject for verbs like a[tə-] 'bite', and the Object (O) remains unmarked:

```
S
  \--- M
   \- A
    \- NP
      \- N
        \- al
          \- (etc.)
    \- O
     \- NP
      \- N
        \- Ø
          \- a[tə-] 1
```

For verbs like erge-2 and igu-1, the unmarked subject is interpreted as the O case once again. Because there is no A, subject choice rules select the O as grammatical subject. The dative case, required as the complement of erge-2, is specified by the strict subcategorization feature of that verb. In effect, the Chomskian definition of strict subcategorization has been broadened to include all NP complements of the verb as case categories.
A Fillmorian case grammar claims therefore a higher level of adequacy than both tagmemics and the 'standard' or 'Aspects' version of transformational theory in accounting for the two important generalizations noted earlier. It claims that cases are substantive universals, introduced as 'sister' categories of the verb. In the subject choice rules, it reflects the fact that alternative cases are available to the grammars of some languages when certain verbs are selected, and speakers have a creative choice of subject in such instances.
The above considerations are of a purely formal and theoretical nature. There are, however, language-specific reasons why a case grammar account of Oykangand is more satisfactory than any alternative account. Consider the example

(2.14) in eründiy ibmbuRiv uyamiy ari il ijun.

meat crocodile plain hand hit-RPAST he him

where the only reasonable semantic reading is 'The crocodile hit him with its paw out on the plain'. The Oykangand words glossed 'crocodile', 'plain' and 'hand' each have the fused postposition -iy. This spelling is typical of agents, instruments and locations. The problem is to account for the obvious semantic reading by excluding any others on some sort of principled basis.

The 'standard' theory relies on the selectional feature [+animate] to differentiate the subject NP in eründ; the verb ari-1 'hit' requiring this feature of its subject. In this, it is an improvement on tagmemics, but it offers no principled exclusion of the interpretation of this sentence as '*The crocodile hit him with a plain at his hand'. Both ibmbuRiy and uyamiy have the same postposition, and are each developed from a PP node in the verb phrase.

The alternative offered by case grammar causes no such difficulty. Because the cases are semantically defined, there is no deep structure ambiguity. Sentence (2.14) results from transformations effected on the deep structure in (2.15).
Capell 1956 notes:

The term "operative" case, first suggested to me by Dr. C. M. Churchward some ten years ago, is preferable to "agentive" because it covers more neatly two different usages of the suffix - the first to express the instrument by which an act is performed, and the second the person who performs it. Thus in Gobabwingu, julnu-ji nara-na gate-ji bu-nala, 'man me spear-with hit-did'. In this example, both julnu, the agent, and gate, the instrument, take the same suffix, -ji. It is difficult to call the man the 'instrument' or the spear the 'agent' of the action. The term "operative" covers both, since both operate in their different ways. (63-4)

But in this instance the form of the two cases have simply fallen together, as in most Australian languages. The suggestion here is that rather than a new term, what is needed is merely a simple semantic definition of each case, and this is offered by case grammar.

The Notion of 'Subject'

Crucial to the understanding of case theory is Fillmore's concept of the subject. This is the noun phrase brought into some
kind of focus of attention in the surface structure of a sentence. Languages which permit alternative choices to be made among the NP components of a case frame—or specified array of cases defined by a verb—are said to allow 'primary topicalization' or 'subjectivalization' (Fillmore 1968a:57 et seq.). The focus or attention gained by a subject NP is regarded here as being the result of the movement of the case containing the NP from within the Proposition (P) to direct domination by S. That is, subject choice effects a structural change.

This structural change is reflected by pronoun selection. Example (2.16) represents the intermediate structure of a transitive sentence (2.17) in which subject, object and genitive pronouns appear. It is possible to predict the form of the pronoun from structural considerations alone (the few exceptions are accounted for later).

(2.16)
(2.17) udal in pigipig aṣen aṣar il iṣun.
[dog-AG] meat my bite-RPAST he it 'The dog bit my pig.'

Under A, the case transported by the subject choice rules from domination by P to domination by S, the subject pronouns of Table 8.1 are introduced. Middle sentences and Intransitive sentences introduce the same pronouns from their 'unmarked' O case subjects, likewise dominated by S. Under the O of (2.16), and under D, L and other cases dominated directly by P, the object pronouns of Table 8.2 are introduced, and under D,N (Dative dominated by a noun) the GENITIVE rule introduces the genitive pronouns of Table 8.3.

There are thus clear reasons for proposing that ud in (2.16) is the surface subject of the sentence, but there is counter evidence. By ignoring the pronouns, an alternative appears.

O case consistently appears without any case postposition, whether in middle and intransitive sentences where it is clearly the subject, or in transitive sentences. The claim has been made that languages having the 'ergative' system described above possess in fact verbs which are inherently passive, i.e. languages whose Objective NPs are really always subjects.

Hale (n.d.) argues this point very persuasively for Australian languages. Its advantages are obvious—the subject NP always has its source in the O case, which loses its case postposition when a verb appears.
This view gains some support from 'equational' and 'possessive' sentences where no verb appears, and the subject is presumed to be a Dative—which loses its case postposition in the manner of all subjects. But the complement of the Dative is the Objective. Here the O case occurs again without a case postposition and unless it is claimed that the O case postposition is zero, and that this is deleted in 'verbless' sentences, then this argument gains only the charge that it is specious.

Hale develops some interesting conclusions on the passive-ergative hypothesis, and it may be that these are correct, without necessarily validating the hypothesis. He also offers some remarks on the pronominal evidence cited above for the view adopted in this study; not all will find his remarks convincing.

With the sole exception then, of passive alternatives to active constructions (in languages that have the two) subjectivization depends on the cases realized as the sister categories of any verb. Under the theory chosen for this study, Fillmore's (1968:22) examples 18, 19 and 20 illustrate the case frame of the verb break [(A)_O (I)].

18. John broke the window.

19. A hammer broke the window.

20. John broke the window with a hammer.

It is also possible to say

The window broke.
The four sentences each select a subject automatically according to the cases realized in the respective frames

[A_O]

[I_O]

[A_O I] and

[O_].

This phenomenon gives rise to the idea of 'subject choice rules' in which a hierarchy of cases is recognized; if A occurs, it is the subject, and if no A occurs then the I and O cases are chosen in that order.

Strictly speaking, subject choice rules are only valid where the case frame permits optionality in the cases that can become subject, as in the instance of break. Oykangand offers no such options in the specification of its verbs. The subject choice rules therefore read the case frame of each verb, and select the subject, but there is no alternative available for any of the verbs in the lexicon (with two exceptions). ari-1 'hit' and ata-1 'bite' are always transitive; the Agentive is always selected as subject—no other possibility, not even passivization, is acceptable. In this sense Kunjen is an ergative language, which lacks subjectivalization in Fillmore's terms.

Residual Problems

'Kunjen syntax' accounts for the entire corpus of the language available to the researcher through eliciting and tape recording. It is based on the norms of informal discussion, conversation
and narrative. More formal speech, the language of the culture-myths, poetry, heated argument and of children is beyond the scope of this study.

It is not to be assumed that because the entire corpus is accounted for that each and every rule of the grammar is supported by independent motivation, or that the whole of the grammar is represented in neat, well formulated rules. For example, the facts of aRemar and ilg ar are reported in Chapter VI, but no principled explanation can yet be offered for the structures in which these appear. Another example concerns the -ay which appears on verbs in constructions involving amba-1 (Chapter X). The facts are reported, but their place in the rules of a complete grammar of Kunjen is sometimes uncertain. Yet another difficulty is pointed out in Chapter XII with respect to the rules themselves.

The choice of a case grammar theory of language has already been justified, both with respect to theoretical considerations and with regard to the facts of Oykangand. It must not be assumed that the theory as currently conceived answers all the problems of a grammatical description of Kunjen. There are points at which a more deeply 'semantic' syntax appears to be worthy of investigation, and where case grammar tends to hint at a semantic solution to the problems that arise. These points include the derivation of Locatives (Chapter V), the insertion of M constituents into P (Chapter IX), and classifier insertion (Chapter VII).

The conditions and constraints on various structures and rules also constitute an embarrassment. The only encouragement at
this point comes from Dingwall 1969 who lists a whole series of 'filters' found necessary by various generative scholars to prevent ungrammatical derivations.

The residual problems that defy satisfactory settlement are nevertheless fewer in number and smaller in scope than are encountered in alternative theories. They point in some cases to semantic solutions, and in others to language-specific phenomena for which even in the ultimate analysis an ad hoc solution may be necessary.

FOOTNOTE

1 For an account of the conventions governing the underlining of suffixes, the glossing of the literal translation, bracketing and abbreviations see Chapter III.
Chapter III

NOTATIONAL CONVENTIONS

No attempt is made in this study to exhaustively discuss Kunjen phonology. For such a description see Sommer 1969. The notational devices and conventions necessary to presenting a readable account of the syntax of Kunjen follow.

A surface phonological analysis of Kunjen requires the recognition of the following segments.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
p & \xi & t & \eta & k \\
b & d & d & \partial & g \\
f & \partial & y \\
m & n & \ddot{n} & \eta \\
l & \\
r & R \ l \\
w & y \\
i & u \\
e & o \\
a & \\
\end{array}
\]

The Olgol dialect has \(y\) rather than \(\xi\); the stop orders are differentiated by aspiration rather than voicing.

The Kunjen words cited in this study are transcribed in terms of the above system. Some words require that a specific
final vowel be appended to the citation form in order to spell the form of the lexical entry. In other words, some lexical entries appear in the examples as if the phonological rule which deletes a final vowel had already operated. For example ud 'dog', in 'meat, animal' and al 'fire' are cited rather than the fuller lexical entries uda, ina and alu respectively. (The tables of Chapter V which spell out the various case postpositional forms are predicted on the underlying representations of the lexicon, but in most other instances the final vowel deletion rule has been assumed.)

English words are transcribed according to traditional English usage. No attempt has been made to integrate the English interference phenomena observed in the speech of some Oykangand informants into this study.

Some of the more frequent phonological processes deserve mention. Certain verbs that appear with a -y suffix for the Realis Present and Irrealis Imperative tenses lose that y and the preceding vowel by a regular obligatory rule. This accounts for the reduction of

\[
\begin{align*}
ergey & \quad '\text{speak}' \\
inay & \quad '\text{sit}' \text{ and} \\
erney & \quad '\text{stand}'
\end{align*}
\]

to the forms

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{erg} \\
in & \quad \text{and} \\
\text{ern} & \quad \text{respectively.}
\end{align*}
\]
The verbs which undergo this rule are marked in the lexicon. Verbs of this type are class 2 verbs which occur with a definitive series of tense markers (Table 9.1). Membership in one of the two possible classes of Oykangand verbs is indicated by a numeral whenever a verb stem is cited.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a\text{	extendash}a} & : 1 \quad \text{'bite'} \\
\text{erge} & : 2 \quad \text{'speak'} \\
\text{igu} & : 1 \quad \text{'go'}.
\end{align*} \]

Class 1 verbs select \( n \), class 2 verbs select \( \text{n} \), as an 'empty' morph inserted between the vowel of the verb stem and the vowel of certain affixes, for example the Purposive (PRP) suffix \(-\text{ay}\), or the Participle Past marker \(-\text{am}\).

Other rules effect the change of stem final \( n \) to \( \text{n} \) before \( \text{d} \), or to \( \text{n} \) before \( \text{d} \). Final \( 1 \) becomes \( \text{R} \) before \( \text{nd} \).

The form of the rules and illustrative trees in this study is that traditionally associated with transformational-generative grammars. In some of the tree diagrams, the author has simplified the structure or labelling for the sake of clarity, or to more lucidly illustrate the point under discussion. In structures involving pronominalization, the more traditional and readable notation involving person and number are substituted for more formal feature matrices.

The literal gloss of Oykangand examples provided between the language and the free English translation contains information also
of a grammatical nature. Case postpositions—where overtly realized—are underlined, as are tense or other verbal suffixes. Except for the objective case, bracketing is employed to define the scope of the case whose postposition normally appears before the closing bracket, or whose function is otherwise identified by an abbreviation.

Less obvious is the occurrence of pronominal forms. Personal pronouns are permuted to a position following the verb by a rule discussed in Chapter VIII. The reader is referred to Tables 8.1 to 8.3 for the form of the personal pronouns of Oykangand. Another optional rule, the SCRAMBLING rule, permutes sentence constituents for stylistic reasons, often affecting the basic SOV order. The appearance of examples having an order of constituents not permitted by the rules to that point should not unduly disturb the reader for this reason.

Another possible source of confusion is the repeated appearance of words like abm 'person', in 'meat, animal' or ego 'food'. These are classifiers, selected by and introduced from nouns of the language. The classifiers also occur as full nouns for which there is a potential for independent occurrence. Examples are as follows.

- abm alŋgeŋ 'person young-woman'
- in oyboy 'meat wallaby'
- ego antun 'food sweet-lily'.

Some of the above mechanical conventions are discarded in the text samples of Chapters XIII and XIV in order to save space and retain readability.
Table 3.1

Major Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agentive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Agentive case postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/P</td>
<td>Comitative/Privative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSL</td>
<td>Causal case or its postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>Dative case postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Empty morph inserted by Spelling Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Instrumental case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>Instrumental case postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Partial reduplication introduced by [+INTENS]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPOT</td>
<td>Irrealis potential tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPAST</td>
<td>Irrealis past tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIMP</td>
<td>Irrealis imperative tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFUT</td>
<td>Irrealis future tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Case postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Locative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Modality constituent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Objective case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Proposition constituent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNP</td>
<td>Participle non-past tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPAST</td>
<td>Participle past tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPOT</td>
<td>Participle potential tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Prereferential noun; amb etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>Purposive case or its postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Reduplicative (complete) morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Relativizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCUST</td>
<td>Realis customary tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFUT</td>
<td>Realis future tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RINT</td>
<td>Realis intensive tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPAST</td>
<td>Realis past tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFPRES</td>
<td>Realis present tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>Subject choice rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Any case constituent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FOOTNOTE

¹In the symbolization of the vibrants $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathfrak{r}$ I depart here from the orthography followed earlier (Sommer 1969) in favor of Hale's 1964 usage.
Chapter IV
CONJUNCTION

Introduction

Traditional grammars of English recognize two types of sentence conjunction: subordinate and coordinate. The distinction has been found useful in other languages also, and Hockett 1958 provides examples and discussion.

More recently the phenomenon of coordinate conjunction has attracted the interest of generative grammarians. Chomsky 1957, Carlota Smith 1969, Leila Gleitman 1965 and Lakoff and Peters 1966 have made contributions to our understanding of English conjunction and to the theory of conjunction in general. Few of the above authors have been able to avoid the related matters of phrasal conjunction and pronominalization—especially is this the case for Gleitman and for Lakoff and Peters.

Ross's contributions to the theory of sentence conjunction include the concept of gapping (1967a, b) that will be referred to later in the discussion of Oykangand sentences. That gapping and sentence conjunction are still a matter of scholarly debate is evident from a recent article by Dingwall 1969, in which a lucid resumé of Ross (supra) and Schane 1966 may be found, along with some additional evidence.

Following Schane, primary and secondary conjunction will be distinguished in the following way: The structure (4.1b) (produced
by rules from [4.1a]) is a case of primary conjunction; that of
(4.1c) (produced by an alternate rule schema) exemplifies
secondary conjunction. The examples are from Dingwall 1969:209:

(4.1a)

(4.1b)

(4.1c)
Simple Coordinate Sentences

Oykangand has only coordinate conjunction. The function of English subordinate constructions is effected either by coordinate structures or by sentence embedding. Coordinate sentences may be simply juxtaposed, with the requirement that all but the last sentence in such a coordinate sequence have non-final intonation.

(4.2) abm ay in elkoy idar, lalanal uy idar.
person I meat turtle ate-RPAST [uncle-AG] fish ate-RPAST
'I ate the turtle (and) uncle ate the fish.'

(4.3) akanar aden undamar in oyboy ungul awaR idur
[y.brother my E-AG] meat wallaby there east spear-RPAST
il, elken ambanm anjan il.
he bring-home-RCUST for-us he
'My younger brother speared a wallaby away to the east,
(and) was bringing it home for us.'

The formulation of a base rule to account for sentence conjunction nevertheless includes a sentence particle (sp). Two such particles, ilimb 'then, next' and amp uw 'as a consequence of, since' occur in Oykangand syntax, but neither is regarded as a conjunction. In the first place, later transformational rules may permute the sentence constituents such that sp occurs before the verb, or in some other non-initial position. In the second, either sp may occur in a single sentence, which cannot be regarded as being
conjoined to any other sentence. Such a wide privilege of occurrence is distinct from that enjoyed by conjunctives such as 'and' or disjunctives such as 'but', 'or' etc., and hence *ilimb* and *amp uw* are not accorded the status of conjunctions.  

(4.4) \[ \text{BR}_1 \quad S \rightarrow (\text{sp}) \ S \quad (S)* \]

The function of *ilimb* and *amp uw* in single, non-coordinate sentences is evident from the following:

(4.5) *ilimb arir ay.*
then hit-RPAST I
'Then I fired.'

(4.6) *ilimb arir uw il iñun.*
then hit-RPAST again he him
'Then he hit him again.'

(4.7) *abm ay iñav amp uw igur.*
person I [meat-PRP] since go-RPAST
'I had to go for the meat (and this excluded other considerations).'

(4.8) *ôngom amp uw aRtin ay!*
this since work-RPRES I
'I am too busy (for anything else)!'
iliimb and amp uw function in coordinate sentences in the following examples.

(4.9) ilimb il īlanāŋ ong olon adeŋan, ilimb ay ukel
then the uncle thither come-IFUT then I bullets
uwapan igun.
'If uncle comes this way, I'll give him the bullets.'

(4.10) awaR igunm ul, ilimb ubalŋ udnal ul.
east go-RCUST they-2 then half-way camp-RPAST they-2
'They were going east, and camped half-way.'

(4.11) abm ay anjaŋγ igur ay ofoɣoRay ortaR amay
person I NEG go-RPAST I [river-to]L cloud big
ar tęŋ ambusan amp uw.
arise-RPAST to-us since
'I didn't go out to the river, because big clouds blew up our way.'

(4.12) abm ay amp uw ar tęŋ ay, erk akarkaŋγ amp uw
person I since work-RPRES I place dusty since
ugŋiŋ eyd un aŋun.
leave-RPAST they me
'I am too busy working for anything else, since they left the place so dusty for me.'
Primary Conjunction

Primary conjunction has been recognized as a part of transformational-generative theory ever since Chomsky's original *Syntactic structures* (1957). Primary conjunction is there viewed as phrasal conjunction that results from the application of transformational rules to conjoined sentences. Lakoff and Peters 1966 comment that

The clearest suggestion that phrasal conjunction be derived from sentence conjunction can be found in Gleitman (1965). Many other transformational grammarians have hoped that some scheme of derivation such as presented by Gleitman would solve the problem of phrasal conjunction. (113-4)

A special case of phrasal conjunction exists in English, where two phrases in each of a series of coordinate sentences may be conjoined if they are the same sentence constituents. This is the case in (4.1b) above, where 'respectively' is introduced to preserve the semantic reading. A further case is that in (4.13a, b).

(4.13a) George hates Elvis Presley, and Teresa adores Elvis Presley.

(4.13b) George and Teresa respectively hate and adore Elvis Presley.

'Respectively' obviates the multiply ambiguous (4.1d) and the nonsensical (4.13c).

(4.1d) Mary and John teach algebra and geometry.
(4.13c) George and Teresa hate and adore Elvis Presley.

Oykangand lacks any syntactic device akin to 'respectively', and hence phrasal conjunction is limited to that type of derivation also seen in English without 'respectively'. The conjunction of a (theoretically infinite) series of nominal phrases, each having the same sentential function and each having otherwise identical sentence components in their underlying structures, results from a rule schema operating on a series of such conjoined sentences. Example

(4.14) lalaŋal uy ḷam nl, niŋŋal uy
[uncle-AG] fish eat-RCUST he [aunty-AG] fish

iŋŋal nl.

eat-RCUST she

(4.14) reduces to (4.15) by the PHRASAL CONJUNCTION rule (4.16).

(4.15) lalaŋal, niŋŋal ul, uy ḷam ul.
[uncle-AG] [aunty-AG] they-2 fish eat-RCUST they-2

'Uncle and aunty were eating fish.'

PHRASAL CONJUNCTION

(4.16) (X) - Y - (Z), (X) - Y₁ - (Z) ... (X) - Yₙ - (Z) =>

(X) - Y # Y₁ # ... # Yₙ - (Z)

This rule reduces the (simplified) structure of (4.17) to that of (4.18).
The pronouns are copied in by later transformations.

The sentence (4.19) cannot undergo the PHRASAL CONJUNCTION rule as formulated above; conjunction of both the A and O components would result in the ambiguous (4.20).

(4.19) lalaŋal uy idanm il, niŋaŋal ip elkoy
[uncle-AG] fish eat-RCUST he [aunty-AG] meat turtle
idanm.
eat-RCUST
Unlike English, which disambiguates such sentences by either 'respectively' or words like 'both', 'each', 'together', etc., Oykangand must rely solely for disambiguation on idndamay 'together' or erbaniy 'together'. (The use of one or the other is governed by feature [animate] on the nouns concerned.) Hence (4.22) is regarded as being transformationally related to (4.21), rather than to (4.19). (4.19/20) and (4.21/22) have quite distinct semantic readings.

(4.21)  lalaŋal uy iðanm il, iŋ elkoy erbaniy,  
niŋaŋal uy iðanm il, iŋ elkoy erbaniy.

(4.22)  lalaŋal, niŋaŋ ul, uy, iŋ elkoy erbaniy iðanm ul.  
'Uncle and aunty were each eating fish and turtle together.' (4.21/22)

Phrasal conjunction operates on nominal phrases only; there is no equivalent to the English sentence (4.23).

(4.23)  Uncle was preparing and eating fish.

There are also constraints on the variables, (X) and (Z) in the above formulation. Neither may contain the sentence particles
(sp) *iilm* and *amp uw*. Both *sp* indicate some sort of sequential relation: *iilm* usually of time, *amp uw* of purpose. The restriction would appear to be semantic in origin:

\[ X, Z \text{ contains no } sp. \]

Can all phrasal conjunction in Oykangand be transformationally derived from sentence conjunction? In English it apparently cannot be exclusively so derived; Lakoff and Peters find that 'at least in the case of noun phrases, conjunction must occur in the base component' of a grammar of English. A similar conclusion is indicated for Oykangand, but the evidence is less compelling.

Lakoff and Peters present rules of *Preposition Adjunction* and *Conjunct Movement* which apply to the conjoined NP subjects of English sentences, and derive such sentences as

- John PAST confer with Bill.
- John PAST rob a bank with Bill.
- John PRES be similar to Bill.

from a conjoined NP

- and John and Bill.

Either John or Bill can become the ultimate surface subject of

- and John and Bill PRES be similar

and the entire sense of the sentence be retained. That is, a case of entailment exists between the following derived sentences:

- John PRES be similar to Bill.
- Bill PRES be similar to John.

One cannot be true and the other false (Lakoff and Peters 1966).
Similar sentences can be found in Oykangand.

(4.24) bebaŋ, wuwaŋ, ukal ilgay ul.
'o.sister daughter name together they-2
'My older sister and my daughter have the same name.'

(4.25) James, Ian ul, ow-onbaR idndamay ul.
'they-2 face-together they-2
'James and Ian look alike.'

There is also a sentence (4.26) having the same semantic content as (4.25) and entailed by it. (A parallel sentence exists for [4.24] also.)

(4.26) James il ow-onbaR idndamay injun Ian-an.
'he face-together [him -DAT]
'James looks like Ian.'

A highly tentative history of the derivation of (4.26) from (4.25) is sketched below. It is highly tentative in that only sentences such as (4.24) and (4.25), containing

\[
( \text{ilgay} \\
N( \text{idndamay}
\]

appear to undergo these transformations, and no independent motivation for the rules can be found within the grammar. (For the PS rules which give the structure of cases see BR 4 to BR 6 in Chapter VI.)
(4.27) S

```
M

P

D

NP  NP  K
James Ian aγ ow-onbaR idndamaγ
```

(4.28) K Adjunction/X Copying

```
S

M

P

D

D

NP  K  NP  K
James aγ  Ian aγ  ow-onbaR idndamaγ
```

(4.29) Subject Choice

```
S

D

M

P

O

D

NP  NP
James ow-onbaR idndamaγ  Ian aγ
```

It will be clear to the reader that the same sort of rules are required in the above as are required by Lakoff and Peters. While not desiring to lay hasty claim to language universals it appears to be not unlikely that a derivation of the above nature is available to the grammars of most, if not all, natural languages. That is to say, certain sentences depend for their correct derivation on phrasal conjunction in the base component. The evidence, such as it is, indicates at least that Oykangand requires a base rule to effect phrasal conjunction similar to that in English. It is presented here in a simplified form:

\[ X \rightarrow NP \ (NP)^*K \]

where \( X \) represents any case constituent of a sentence.
In any sentence in which a conjoined NP occurs, it creates by copying a new node X and case marker K. Thus the structure of D in example (4.27)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{K} \\
\text{James} \quad \text{Ian} \quad aY
\end{array}
\]

develops by the rule of K ADJUNCTION/X COPYING the following structure.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{K} \\
\text{James} \quad aY \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{K} \\
\text{Ian} \quad aY
\end{array}
\]

Conjoined structures—either sentential or phrasal—are delimited by a potential pause in various tempos which is inserted by the phonological component of the grammar. Sentences such as (4.15), (4.22) and (4.24) indicate this pause by use of a comma (,).

A few Oykangand verbs require a non-singular subject. This subject may be a noun having the feature [+dual] or [+plural]. Alternatively, it may be a listing of participants, such as the listing of proper nouns in (4.31).
At first sight, (4.31) would appear to give further evidence for phrasal conjunction in the base, since (4.32) is ungrammatical because of the singular subject.

(4.32) *Arthur il uŋgul ogon alŋgen...

he

The argument collapses if the subject is the (optionally) deleted abm 'person' which is entered with [+plural] as a feature, and the personal names derived by apposition (discussed in Chapter V, but see also BR 4 and BR 5 Chapter VI).

(4.33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N
(abm) Cecil Jimmy Arthur ø

Note that the subject of (4.34) presumably has its source in a similar structure, (4.35).
(4.34) Maudie edn aŋg awaŋ ịgụ edn, uy ikińaŋ.
    they there east go-RPAST they [fish throw-PRP]
    'Maudie and those with her went up the river fishing.'

(4.35)

This is suggested by the semantic reading of (4.34) which does not include 'the (plural) Maudies' as a possibility.

The analysis proposed so far introduces an unwelcome problem. Phrasal conjunction is the outcome of two possible schemata: the PHRASAL CONJUNCTION transformation (4.16) and the base rule X + NP (NP)* K. The sentence (4.36) has a conjoined subject which could be the product of either rule schema, each of which requires a different deep structure.

(4.36) Cecil, Jimmy, Arthur edn ujụgụ inan edn, card-i-y
    ịyalmeụ ambambahanay.
    'Cecil, Jimmy and Arthur used to sit there to play cards.'

The different deep structures underlying (4.36) are each required to have distinct semantic readings.
So far as the writer can ascertain there are two readings of (4.36):

(1) This reading equates Cecil, Jimmy and Arthur with edn 'they-pl', in the manner anticipated by speakers of English.

(2) This reading identifies Cecil, Jimmy and Arthur as members of the set edn which could include one or more other persons, after the pattern of (4.34). It appears to correspond to a structure independent of either the PHRASAL CONJUNCTION rule or the proposed \( X \rightarrow NP \ (NP)^* \) base rule.

Intensive eliciting could not reveal a semantic reading of (4.36) clearly tracable to the PHRASAL CONJUNCTION rule, unless the structure of (4.33) (and hence [4.35]) can be related to it in a manner which still defies analysis. The theoretical difficulties which attend two schemata for phrasal conjunction cannot be resolved any more by this study than by Lakoff and Peters. The transformational schema (4.16) which reflects the 'classical' transformational view is perhaps that which a grammar of Oykgand would function without. The elimination of (4.16) would nevertheless be a drastic measure in view of the impressive accumulation of scholarly evidence in its favor with respect to other languages.

Secondary Conjunction

The rules of secondary conjunction for Oykgand optionally delete any element common to the conjoined sentences. Gapping thus operates 'forward' in a manner similar to English.
Unlike instances of and-conjunction in English, the 'gapping' rule also operates on the subject, as well as the object of a sentence.

The rule schema to effect such deletion is extremely complex, since an element deleted from successive conjoined sentences may again reappear. Gapping rules operate subsequent to pronoun insertion, and the reappearance of pronominal ay in (4.39) must be accounted for in the gapping rule.

The GAPPING rule must also operate on a series of identical sentences, produced for stylistic reasons. Gapping then reduces the
conjoined structures, leaving only that constituent.

(4.40) egn antun afar ay, afar, afar, afar,
food sweet-lily get-RPAST I
aRtir ay.
come-out-RPAST I
'I got some sweet lily, more, and more, and more
I got, then I came out (of the swamp)._'

(4.41) itodamiv ay igigr ey, igur awand,
[there-from]I INT-go-RPAST go-RPAST [west],
igur awand, igur awand, igur awand, onalgn amb
creek PR
arkinm.
follow-RCUST
'From there I went, going westward, westward,
westward, ever westward following that creek._'

Note that from (4.40) the pronominal subject and nominal object
have been 'gapped' out of successive sentences. Sentence (4.41)
shows not only the deletion of itodamiv ay and the reduplicative
ig-, but the introduction of awand in sentences successive to the
first, and like (4.40), a totally different final conjoined S,
from which pronominal ay has in this instance been deleted.

awand, awar and similar 'cardinal' directionals (under
the Locative case) frequently stand alone as the sole remnants of
identical conjoined sentences after application of the gapping rule.

(4.42) ifañ iru ariñ uwend, ifañ iru

ariñ uwend, uwend, uwend, uwend, eg-alkal
we-2-ex [west]$_L$ [straight]$_L$
iru ariñ ey, ịg uwend iru ịn ịm ịn
go-RPAST we-2-ex [there west]$_L$ [meat [child
ilg odndolodndonn am ewal ịg ịm ịm ịm ịn
with]$_C$ r-float-PPAST see-RPAST before we-pl-ex

'On the south (side of the river) we went westward,
on the south side we went westward, westward,
westward, to that place westward where once before
we had seen a crocodile floating with its young.'

A satisfactory account of gapping as described above is
barely formulable, but further evidence makes it virtually
impossible. Gapping not only operates 'forward', (as already
shown) but also 'backward' on conjoined sentences without a verb,
i.e. on 'stative' or 'equational' sentences.

The (dative) topic of (4.43) appears only in the final
conjoined sentence. Since Oykangand has no overt copula, it is
only the topic that has been deleted. The entire utterance is
recorded intact: it constitutes the informant's response to an
illustration.
'Do you see this woman? She has a coolamon standing on her head, a child on her hip, a yamstick in her hand and she's wearing a grass skirt.'

Even more embarrassing cases, in which some 'gapping' rule is clearly at work on sentences which are not dominated by any common S node, have likewise been recorded in 'natural' text material.

'I came back again, with a child on my hip. With a child on my hip I went, carrying Vera. Food on my head, and child on my hip.'

Stylistically the speaker was conveying by repetition some degree of weariness at both carrying her child and hunting too, since the
younger teenage girls are normally assigned to child minding. This
does not however explain the last, independent pair of conjoined
sentences: *egn egamand, arng edoy*. At least the pronominal
(abm) ay has been deleted, and perhaps the verb *algam*.

(4.45) *odnd amb elkel ul. ital.*

vainly PR return-RPAST they-2 hungry

'They just came back—(and they were) hungry.'

Both sentences in (4.45) have final intonation, and there is no
evidence to suggest that they are conjoined. But at least the
pronominal *ul* and probably the verb *elkel* have been deleted from
the second sentence; native speakers will accept either version
when either or both of these constituents are placed in the
sentence.

Transformational-generative theory does not yet provide
any device for stating all these facts. Because 'gapping' is
clearly a language-specific phenomenon (Dingwall 1969) some rule
of gapping should, and perhaps could, be set up for Oykangand, but
it would not be statable within the formal theory currently
available. It must refer to sequences such as (4.46) and correctly
delete sentence constituents.
FOOTNOTE

1Some speakers prefer *ibund* to *amp uw*, others use both forms. The two are apparently alternatives without any difference in semantic or syntactic characteristics.
Chapter V

THE CASE SYSTEM

The case categories of Oykangand are introduced under the Proposition (P) node, which results from application of the rule (5.1).

(5.1) $BR_2$ $S \rightarrow M \ P$

Fillmore comments: 'The P constituent is "expanded" as a verb and one or more case categories' (1968:24). Such a view needs modification for this study; not every Oykangand sentence requires the introduction of a V constituent. Fully acceptable sentences of the language exist without an overt verb; sentences for which no deletion of an underlying or unrealized V can reasonably be proposed. Such a sentence is (5.2), where there is no V constituent in the matrix sentence.

(5.2) alyal amay ay inun.
love great I you

[+N] [+pronoun][+pronoun]

'I love you dearly (I have great love for you).'

Acceptable Oykangand sentences do require that a minimum of two categories be chosen from those available by expansion of the P constituent. (minor modification of this generalization, together with a discussion of which of the two minimal constituents may be
selected, is found later in this chapter.) There are strict restrictions of cooccurrence that apply to these 'daughter' categories of P. Generally speaking these restrictions can be most adequately stated by the strict subcategorization ('case frame') feature of the verb, as discussed in Chapter II. Where there is no verb, however, rules are required to specify the acceptable series of case frames. Otherwise such ungrammatical (syntactically ill-formed) strings as the following would result.

(5.3) $^*\text{ulqoqtr}^\text{u} \text{ongol}$

[fighting-stick-on]$_L$ for us

(5.4) $^*\text{ud olb}^\text{qand} \text{uy ar}^\text{tenam}$

[dog black-off]$_L$ fish not cook-PPAST

What case categories must be recognized?

Fillmore 1968a makes sweeping claims as to the case constituents required by a grammar:

The case notions comprise a set of universal, presumably innate, concepts which identify certain types of judgments human beings are capable of making about the events that are going on around them, judgments about such matters as who did it, who it happened to, and what got changed. The cases that appear to be needed include:

**Agentive** (A), the case of the typically animate perceived instigator of the action identified by the verb.

**Instrumental** (I), the case of the inanimate force or object causally involved in the action or state identified by the verb.

**Dative** (D), the case of the animate being affected by the state or action identified by the verb.
Factive (F), the case of the object or being resulting from the action or state identified by the verb, or understood as a part of the meaning of the verb.

Locative (L), the case which identifies the location or spatial orientation of the state or action identified by the verb.

Objective (O), the semantically most neutral case, the case of anything representable by a noun whose role in the action or state identified by the verb is identified by the semantic interpretation of the verb itself; conceivably the concept should be limited to things which are affected by the action or state identified by the verb. The term is not to be confused with the notion of direct object, nor with the name of the surface case synonymous with accusative.

Additional cases will surely be needed. (24-5)

The list of cases includes L, but nothing corresponding to what might be called directional. There is a certain amount of evidence, as was mentioned above, that locational and directional elements do not contrast but are superficial differences determined either by the constituent structure or by the character of the associated verb. (25)

Fillmore's inventory of case categories will provide a basis for the following discussion, but a need for Purposive (PRP), Causal (CSL), Comitative/Privative (C/P) and Genitive (G) cases will appear also.

The inventory of cases in Oykangand, arranged according to the spelling of their postpositions, is as follows.

Agentive A
Instrumental I } see Table 5.1
Locative 'at' L
Dative  \[ D \]

Purposive  \[ PRP \] see Table 5.2

Locative 'to'  \[ L \]

Genitive  \[ G \] see Table 5.3

Locative 'from'  \[ L \] see Table 5.4

Causal  \[ CSL \] postposition spelled -\textit{ayal}

Objective  \[ 0 \] postposition spelled zero (\textit{\$})

The Genitive (G) and Comitative/Privative (C/P) are 'secondary' cases, introduced under NPs dominated by 'primary' cases. The 'primary' cases—for want of a better term—are those cases developed directly by expansion of the P constituent. The Locative (L) and Dative (D) may be either primary or secondary.

In a footnote to page twenty-eight of his article 'The case for case' Fillmore 1968a adds:

It should be pointed out that descriptions of embedded sentences as \textit{it} + S realizations of the category NP in 'subject/object' grammars must somehow guarantee that this particular expansion of NP is limited to the subjects of intransitive sentences and the objects (direct or oblique) of transitive sentences. All such restrictions are rendered unnecessary by the decision to limit complement S to the case element 0.

Whatever the facts for English are, the limitation of complement S to the case category 0 is too severe a constraint for Oykangand. S is introduced as a sister category to the verb, for reasons explored later under Chapter X.

A rule for expanding P in accordance with the requirements of Oykangand syntax will have the following form:
Fillmore's 'crossed parentheses' notation—for an optional series of elements from which at least one must be selected—has been utilized here, despite its marginal acceptance as a 'formal universal'.

Each case is (minimally) expandable as a noun phrase and associated case marker, K, according to (5.6).

(5.6) \( X \rightarrow NP^K \)

Where \( X \) is any case category.

Without boggling the imagination over the constitution of an NP (the formal description of it is left until BR 6, Chapter VI) the primary case categories of Oykangand will be exemplified and discussed in the remainder of this chapter. To avoid possible confusion, case categories (such as Dative) will retain the upper case; surface constituents (such as subject) will have lower case type.

**Agentive (A)**

Fillmore 1968a:87 notes that there are apparent dependency relations among cases. That is to say, the appearance of a case \( Y \) depends on the sentence containing a case \( X \). The Agentive is, in this sense, a dependent case. It occurs only if the sentence contains the Objective case (O), and a Verb (V).
It is no doubt more usual, and in fact necessary to a full specification of verbs, for cooccurrence restrictions to be stated in terms of the case frame in which a verb appears. Transitive verbs are defined by their appearance in the frame [A 0], requiring both an Agentive and an Objective case. Transitive verbs never appear without an A and 0 in the case frame, a fact reflected by the absence of 'optional' parentheses in the formulation of the case frame.

The Agentive case is formally marked by a postposition to the NP having agentive function. The Agentive postposition manifested by K,A has variant shapes, most of which are phonologically determined by the last word of the NP. A tabulation of these variants is found as Table 5.1. The Agentive is without exception the surface subject of any sentence in which it appears.

Examples of agentive phrases follow. Each phrase could appropriately comprise a complete Oykangand sentence when complemented by atar adun 'bit me'.

(5.7) [udal]_A  (from ud 'dog')
[ud amayar]_A   (amay 'big')
[ud abal elgoR ilg ar]_A  (abal elgoR ilg 'with many ticks')
[ud inin undamar]_A  (inin 'yours [sg.]'; undam- is discussed later in this section)

The agentive postposition does not always appear in a surface realization, however. In the instance of (5.8), which is one
of the above agentive phrases formally completed as a sentence by atar agun, the agentive postposition has undergone deletion.

(5.8) ud amay atar agun.

[dog big] A bite-RPAST me

'A big dog bit me.'

The deletion is possible presumably because no ambiguity results from it. Deletion cannot take place in sentence (5.9).

(5.9) ud amayar in oyboy atar il iun.

[dog big-AG] meat wallaby bite-RPAST he it

'A big dog bit the wallaby.'

The rule of K,A (Agentive postposition) Deletion can be deduced from these examples. It is optional when the conditions for its application are met.

K,A DELETION (preliminary formulation)

(5.10) W [NP K] A Y V Pronoun Z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 => OPT

1 2 ∅ 4 5 6 7

Where 2 ≠ 6 (i.e. 2 and 6 are not coreferential) and Y contains no O case.

The example (5.7) ud inin undamar 'your dog (AG)' is an instance of a Genitive case appearing within the domain of the
A case. Table 5.1 shows that ar is one of the A case postposition. How then is undam- accounted for? It appears as a stem, following genitive expressions, affixed by -ar (Agentive, Instrumental, or Locative 'at' marker), -am (Locative 'from'), or -ay (Dative, Purposive, Location 'to').

The most economical account of undam- is given by the following: It is inserted by the grammar whenever the sequence

\[ NP \; K \mid \_ \mid \_ \; K \]

occurs, where \( K \) is not \( \emptyset \). Since \( K,0 \) is the only instance where \( K \) is zero, undam- never occurs under 0. The output of the rule is

(5.11) \[ NP \; K \mid \_ \mid \_ \; \text{undam-} \; K. \]

This may at first sight appear to be merely an ingenious device for disposing of a 'carrier' or 'empty' morph (Hockett 1947: 333; Elson and Pickett 1962:50). Unfortunately, Hockett (op. cit.) poses no better a solution for his Fox example. The gap filled by undam- is a syntactic one, defined by case postpositions, and a transformational rule of CASE SUPPORT of the above nature is proposed to fill this gap.

There is no 'economical' alternative. The cost of an additional category and deletion rule is out of all proportion to the grammatical significance of undam- which in any case has no lexical function.
Table 5.1

Variant spellings of the surface Agentive, Instrumental and Locative (Location) Case Markers in Oykangand.\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words of two or more closed syllables\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>K =</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... with final ( n ) (which becomes ( n ))</td>
<td>(-d)</td>
<td>ukan 'grass'; ukan(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... with final ( l ) (which becomes ( R ))</td>
<td>(-nd)</td>
<td>ulgogul 'stick'; ulgogur(ng)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... with any other final consonant</td>
<td>(-iy)</td>
<td>agar 'bedroll'; agariy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... and a final vowel ( e, o ) or ( a )</td>
<td>(-mand)</td>
<td>ambo(to) 'small'; ambo(ton(ng)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... being idiosyncratic exceptions to the above</td>
<td>(-ar)</td>
<td>amay 'big'; amayar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... being kin terms with final ( n )</td>
<td>(-al)</td>
<td>lalan(() 'uncle'; lala(n)al</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words of one closed syllable</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... and final vowel ( a, e )</td>
<td>(-ma(nd)</td>
<td>ewa 'mouth'; ewa(m(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... and final vowel ( u ), preceded by ( k, g )</td>
<td>(-y)</td>
<td>uku 'tree'; ukuy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... and final vowel ( i )</td>
<td>(-y)</td>
<td>erki 'place'; erkiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... being idiosyncratic exceptions to the above, having a final ( V )</td>
<td>(-l)</td>
<td>abma 'person'; abmal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-nd)</td>
<td>er(() 'sandridge'; er((()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-mb)</td>
<td>u(() 'sun'; u(()amb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}This table is intended as a summary of a more complex phonological statement not germane to a discussion of case relationships.

\textsuperscript{b}Oykangand words permit open syllables only in final position.
**Instrumental** (I)

The occurrence of the Instrumental case category (I) is dependent on the sentence containing an O case category and a verb (V). In the specification of most verbs, the I case is an optional element of the case frame. *ari-* 1 'hit, kill' and *ifu-* 1 'kick' share a case frame specified (in part) as [A O (I)]. Sentences (5.12) and (5.13) illustrate these verbs.

The verb need not be transitive for an I case to appear. *igu-* 1 'go, walk' and *erge-* 2 'speak, talk' are intransitive and middle verbs respectively. The sentences (5.14) and (5.15) incorporate these verbs, with an Instrumental.

Other verbs, as *oruki-* 1 'secure, place inside' require an Instrumental in the case frame. Such verbs are rare, but it appears to be a necessary condition on these verbs that the A case be obligatorily specified in the case frame; i.e. I ⊃ A.

(5.12) arir edn ulaŋan ulgʊgʊŋ, atŋiŋd
hit-RPAST they them-2 [fighting-stick-INST] [yam-stick-INST] awiy.
also
'They hit those two with fighting sticks, with yamsticks, too.'
(5.13) 'He kicked this place down here with (his) foot; can you see the dust?'

(5.14) 'Dad, Mum, Gloria and I went (out) east to Adniduragh by car.'

(5.15) 'He spoke to me in Oykangand!'

(5.16) 'I was putting the fish in the bag (was securing the fish by means of the bag).'

The morphological shape of the I case marker is identical with that of the Agentive. It does not, however, undergo deletion. The Instrumental case is never chosen as the surface subject of a sentence.
Dative (D)

The Dative case (D) is dependent on the Objective, Purposive, Causal or Locative for its appearance in any sentence as a 'primary' case. It constitutes an optional element in the case frame specification of some transitive verbs and is obligatory with middle verbs. Examples of Dative case usage include the following.

With a transitive verb: (1) uwa- 2 'give'

(5.17) lalaŋal  alk iŋkum  kakaŋan  uwal  il.

[uncle-AG] spear new  [y.brother-DAT] give-RPAST he

'Uncle gave my younger brother a new spear.'

(2) eley-amba- 1 'show'

(5.18) lalaŋal  alk iŋkum  bibiŋ aadx  undamay  eley-ambar


il.

he

'Uncle showed the new spear to my father.'

With a middle verb: (1) erge- 2 'speak'

(5.19) lalaŋ il  niñaŋan  ergen  il.

uncle he  [aunty-DAT] speak-RCUST he

'Uncle was speaking to aunty.'
(2) eke-2 'be glad'
(5.20) lalaŋ il kakan an ekel il.
uncle he [y.brother-DAT] glad-RPAST he
'Uncle was pleased at my younger brother.'

Fillmore 1968a:47 proposes that 'typical have sentences' involve D and O cases and an 'empty verb'. This fact together with suggestions made by Bach 1967 in his 'Have and be in English syntax', has led to the analysis proposed below. The Dative is the surface subject of sentences which contain no verb but instead have the predication effected by either the Objective, Locative, Purposive or Causal case.

Sentence (5.21) lacks an overt verb, and comprises instead a Dative reflected by ay, and an Objective represented by abm ukirəng.

(5.21) abm ukirəng ay.
person old-man I
'I am an old man.'

In sentence (5.21) the deep structure dative is chosen as the surface subject. The subject choice rules permute the noun phrase NP,D (i.e. an NP directly dominated by D) so that it is immediately dominated by S, and delete the case marker K,D. This derivation depends on the sentence meeting the conditions of (5.22).
That is, the noun phrases immediately dominated by the D and 0 case nodes are coreferential, and the sentence contains no verb.

'Equational' sentences of this nature can be embedded as 'appositive clauses'. Like the English appositive, or non-restrictive clause, it is very clearly distinguished phonologically.

The rule of EQUI-NP DELETION operates, and the case marker relevant to the matrix S is assigned to the remaining NP. For example in the sentence (5.23) the Agentive lalaŋal, abm aŋuŋiyar is the realization of the deep structure

\[
(5.22) \ NP_i^D = NP_i^O; \text{ and } S \text{ contains no } V.
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A} & \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{S} & \quad \text{K} \\
\text{M} & \quad \text{al} \\
\text{lalaŋ} & \quad \text{N} \\
\text{P} & \quad \text{D} \\
\text{NP} & \quad \text{K} \\
\text{NP} & \quad \text{K} \\
\text{lalaŋ} & \quad \text{ay} \\
\text{aŋuŋiy} & \quad \emptyset
\end{align*}
\]

to which has applied the EQUI-NP DELETION rule and K ADJUNCTION/ X COPYING rule mentioned earlier. Unlike a conjoined NP, the appositive NP does not affect the application of the pronoun rules—it is not 'counted' as a separate entity in determining grammatical number. For the sentence (5.23) a structure (5.24) is presumed.
If the two noun phrases are not coreferential, that is, if the conditions of (5.22) do not hold, two possible developments are available to the grammar. The sentence may preserve the dative unchanged in the surface structure, or it may be transformed to the corresponding genitive.

The genitive transformation derives a genitive (G) from an underlying Dative in sentences whose structure is $0 + D$, where condition (5.22) does not hold. Genitives under this interpretation are therefore derived from underlying sentences. Embedded 'genitive' sentences become part of the dominating NP by the familiar rule of EQUI-NP DELETION, followed by NODE RAZING and the GENITIVE RULE.¹
(These rules are assembled in Chapter XII, but are discussed in Chapters VI, IX and V respectively.) The sentence (5.25) results from the application of these (and other) rules to the structure (5.26), and has itself the structure (5.27).

(5.25) ud aden elkel il.

dog my return-RPAST he

'My dog came back.'

(5.26)
This analysis is not unlike the proposal offered for the English possessives: an underlying sentence of the form 'A has B' becomes 'A's B'. In support of the view that possessives of this nature are derived from underlying sentences evidence is available from the restrictions on adjective insertion. The occurrence of Oykang and adjectives is in certain circumstances dependent on the genitive. In brief, it should be noted that:

1. Adjectives are introduced from embedded Ss.
2. Adjectives are categorized as verbs having the feature [+Adj].
3. Oykang and proscribes the contiguous cooccurrence of two adjectives.

Points (1) and (2) simply summarize current views on adjective derivation which are sufficiently well-established to appear in recent English texts such as Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968. Point
(3) states a language-specific phenomenon which must be formalized as a constraint on Oykangand deep structures.

NPs such as (5.28) are ungrammatical.

(5.28) *[ud olbon amay]_NP
        dog black big

What the grammar proscribes, then, are structures characterized by (5.29). A more exact formulation than this has been avoided. It may be a language-specific constraint, or it may be more general. If the former is the case, only an uninteresting ad hoc constraint is necessary.

(5.29)

```
*NP
  /\      /
 N  S     /\    /
   /\    [ud S] [amay]_V
   ud [ud]_O [olbon]_V
```

When the sequence of two adjectives is broken by the insertion of a genitive, the NP is again grammatically acceptable, as in (5.30).

(5.30) [ud olbon inin amay]_NP
        dog black your big
Only the hypothesis that the genitive is derived from an underlying 0 + D sentence adequately explains the acceptability of (5.30), while marking (5.28) as deviant on the basis of its violation of a principled constraint.

There are other genitival expressions which are also relatable to the Dative, but in a different way. Both (5.32) and (5.33) are acceptable and grammatical responses to the question 'What relation is Maudie to Gavin?' (5.32) may be accounted for by making the GENITIVE rule, which derives (5.33), an optional one.

(5.32) amañar òjùn.

mother him (DAT)

'Mother to him.'

(5.33) amañar òjìn.

mother his (GEN)

'His mother.'
More usually however, the response is the fuller (5.34) or (5.35), of which the above are presumably anaphoric versions, dependent for anaphoric reduction on the previous question.

(5.34) abm il amaŋar iqun.
   person she mother him (DAT)
   'She is mother to him.'

(5.35) abm il amaŋar iqin.
   person she mother his (GEN)
   'She is his mother.'

The surface structure of (5.34) closely resembles that in which amaŋar is replaced by a verb (5.36) or an adjective (5.37). Since the form of amaŋar does not change in this context, the suggestion has been made that amaŋar and similar kin terms are actually stative adjectives. In (5.36) and (5.37) the kin term amaŋar of (5.34) is replaced by the verb elkel and the adjective ebmboro respectively.

(5.36) abm il elkel iqun.
   'She returned for him.'

(5.37) abm il ebmboro iqun.
   'She is taller than he (is).'

Kin terms must be rather special stative adjectives if this hypothesis is valid, since parallels to (5.35) are ungrammatical.
The view adopted in this study, and one that will be defended by showing the inadequacies of the kin term/adjective hypothesis, is that such words constitute a special sub-class of nouns, which share the possibilities of syntactic arrangement of other [+human] nouns, beside having additional, idiosyncratic properties.

The problem raised by sentence (5.34) apparently results from the reduction of two separate 'judgments' into one sentence. The final surface form of the sentence corresponds to Fillmore's (64) example:

135. p\text{dat} \ [B^{\text{nom}} \ \text{be} \ A]

or, to re-order the expression in accordance with the requirements of Oykangand syntax,

(5.39) \ [B^{\text{nom}} \ \text{be} \ A] \ p\text{dat}

Fillmore's use of these formulae concern inalienable possession, where P represents the possessor, B a body part, and A an attribute. The 'attribute' is, in this instance, \textit{amanar} 'mother', which could be taken to give further weight to the hypothesis that kin terms are stative adjectives. The two judgments which comprise (135) are
Fillmore suggests that inalienable possession is not a sentential relationship, but an 'adnominal dative' one, where the dative is introduced as a 'secondary' case by a rule of the form

\[ '152. \ NP \rightarrow N (D)' \] (66).

He further suggests that nouns be assigned a case frame feature, such that alienable possession is introduced by adnominal S [\(+S\)] and inalienable possession by adnominal D [\(+D\)].

Adnominal S accounts for the structure of (5.27), and it seems reasonable to propose that ud 'dog' is 'alienably' possessed, while the inalienable possession of amanar is introduced from the adnominal dative. That kin should be regarded as inalienable will come as no surprise to anthropologists or linguists acquainted with the Australian aboriginal culture generally.

The grammar of Oykangand does not however, categorize body parts as inalienably possessed; or perhaps more accurately, body parts do not enter into the same structures as do kin terms. (5.40) is ungrammatical; (5.41) is not.

(5.40) *itom ebmal ağun.

that foot me (DAT)
(5.41) itom ebmal aden.
   that foot my (GEN)
   'That's my foot.'

If an adnominal dative is to be posited as the source of possessed
body parts, the GENITIVE rule must be obligatory. Oykangand sen-
tences which follow the pattern of Fillmore's formula (135) are
ungrammatical unless the dative is transformed to the genitive.

(5.42) ebmal ambot
      \{ aden
      \*aden

foot small \{ my(GEN)
\*me(DAT)

'My foot is small.'

There is a further difficulty with the proposed analysis:
only an ad hoc constraint can be introduced to prevent the deriva-
tion of ungrammatical structures such as

(5.43) *NP

   S
   |
   N

   amaqar [amaqar] [iun] inun;
   mother mother him(DAT) you(DAT)

that is, structures where both a sentential and an adnominal dative
of possession occur. That the base rules require an S, and that the
S and D are not mutually exclusive is established by the structure
(5.44) which produces the grammatically correct NP.
Since no independent motivation can be established for this constraint, it is stated in its most explicit form:

(5.45) The structure

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NP} & \quad \text{N} \quad \text{S} \quad \text{D} \\
\text{amañar} & \quad [\text{amañar}]_0 \quad [\text{ambo}t]_v \quad \text{inun} \\
\text{[amañar ambo}t \text{ inun]}_{\text{NP}} & \\
\text{mother small his}
\end{align*}
\]

is not permitted as part of the grammar of Oykangand.

These weaknesses are less of a hindrance to the grammar—that is, they entail fewer exceptions than does the kin term/adjective hypothesis. Consider (5.44) above. If the general and powerful constraint on the adjacent cooccurrence of adjectives is valid, then this NP should be ungrammatical. The proposed adjective, amañar cooccurs with an indisputable adjective, ambo\text{t}, and
yet the resulting sequence is grammatical. Either the hypothesis is false, or amaŋar is an adjective which permits cooccurrence of this type. Note that (5.46) is ungrammatical.

(5.46) *[abm amboŋ amaŋar]_NP
    person small mother

The 'exception features' that must be assigned to amaŋar in the lexicon minimally include constraints on order, and exceptions to the cooccurrence restraint (5.45).

How many exceptional adjectives (such as amaŋar) exist in the lexicon? My exceptionally perspicacious informant could recount situations in which (5.47) and (5.48) were both grammatically correct and socially appropriate.

(5.47) abm il Winifred alŋgen iŋun Gillian.
    person she y.woman her (DAT)
    'Winifred is more of a young woman than Gillian.'

(5.48) abm onong il abeR iŋun.
    person other she female him (DAT)
    'The other is a female for him.'

It would appear, then, that all the words that will be marked [+human] in this study, occur in the frame

    abm il _____ iŋun
    person he him (DAT)
and would have to be categorized as adjectives. Only *artun* 'warrior' is an exception.

If then an NP, *abm algen*, has the structure N + Adj, by analogy, and because the entire classifier system becomes unnecessary, the NP *in oyboy* (lit. 'meat wallaby', 'a wallaby') takes on the same structure, and *in* 'meat', like *abm* 'person' is complemented by literally hundreds of specialized 'adjectives' (such as *oyboy*) in addition to the more general ones. *ukan* 'grass', *og* 'water', *ednbal* 'frog', *alk* 'spear', *uv* 'fish', *uk* 'tree' would be examples of nouns associated with other sets of specialized adjectives.

The lexicon would therefore contain a stock of general adjectives, dwarfed by the stock of specialized adjectives, each of which has very specific indication as to the noun with which it may cooccur. (5.49) is resoundingly ungrammatical.

(5.49) *abm oyboy

person wallaby

The anomaly of such a view becomes even more apparent when the stock of nouns is considered. 'True' nouns would number a few such as those listed above: *abm, in, ukan*, etc. There would also be a large stock of 'other' nouns: *elidnban* 'star', *egnaal* 'boomerang', *aral* 'wax', *edeR* 'rain', *alon* 'woomera shell' etc. To these latter nouns only the general sub-set of adjectives (e.g. *ambot* 'small') could apply, and none of the specialized ones (e.g.
oyboy 'wallaby').

The complexity and 'cost' of this hypothesis, in terms of exception features, together with a lexicon which offends the 'linguist's intuition' makes it highly suspect. Semantic considerations, which follow, totally invalidate it.

It is a necessary condition on sentence (5.47) that Winifred be a young woman; viz. that she have the developmental status of alogen.

(5.47) abm il Winifred aḻoqe̱n ʔun Gillian.

It is an equally necessary condition on the truth of this sentence that Gillian not have attained this status. Identical conditions—or presuppositions, to use the logical term—are necessary if (5.34) is to be true.

(5.34) abm il amanar ʔun.

That is, the person specified by il is amanar and the one specified by ʔun is not.

Quite different constraints operate if the undisputed stative adjective ebmborg 'tall' is substituted for aḻoqe̱n:

(5.50) abm il Winifred ebmborg ʔun Gillian.

'Winifred is taller than Gillian.'

Neither Winifred nor Gillian need be tall by local standards. Both,
or either, could be well short of the norm or well above it. Only one judgment is being made: the tallness of Gillian is less than that of Winifred, and this does not entail that Winifred be, in any definable sense, tall except by comparison with Gillian. Only by denying the assertion itself can the sentence be untrue.

It is quite clear that distinct sets of presuppositions apply to alŋeŋ and ebmborn. The conditions that amanar requires are shared by alŋeŋ rather than ebmborn.

Syntactically and semantically the differences between kin terms and stative adjectives are so extensive that the grammar becomes all but unworkable by virtue of its complexity if any hypothesis which combines these into one category be accepted.

Fillmore suggests that rules of 'adnominal dative promotion' account for certain English sentences (1968a:67 et. seq.). By these rules, an adnominal D is 'promoted' from secondary case status to the position of a primary case, i.e. immediately dominated by P. In Oykangand, a condition on this promotion is the necessary appearance of some complement to the noun. Typical examples follow.

(5.51) odnd idjam ilg ay.
  leg sores with I
  'My leg is sore (has sores on it).'

(5.52) idnan ar ay.
  body tired I
  'I am tired.'
(5.2)  alyal amay ay inun.
love great I    you
'I love you dearly (I have great love for you).'</n
In (5.51) and (5.52) it is this 'promoted' D that becomes the surface subject. D PROMOTION (see Chapter XII) is therefore assumed to precede the SUBJECT CHOICE rules. In (5.2) the promoted D is chosen as the surface subject instead of the 'original' primary D.3 That the subjects of the three sentences above are Dative in origin is established by the grammaticality of their genitive transformations when D is not promoted. The result of the GENITIVE rule in each case is an NP which forms grammatical sentences with the complement _____ ayin ew inan? 'Do you see _____?'

(5.53) odnd idam ilg aqen ayin ew inan?  
'Do you see my sore leg?'

(5.54) idnan ar aqen ayin ew inan?  
'Do you see my tiredness (my tired body)?'

(5.55) alyal amay aqen inun ayin ew ina?  
'Do you see my great love for you?'

The deep structure of (5.52) is presumably something approaching (5.56).
This raises interesting problems. Should the grammar permit (or require) the adnominal D to be promoted to an 'empty' D node in the tree (after the manner of Emonds 1969)? Or should there be constraints on the structure of sentences that must apply at various points in the derivation? The latter alternative has recently been summarized by Dingwall 1969:228-9 and appears to be necessary to this grammar. A constraint that would cope with the present problem would be stated: 'the node P shall dominate at least two categories prior to the SUBJECT CHOICE rule'. Restrictions on adjectives and on cooccurring case categories must also be stated, and these together with the above appear to constitute a 'natural' filter early in the grammar.

Returning to the genitive, there is presumably only one Genitive Rule which operates on the adnominal dative
and on the sentential dative after EQUI-NP DELETION and NODE RAZING (which together delete the circled nodes).

This theory is supported by genitive constructions where the noun permits either sentential or adnominal datives. The sentence (5.48) has a more restricted acceptability than its genitive transform (5.57), since abeR permits both sentential and adnominal dative sources of the possessive.

(5.48) abm onong il abeR ijun.
(5.57) abm onong il abeR ijin.

'The other is his woman.'

That is to say, some of the readings of (5.57) are due to the sentential source of the genitive, while others result from the adnominal source (5.48).

The genitive rule (5.58) applies obligatorily except for adnominal datives in matrix sentences which lack a verb.
GENITIVE RULE

(5.58) N (S) [NP K]_D => N (S) [NP K]_G

The Dative suffix coincides in spelling with that of the Locative (Directional 'to') and Purposive. Table 5.2 sets out the morphological variation of this suffix. The Genitive suffix is unique, and its variants are found in Table 5.3.

The genitive pronouns alin 'ours-2-in' and ambuŋ 'ours-pl-in' are often used in place of the expected dative. The GENITIVE rule apparently operates in these instances also.

(5.59) ang adniy ambel ambuŋ!

here up become-RPAST ours-pl-in

'(It) came up for us!'

The insertion of undam- as an 'empty' morph was noted in the discussion of the Agentive, where

[ud inin undamar]_A

dog your E-AG

illustrated the genitive expression 'your dog' under the A case. undam- is also necessary to constructions where the genitive is not a personal pronoun. For example,

(5.60) alk Bruce-iŋ undamar

[spear -GEN E-INST]

'with Bruce's spear'
could appear as the Instrumental case in a sentence.

undam- is also inserted optionally in several other instances.

(5.61) abm ay ednajan undamay igur ay.

person I [them to], go-RPAST I

'I went to them.'

Here undamay is entirely optional. It is assumed that there is only one rule of undam- insertion (CASE SUPPORT) which accepts the input

Pronoun]L

and produces (optionally) the sequence

Pronoun undam- ]L.

Instances where Pronoun]D is similarly treated have also appeared in the data.

Causal (CSL)

The Causal depends on the sentence containing either a Dative, or alternatively an Objective and a Verb or Dative prior to the SUBJECT CHOICE rules.

Its suffix is unique in phonological shape, but its semantic area is less easily defined. It resembles both the Dative and the Agentive, in that it is the case of a being, object or event which either motivates the action or state defined by the
verb, or the being, object or event ultimately—but not immediately—affected by the state or action of the verb.

The affixation reflects the semantics: the typical Causal marker is representable as -ayal, in which -ay- is recognizable as the Dative affix (Table 5.2) and -al as one form of the Agentive (Table 5.1). It is tempting to posit a sentential source of the Causal, or perhaps a 'secondary' Dative dominated by an Agentive. These alternatives have been tried and found wanting; a simpler grammar results from acceptance of a Causal case.

The Causal subsumes some of the semantic area of the Benefactive which Fillmore recognized a need for but did not define.

Lakoff has noticed that the "true imperative", the progressive aspect, the occurrence of benefactive (B) phrases, and do so substitution occur only with "nonstative" verbs. His discussion suggests that one must assign "stative" and "nonstative" as features on verbs and then guarantee that B phrases are permitted only with "nonstatives" (put the other way around, one must guarantee that the presence of a B expression allows only for the selection of "nonstatives"), that the imperative transformation can be applied only if the verb is "nonstative", and so on. The treatment that I prefer is implicit in what I have already presented. The transformation which accounts for the "true imperatives" can apply only to sentences containing A's, and the occurrence of B expressions (and "outer L's") is dependent on the presence of an A. (Fillmore 1968a:31)

Examples of the Causal which have a 'Benefactive' function follow:
(5.62) ukel elgoR uwal ay ijun lalanayal.
   bullet many give-RPAST I him [uncle-CSL]
   'I gave him a lot of bullets for uncle.'

The more usual benefactive is the Dative.

(5.63) in onmon afanayn ay ijun lalanayn.
   meat egg get-IFUT I [him uncle-DAT]
   'I might get some eggs for uncle.'

(5.64) egn idar il aqun, egn armen ambar.
   food eat-RPAST he me food finish-RPAST
   'He ate the food for me, and finished it up.'

Sentence (5.62) illustrates also that the CSL cannot be derived
from either an A or D in the matrix sentence.

(5.65) in oyboy ang arten ay lalanayal.
   meat wallaby this cook-RPRES I [uncle-CSL]
   'I am cooking this wallaby for uncle.'

(5.66) agnaran ergel ay ijun andandaayal.
   [w.man-DAT speak-RPAST I him [daughter-CSL]
   'I spoke to the white man on behalf of my daughter.'

In other instances the causal cannot be regarded as benefactive:
some being, object, or event appears to be responsible for some
unstated act which motivates the state or action identified by
the verb.
Table 5.2

Morphological Variants of the Dative, Purposive and Locative (Directional 'to, until') case markers in Oykangand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words of two or more closed syllables</th>
<th>K =</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... with final n</td>
<td>-g</td>
<td>olwon 'mountain'; olwong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... with final l</td>
<td>-γ</td>
<td>oδδοl 'water'; oδδοly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... with final V</td>
<td>-aγ</td>
<td>ambotọ 'small'; ambotọγ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... with any other C final</td>
<td>-aγ</td>
<td>intịm 'house'; intịmaγ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words of one closed syllable</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... and final V</td>
<td>-γ</td>
<td>erki 'place' erkiγ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.3

**Morphological variants of the Genitive case of Oykangand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words of two or more closed syllables</th>
<th>K =</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... with final y, t̂, ʎ</td>
<td>-iŋ</td>
<td>amay 'big'; amayŋ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... with final ɬ</td>
<td>-ŋ</td>
<td>oḏñol 'water'; oḏñolŋ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... with final v</td>
<td>-ŋ</td>
<td>amboŋo 'small'; amboŋoŋ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... with any other C final</td>
<td>-aŋ</td>
<td>eŋkoR 'shade'; eŋkoRŋ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words of one closed syllable</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... and final v</td>
<td>-ŋ</td>
<td>uku 'wood'; ukuŋ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Those two once fought over a dog as if they were fighting over a man."

'I took uncle some bullets because of the dogs.'

Unlike the Dative, the Causal applies to objects (5.69) and events (5.70).

'Let me talk because of all those bullets! Why did (he) have to waste (them)?'

'I closed up the door of my house because (I went) to fetch food.'
Sentences such as (5.71) and (5.72) occur where the Causal is the complement of the Dative Subject.

(5.71) abm ay egni idndanayal; aney udnar ağun?
   person I [food squeeze-CSL] what for summon-RPAST me
   = punch down dough
   'I am about to punch down the bread; what did they
call me up for?'

(5.72) anaqndj abm ay anqkinayal!
   NEG person I [hunt-CSL]
   'No! I'm ready to go hunting!'

Purposive (PRP)

The Purposive has a suffix identical in form with the Dative, but its specification is different. Where the Dative concerns 'beings', the Purposive is the case of 'objects and events'. That together these two exhaust the entire semantic area associated with nouns is highly suspicious in itself. As the cooccurrence of the two cases is infrequent in the grammar, the temptation to any linguist (trained, as was the writer, in tagmemics and 'classical' phonemics) to write the two cases as one is almost irresistible. In a more thoroughly 'semantic' approach to syntax, this union might be possible, or even necessary. On the other hand, this similarity may be a phenomenon specific to Oykangand. Fillmore has claimed the universality of the Dative, and until empirical data
is amassed to contradict this claim it cannot—on the basis of other languages better known than Oykangand—be impetuously rejected just for this study. The Dative and Purposive must stand as separate case entities—at least for the present time.

Like the Causal, the Purposive depends upon either a Dative, or an Objective and a Verb, for its appearance in any sentence.

(5.73) abm ay egnay.

person I [food-PRP]

'I'll (take) the food.'

(5.73) constitutes a grammatical and appropriate response to the offer of two things, one of which—the food—is accepted by the speaker. A similar sociolinguistic situation might well produce (5.74), where the PRP case is manifest by a sentence.

(5.74) abm ay in oyboy aŋkinay.

person I [meat wallaby hunt-PRP]

'I must hunt wallabies.'

An embedded S in the Purposive case has a distribution (in sentences like [5.74] without a matrix V) not unlike a V. The sentence (5.74) requires only a minor change in surface structure to produce an acceptable sentence of entirely different deep structure. No embedded S is posited for (5.75) for example.
In his 1956 'New approach to Australian linguistics' Capell discusses the Bivalent suffix -gu (-ngu) and notes that this 'occurs with both nouns and verbs, and often with both in the same language' (77). Capell lists various languages which make use of -gu as (1) the dative marker, (2) the genitive ('actual possessor') marker and (3) the future or purposive marker. The identification of Capell's -gu with Oykangand -ay is obvious; what is less obvious is an acceptable account of the development of this phenomenon.

It is not possible to offer in this study the weighty evidence necessary to establish the historical development of these obviously related phenomena, even were adequate evidence available. It is only possible to suggest a scheme, based on the evidence Capell presents, and on the facts of Oykangand.

The Dative and Purposive are--as already mentioned--almost complementary. Sentences with both cases are grammatical, but uncommon.

'I am hunting wallabies.'
If the two arose from an earlier single case having the postposition *-gu or *-ngu, then the homophony of the Dative and Purposive markers is accounted for. Similarly, the re-analysis of sentences such as (5.69) by successive speakers of the language resulted in the case marker -ay becoming a tense/aspect marker, and the verb (as anki-1) a matrix verb rather than an embedded one.

The source of the genitive in the deep structure Dative accounts for the homophony of these markers in the languages listed by Capell. This fact is explained very economically by proposing that these languages lack a GENITIVE rule.

Counter evidence for this scheme is not lacking; there are many gaps in Capell's table of languages, and the fact that Algol (Chapter XIV) differentiates the verbal affix of an S embedded under the PRP case from the form of the Realis Future tense affix implies that the above scheme is an oversimplification, if valid at all. Nevertheless it has not been conclusively decided one way or the other until the details of many more languages have been investigated and made available.

The Purposive is translated most easily by English 'for', when an NP occurs, and by 'to' when an S occurs:

(5.77) abm ay eg$	ext{g}_{\text{ay}}$ igun.

person I [food-PRP] go-RPRES

'I am going for food (now).'
Locative (L)

Oykangand maintains a rich and expressive system for the specification of spatial orientation, making it possible to identify with economy and precision the location of any one object, being, or event relative to any other. The very complexity of the locative system requires that some attention be paid to theoretical considerations bearing on its description.

There are certain grammatical phrases that suggest that there is no clear distinction between 'spatial' and 'temporal' orientation. That is to say, locative and temporal phrases are not syntactically differentiated. The phrase (5.79) implies not only 'at the pit' but also 'when the meat was roasting'. Since it provides both a locative and a temporal orientation to the action identified by the verb, it may be fairly asked whether it can be assigned to a discrete 'locational' or to a 'temporal' case without injustice.

(5.79) ily-ambaniyar.

[meat pit-roasting-at]L

'At the meat roasting pit.'
Morphological evidence points to the conclusion alluded to above: temporal and locative phrases are variants of the one case. Location in space, and location in time are expressed by the same affix—idiosyncratic exceptions to the rule accounted for in the lexicon being excluded, of course. Direction in time and space—'to, until' and 'from, since'—are similarly marked; there is no morphological difference in the respective affixes.

The parameters of time and space do not apparently require the recognition of more than one case, but is it necessary to set up Location and Direction as separate cases? In this instance there are regular morphological distinctions, but can an argument be established on semantic grounds? Fillmore, quoted earlier in this chapter, believes that there is both semantic and syntactic evidence in favor of the view that only one case is required, the 'superficial differences' being 'determined either by the constituent structure or by the character of the associated verb' (25). He then goes on to cite the work of Hall in support of this hypothesis, and it will be this view that is adopted here. It will become evident that considerations of simplicity endorse this decision.

A further problem, raised by Fillmore in a footnote (26), concerns the L node itself: is it developed by expansion of P, or of M, or of both? Syntactically it is desirable to have an L node as a constituent of P, since sentences such as (5.80) and (5.81) appear to comprise a Dative 'subject' and Locative 'comment'.
(5.80) bibiŋ Lefty il ūŋgul Koolatah.
father he [there-at]_L
'Dad Lefty is at Koolatah.'

(5.81) abm il onalkŋand.
person he [island-from]_L
'He's an Islander.'

Justification of the decision to place L 'under' the P constituent is found in connection with cooccurrence restrictions. One of the most powerful and useful mechanisms for restraining the cooccurrence of two elements is the case frame specification of verbs. If these specifications include syntactic features as well as categorial ones, then it is possible to account for the acceptability of (5.82) and the ungrammaticality of (5.83) by reference to the case frame of aggə-ga-1 'look for', where the L case is further specified [+location]. That is to say, directionals, which are specified as [-location] may not cooccur with aggə-ga-1.

(5.82) ariman aggə-ga-m ay ofoŋoŋiy.
axe look-for-RCUST I [river-at]_L
'I looked for the axe by the river.'

(5.83) *ariman aggə-ga-m ay ofoŋoŋay.
river-to

This analysis is not without its difficulties. For instance, sentence (5.80) above, for which a D + L structure is proposed,
requires a more precise specification, not simply 'L'. It must be
[+spatial] since temporal complements ([−spatial]) are ungrammatical.

There are other instances of restrictions on L, some being more complex than others. L appears in the case frame of all Oykangand verbs; there is no verb which excludes it, and no verb which negatively specifies the [+location] feature of time or space (temporal or spatial 'at'). This regularity is expressed as a lexical redundancy rule.

ulfi-1 'die' accepts as a directional complement only temporal 'from, since' phrases.

(5.84) uŋŋ aŋ g adniɣam ulfi ir il.
[sun here up-from]L die-RPAST he
'*He died since noon.'

The specification of L in the case frame of ulfi-1 must account for this fact.

The correct derivation of Oykangand sentences is facilitated by the negative specification of features on the L case in the case frame of the verb. This is only possible if L is a 'sister' category of V, that is if L is also dominated by P. ulfi-1 'die' is therefore specified in a manner to express the above restrictions.
There are still further theoretical problems. Consider sentence (5.85).

(5.85) igur il uwand uŋgul uŋgar ank andand
    go-RPAST he [west]L [there north-at]L [scrub through]L
    uŋŋ uŋtînamiyar.
    [sun setting-at]L
    'He went westward there at the north through the scrub
    as the sun was setting.'

According to the proposed analysis there are four manifestations of an underlying Locative case in this sentence: the directional uwand, locational uŋgul uŋgar, directional ank andand and locational uŋŋ uŋtînamiyar. Accounting for these requires some accommodation by the proposed theory. Recall that, by convention, coordinate structures

\[
\begin{array}{c}
X \\
/ \quad \quad \quad \\
NP \quad NP \quad K
\end{array}
\]

are assigned the same case marker K, and secondly that for very obvious reasons, only one appearance of any case X is permitted under P in the deep structure. One of these two constraints on the grammar must be relaxed to accommodate the above data.
The dilemma caused by (5.85) and similar sentences requires that the various L expressions be recognized as coordinate, but that postpositions be introduced for each K by less 'mechanical' means than for the other cases. Fillmore, discussing the assignment of English prepositions, notes that

...the L and T (for time) prepositions are either semantically non-empty (in which case they are introduced as optional choices from the lexicon) or they are selected by the particular associated noun... (1968a:32).

Selection of the appropriate Oykangand postposition appears to proceed along similar lines. Following the assignment of a K node to each conjoined NP, complex selectional processes take place by which the form of the K is chosen. For verbs such as ulfi-1 these selectional processes are governed by restrictions imposed by the verb. For verbs such as aRti-1 'rise, climb' or igu-1 'go' which impose no such restrictions, there are 'natural' restrictions between the possible components of the L case. Sentence (5.86) contains three L expressions; temporal 'at', temporal 'to' and temporal 'from'.

(5.86) abm ay uŋdįnaŋ aRtinm uŋo aRtinamam uŋo

person I [yesterday]L work-RCUST [sun rising-from]L [sun uŋdįnamay].

diving-to]L

'Yesterday I worked from sun-up till sun-down.'
The substitution of undinay 'yesterday' (temporal 'at') by other temporal 'at' phrases is possible, but note that only those substitutions which encompass the semantic area of 'dawn' and 'dusk' are acceptable. With appropriate tense changes, ondeR 'tomorrow', ugna1 'today' and erk ilimbam 'the day after' are all acceptable, but *ugna ong adniy 'noon', *elwan egay 'midnight' and *eweweng 'evening' are not.

(5.87) provides a similar case of selection between the components of an L case.

(5.87) ifan olon elke1 il erkiy.

[from-south]L [hither]L return-RPAST he [place-to]L

'He came back here from the south.'

One reading of this sentence (where ifan is a directional 'from the south', and not a locational 'on the south side') rejects as unacceptable the substitution of erkiy by other directional 'to' phrases, as *ugnaR 'to the north' or *awaR 'to the east'. ifan can be substituted by ofoyoRam 'from the river' but not er 'away', because of other constituents of the L case. *ondeRam 'from tomorrow (on)' and *undinaday 'until yesterday' are ungrammatical forms resulting from the violation of selectional restrictions on the postposition of ondeR and undinay respectively. ondeRay 'until tomorrow' and undinayam 'since yesterday' are perfectly grammatical.
Not all the selectional restrictions or semantic distinctions between various locational and directional constituents are understood. That these restrictions operate to govern syntactic possibilities has already been illustrated, but within the present study an account of the relevant semantic constraints is not possible.

The Locative, beside being a 'primary' case introduced by expansion of the P constituent, is also introduced by expansion of NP as a secondary case. The following sentences require a rule NP + N + L.5

(5.88) abm onalkandiy egalng arix agun.
   [person [island-from]_L-AG] head hit-RPAST me
   'An Islander hit me on the head.'

(5.89) aRadj ogam ewal ay.
   nest [before-from]_L see-RPAST I
   'I saw an old (i.e. from before) nest.'

This 'secondary' L also accounts for ogom 'this' and itom 'that'. These 'demonstratives' are—in Oykangand grammar—actually locatives. They form part of a system of locationals and directionals that includes ongod 'here', ongol 'hence', itod 'there' and so on. Each of these words can replace ogom or itom in its 'demonstrative' function, so that (with aggar 'white man') the NPs
Table 5.4
Morphological variants of the Locative (Directional 'from, since') Case in Oykangand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words with two or more closed syllables</th>
<th>K =</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... and final n</td>
<td>-ŋand</td>
<td>atın 'yamstick'; atınŋand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... and final l</td>
<td>-ŋand</td>
<td>oğol 'water'; oğolŋand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... and any other C, or V</td>
<td>-am</td>
<td>amboţo 'small'; amboţam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agar 'bedroll'; agaram.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words of one closed syllable</th>
<th>K =</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... and final V</td>
<td>-ŋand</td>
<td>uyu 'fish'; uyuŋand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
etc. are all equally grammatical and equally correct.

The 'cardinal' directionals are of interest for their complexity. Beside the four cardinal points of the compass, adniy 'up' and uRupd 'down' enter the system. It is illustrated briefly by reference to ibaR 'south'.

ibaR  'south, southwards'
ifan  'from the south, on the south side (of something)'
       (distinct from ugoR 'northwards')
ibar  'around by the south, south but moving either east or west'.

Like the system involving oR and itom, the cardinal directionals can each comprise the entire content of the L case.

(5.90) uwand          igur     .andan,       ulanday.
       [westward]L go-RCUST we-pl-ex [coast-to]L

'We went westward, down to the coast.'

Place names are a partial exception to the rule of L case postposition adjunction. Some names rarely have the expected postposition, others are rarely without it. This observation applies to both native and introduced English place names. Note the following, where location 'at' should appear as a postposition but does not.
The place-name for the Rutland Plains cattle station (ranch) more frequently appears with a Locative postposition than without.

Objective (0)

The Objective and Factitive cases are considered as one, and referred to as the Objective (0). No distinction between what is semantically clearly a Factitive, and what is likewise clearly an Objective could be observed in their syntactic or morphological possibilities.

Factitive (F)

(5.93) alk iŋkum iyar il, Frank.

spear new make-RPAST he

'Frank made a new spear.'

Objective (0)

(5.94) alk iŋkum ubmar il, Frank.

smash-RPAST

'Frank broke up (his) new spear.'
This abbreviation does not necessarily imply that the Factitive should be deleted from the inventory of universal case categories. All that is implied is that in Oykangand these two case forms have fallen together so completely that the syntax does not differentiate them.

The Objective occurs in most grammatical constructions, and is the case statistically most common. For all that, it is simply described, and least complex in its morphology, having a zero (Ø) postposition.

The Objective becomes the surface subject of sentences in which a verb, but no agent, appears. Both as surface subject and as object, the Objective has a typically zero postposition. (5.93) and (5.94) are sentences where alk inkum 'new spear' is the deep structure objective, and surface object; in (5.95) the same phrase is found as the surface subject.

(5.95) alk inkum eŋŋeŋel.

break-RPAST

'The new spear broke.'

SUBJECT CHOICE RULES

With the primary cases now accounted for, it is possible to formalize the conditions for subject selection. The rule of subject topicalization is quite a simple one to state (see [6.44]) as is the selection of the case which is affected by this rule. For sentences containing a verb the rule is
(5.97) If an O case is present, it becomes the subject, otherwise the I case is selected.

Subject choice determines certain other transformations, notably those concerned with Pronominalization (Chapters VI and VIII).

More difficult is the task of providing a 'filter' through which categorial structures must pass if they are to be grammatically acceptable. BR.3, which introduces the case categories, allows such syntactically ill-formed sequences as

\[ O + D + A, \; O + L + S, \; D + A + V \]

and so on.

Categorial sequences which include a V, but into which no V can be inserted, are automatically blocked. For example, no verb with a case frame \([D, \text{CSL} \_\_\_]\) has been found, so that the sequence \(D + \text{CSL} + V\), if developed by the categorial rules would be marked as syntactically deviant if a verb were to be inserted.

For categorial sequences lacking a verb (or adjective, since adjectives are also entered in the lexicon with case frame specifications) a series of well-formedness conventions must apply. The grammar marks as deviant sentences which contain no verb, but fail to conform to the structures

\[
D \left( \begin{array}{c} \{ \text{CSL} \} \\ \{ \text{PRP} \} \\ \{ O \} \end{array} \right) \chi L \]

or

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\end{array}
\]

\(s\)
So then, case frame features of the verb mark sentences such as (5.3) with an asterisk, while 'verbless' sentences which violate both (5.98) and (5.99) are also marked as deviant.

FOOTNOTES

1 The GENITIVE rule is formulated as (5.58)

\[ N \ (S) \ [NP \ K]_D \Rightarrow \]
\[ N \ (S) \ [NP \ K]_G \]

2 This suggestion has been attributed to K. L. Hale of M.I.T. but I can find no mention of it in his published works to date. Consequently I present the hypothesis without clear recognition of his authorship.

3 There is some evidence to the effect that adnominal D can be promoted to subject position in sentences containing a 'true' verb.

\[ ubman \ 'ongom \ adnan \ ay. \]

'thagh this drip-RPRES I

'My thigh is dripping (blood).'

The deep structure of this sentence illustrates the profound change that the 'promotion' transformation has upon the derivational tree.

To avoid confusion, the term 'Locative' is reserved for the case; 'location', 'locational', 'direction', 'directional' and 'temporal' are useful terms by which to refer to the content of this case.

There is some evidence that suggests a Locative case of 'purpose' should also be recognized. Note the following:

```
elkel  il motorcar-iy  edeRam.
```

return-RPAST he [INST] [rain-from]

'He came back by car because of the rain.'

Such instances are rare; evidence from other Paman languages (as
 Wik-Munkan, Sayers 1964) implies that a Locative of 'purpose' is not out of place.

I have no principled reason for deriving abm onalkal fundraiser from

\[ A \rightarrow NP \rightarrow N \rightarrow K \]

rather than from

\[ A \rightarrow NP \rightarrow N \rightarrow S \rightarrow K \]

The latter is a reasonable scheme, and is perhaps to be preferred.

I have chosen to retain the rule \( NP \to N + L \) solely on its analogy with the C/P case, where a rule \( NP \to N + C/P \) is required. The adnominal Dative is similarly introduced, and is syntactically distinct from the sententially introduced Dative.
Chapter VI

NOUN PHRASES AND SENTENCE EMBEDDING

Two phenomena—conjunction and sentence embedding—together account for the recursive power of a transformational grammar. The more common and more powerful of these recursive mechanisms is sentence embedding. This phenomenon has already been introduced to elucidate various syntactic arguments in Chapter V. In Chapter VI, sentence embedding under the case constituents will be examined, and a justification for the inclusion of S in the expansion potential of the P constituent will be offered.

Genitives and appositive NPs discussed in Chapter V will not be treated further in this chapter. The structure of NPs and of the one remaining 'secondary' case provides a logical framework within which to discuss S embeddings. The base rules which are required are the following. Together with transformations introduced later in this chapter, they account for the nominalizations of the language.

(6.1)  BR 4  A, O, D, I  \rightarrow  NP (NP)* (S)* K

(6.2)  BR 5  L, CSL, PRP  \rightarrow  {NP (NP)* (S)*} S K

(6.3)  BR 6  NP  \rightarrow  {NP (R) S N (N)* (S)* (D) (L) (C/P)}
BR 4 introduces the possibility of conjoined noun phrases explored in Chapter IV and under the Locative in Chapter V. BR 5 identifies the Locative, Causal and Purposive cases as syntactically different in their potential for occurrence. BR 6 introduces relative sentences, conjoined nouns, the adnominal dative, and the 'secondary' L and C/P cases.

The rules ignore certain sentential elements introduced onto NPs from the Modality (M).

Causal, Locative and Purposive

These three cases share an unusual syntactic property: the category to which the case marking postposition is attached may be a sentence, as well as the more usual NP. Note the following examples involving a Causal which were offered as variations on the one matrix sentence by my informant:

(6.4) ukel algŋ‘ar ay iŋun lalaŋan, inayal.
bullets take-RPAST I him [uncle-to],L [meat-CSL]
'I took some bullets to uncle because of the meat (situation).' 

(6.5) ukel algŋ‘ar ay iŋun lalaŋan, aŋkinayal.
[hunt [verb] CSL]
'I took some bullets to uncle on account of going hunting.'
(6.6) ukel algar ay iñun lalanan, inayal aŋkinayal.

'I took some bullets to uncle on account of hunting because of the meat (situation).'

The last sentence has two possible sources (hence two possible semantic readings). One deep structure source contains coordinate CSL phrases (which would have a pause, indicated by a comma, between inayal and aŋkinayal), the other, and more interesting possibility is the structure (6.7).

(6.7)

It appears to be a necessary condition on this type of embedded sentence that the A be deleted. Note the following:
(6.8) ukel uwal ay iṣùn lalaṣan, in aṣkinayal.

\[V \text{ CSL} \]

'...for meat hunting.'

(see Chapter X)

(6.9) ukel uwal ay iṣùn lalaṣan, inaṣay aṣkinayal.

\[ \text{PRP} \text{ CSL} \]

'...to hunt for meat.'

Other examples of the Causal, Locative and Purposive are found in Chapter V.

The Locative case permits the introduction of S immediately dominated by L as evidenced by the next examples. The structure of the verb in these embedded sentences is identical to that of verbs in P-relative sentences. Discussion of this structure is taken up later in this chapter and again in Chapter X under 'Tense'.

(6.10) in ağı̊-ambanamiyar idal ay inun.

\[ \text{meat pit-roast-at} \text{ L wait-RPAST I you} \]

'I waited for you at the meat roasting pit.'

(6.11) kotakot ụgogir ay i̊n ekarekaniyar.

\[ \text{axe leave-RPAST I [meat r-cut-at} \text{ L} \]

'I left my axe at the butchers' shop.'
The case frame of ida-2 'wait' includes the information that this verb governs an optional PRP. This case immediately dominates a sentence and the case marker -ay in the following examples.

(6.13) oogod idaL ay acajar ađen adepmay.

[here]L wait-RPAST I [y.brother my arrive-PRP]
'I waited here for my younger brother's arrival.'

(6.14) idaL aŋdan erk uŋfuR ambenmay.

wait-RPAST we-pl-ex [place cool become-PRP]
'We waited for the place to become cool.'

Relativization

Relativization—the process by which relative clauses are formed—is another subject which has attracted considerable attention over recent years. Transformational grammarians have posited various schemes for relativization in English, but no one scheme has been generally agreed upon. Chomsky's 1964 treatment of relatives and interrogatives is taken up by Kuroda 1968, but Bach 1968a adopts an entirely different mechanism in his search for linguistic universals, and both Vendler 1968 and
Carlota Smith 1964 tie relativization to determiners. For yet another proposal see Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968.

**R-Relatives**

In Oykangand there are two possible surface structures that deserve the term 'relative'. A different semantic reading must be assigned to each, and—since transformations cannot introduce or 'change' meanings—one form of the relative must be assigned to a different deep structure than the other. One relative structure results from transformations applied to the deep structure

![Diagram](image)

while the other relative reflects the deep structure

![Diagram](image)

It is convenient to regard this latter as a 'true' or R-relative because of certain parallels between it and structures already studied (in the above articles) and to describe its syntax first. The R node introduces a relativizer with semantic content, and provides the structural element which serves to differentiate the relatives.

In certain instances, both forms of the relative are grammatical: only the choice of optional R (and rules dependent
on this choice) differentiates the deep structure reflected by (6.15) from that reflected by (6.16).

\[ (6.15) \]

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{M} \\
\item \textbf{SA} \text{[tense]} \text{[RPAST]} \\
\item \text{edndelay} \\
\item \text{NP} \text{R} \text{S} \\
\item \text{NP} \text{N} \\
\item \text{pigipig} \text{anen} \\
\item \text{M} \text{P} \\
\item \text{A} \\
\item \text{NP} \text{K} \\
\item \text{NP} \text{N} \\
\item \text{pigipig} \text{al fence fence a\dgen} \text{\emptyset} \\
\item \text{V} \\
\item \text{O} \\
\item \text{NP} \text{K} \\
\item \text{NP} \text{S} \\
\item \text{al fence fence a\dgen} \text{\emptyset} \\
\item \text{ubma-1} \\
\end{itemize}

Realized as:

\text{in pigipig fence a\dgen anen ubmar, eg\dgen a\dgen }

\text{meat pig my R break-down-RPAST food my }

\text{edndelay id\dgen. }

\text{'The pig that I attest broke down my fence, ate up all my vegetables.'}
The pig that broke down my fence ate up all my vegetables.'

Two points need to be made in connection with these sentences:
(1) the possibility of R-permutation within the succeeding S, and
(2) the subtle semantic difference between the two types of relative construction. The speaker is somehow responsible for the validity of the R-relativized sentence, either by being an eye witness, or by attesting something universally accepted such as some detail of the culture-myths. As a result, sentence (6.17) is anomalous (hence ungrammatical) for any Oykangand speaker. It is anomalous because it implies that the speaker saw for the first time a dead pig which he attests to having seen earlier being killed.

'I saw a dead pig on the bank that I attest the dogs bit.'
by dogs. (6.18) is a sentence which my informant accepted, but afterwards paraphrased in a totally different grammatical structure.

(6.18) *ɪn pɪgɪpɪg ɔɗɗɔr ʌmbaːm ʌn,  ewal ay, *ɪn pɪgɪpɪg again

*anɛn uɗal ɗɑr.*

'I saw again a dead pig on the bank--one that I attest the dogs bit.'

The alternative form of the relative ([6.19], parallel to [6.16]) is free from semantic constraints on its syntactic form.


'I saw a dead pig on the bank, one that the dogs had bitten.'

The R-relative is unique in Oykangand in that it is the only instance of embedded S where verbal affixes are not obligatorily 'reduced' to a participle form. That is, verbal affixes are 'governed' by R, which permits the same tense/aspect affixes as may occur on the matrix verb to also occur on the 'R' verb. Sentences (6.20), (6.21) and (6.22) are therefore all equally grammatical.
(6.20) lalaŋal uradəŋ ambanm ednaŋan iŋin anen algənam.
uncle-AG embarrass-RCUST them story R tell-RCUST

(6.21) lalaŋal uradəŋ ambanm ednaŋan iŋin anen algənamiy.
'Uncle was embarrassing them by the stories I attest he was telling.' (6.20-21)

(6.22) lalaŋal uradəŋ ambanm ednaŋan iŋin anen algənamiy.
'Uncle was embarrassing them by the stories that he was telling.'

A further property common to Oykangand relatives is the potential for extraposition of the embedded S. This potential has been realized in (6.7) where in pigipig anen udal atar has been extraposed from the relativized NP in pigipig of the matrix S. (6.15) on the other hand does not realize the potential for postposing the sentence in pigipig iy anen fence adən ubmar, which is reduced by EQUI-NP DELETION to anen fence adən ubmar. EXTRAPPOSITION will be examined again under P-Relatives.

There are several relativizers, all of which function elsewhere in the grammar, usually as interrogatives. The relativizers (R constituents) are anen 'that', anepd 'for when, when' and ayin 'if, whether'. Once again I owe the following examples to the insight of Mrs. Kathleen Major. The three relativizers can each be inserted under R in the deep structure (6.23), and
the grammatical sentences (6.24), (6.25) and (6.26) result from application of the EQUI-NP DELETION rule to akajaran.

(6.23)

(6.24) ididay ay iyun akaqar aden anen elkejah
INT-wait-RPRES I him y.brother my R return-IFUT
il olon Cairns-am.
he hither [ ū-from]L
'I am waiting for my younger brother who is (I attest)
coming back here from Cairns.'
(6.25) ididay ay iyun akaŋar aŋen anεŋεŋ elkenεŋ il olon

R
Cairns-am.
'I am waiting for when my younger brother will (I attest) be coming back here from Cairns.'

(6.26) ididay ay iyun akaŋar aŋen ayin elkenεŋ il olon

R
Cairns-am.
'I am waiting for my younger brother, whether he will come back here from Cairns (this time).'

In these sentences, as the previous R-relatives, there is no doubt—at least in the speaker's mind—that his akaŋar will indeed return.

Because of the interest in relativizers which coincide with interrogatives (witness Kuroda 1968) these are worth a second look. anen-relativizer coincides in form with anen-interrogative 'what?'. The following illustrates both.

(6.27) iŋ oŋgom anen udnudn? iŋ aŋ pigipig amboŋ
meat this what INT-lie-RPRES meat like pig small
anen olmbolbman, ubmbirumbiŋj.
R INT-crawl-RPRES pretty

'What animal is this? It's a pretty thing like a little pig that crawls.' (This comment relates to the speaker's reaction to a guinea pig at a zoo.)
anen means 'when' or 'if when' in sentences such as (6.28).

(6.28) a1k anen iyan ambul, ogo g alk alaw spear when make-RPRES we-pl-in first spear rod aogan amban al. look-for-E go-RPRES 'When we make a spear, first we go and look for a rod.'

anen also occurs in sentences which are neither embedded in another S, nor are interrogative in function. It has the meaning 'even' in these instances, and is a verbal modifier, as in (6.29).

(6.29) egl) abmban artanten il, og abmbang food himself INT-cook-RPRES he water [himself-DAT] igigun il, er aluy anen igun INT-go-RPRES he [away], [wood-PRP] even go-RPRES il, entoq abmban iyan il. 'He cooks his own food, fetches his own water, even gets his own wood and makes his own bed.'

anen is also an interrogative, being the A case form of anen.

(6.30) anen aqar adun? [what-AG] bite-RPAST me 'What bit me?'
ayin is more usually a question marker, i.e. the morpheme which differentiates the syntax of a statement from that of a question. Note sentence (4.41), reproduced in part below.

(4.41) abeR oŋgom ayin ew inaŋ?
woman this QUEST see-RPRES you
'Do you see this woman?'

One further important property of R-relative sentences concerns the case marking postpositions. The sentence (6.15) provides a typical example. The matrix sentence would (in surface realization) be (6.15a).

(6.15a) in pigipigiy. egŋ edndelay idar.
[meat pig-AG] food completely eat-RPAST
'The pig ate up all my vegetables.'

The Agentive postposition -iy does not appear when the sentence (6.15b) is inserted as an R-relative S.

(6.15b) in pigipigiy fence aŋen ubmar.
[meat pig-AG] my break-down-RPAST

(6.15) in pigipig fence aŋen anen ubmar egŋ aŋen edndelay idar.
'The pig that I attest broke down my fence ate up all my vegetables.'
The explanation for this phenomenon is found in the structure proposed for the relatives as a whole. Case marking postpositions apply only to NPs immediately dominated by a case X, as in the following structure:

![Diagram of NP structure](image)

(as discussed in Chapter IV with respect to example [4.36], and also later in Chapter VI [6.81])

NP₁ and NP₂ are coordinate NPs which are each assigned the postposition K, X. This postposition is assigned to the final word of NP₁, and to the sentence S under NP₂—not to NPᵣ, which is the relativized NP. NPᵣ, the relativized NP of the matrix S, can therefore never be marked for case.

This fact of Oykangand syntax argues strongly for the above structure. No alternative structure accounts so economically and simply for the occurrence of case marking postpositions in relativized structures.

The case marking postposition K is deleted from structures such as the above in which an R element appears; there is no K, A affixed to the relativized NP in pigipig (for reasons given above) nor to the R-relative sentence, fence aden anen ubmar in (6.15).
The rule of CASE POSTPOSITION DELETION must refer to the R element for reasons that appear later. This rule takes the form (6.31).

**CASE POSTPOSITION DELETION**

(6.31) $\text{NP} \ R \ S \ K]_X$

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
& => & \text{OBL}
\end{array}
\]

1 2 3 \emptyset

That the above generalization and explanation of case postposition is valid is established by examples in which I (6.32), D (6.33) and L (6.34) cases dominate the relativized NP, but in no instance does that NP have any case affix. An example involving PRP is found in (6.24). In the following examples, \emptyset indicates the point at which the rule (6.31) has applied.

(6.32) ulgogul-\emptyset anen egogen ambar ay, lalaŋal

fighting-stick R break-RPAST I [uncle-AC]

arim aŋun.

hit-RCUST me

'The fighting stick that I broke was that with which uncle used to hit me.'

(6.33) ukel uwal ay iŋun lalaŋ-\emptyset anen aŋkin

bullet give-RPAST I him uncle R hunt

iŋunm awaR.

go-RCUST [east]_L

'I gave the bullets to uncle, who went out hunting eastwards.'
P-Relatives

The alternative to the R-relative is the P-relative, examples of which have already been cited ([6.16] and [6.19]). The verb of such relatives is not unlike the form that is traditionally termed a 'participle' in the study of Latin or Ancient Greek.

The term 'participle' has of late suffered the same fate as the grammarians who once proposed the term. Both have known scorn and scathing criticism heaped on their dearest achievements by modern linguists. Hockett 1958 spares a passing reference to participles, while most transformationalists ignore the term. Only Lyons 1968 recognizes the validity of a participle and differentiates it from the English gerund (page 249 et seq.), and Langendoen 1969 admits of a 'so-called present- and past-participle' in English (page 134).

Various considerations justify the resurrection of the term--if not the category--as one convenient to this study. One feature of participles as traditionally conceived is their restriction to fewer morphological sets of tense/aspect possibilities than
the verbs of a matrix sentence. Oykangand verbs in P-relative sentences are marked only for 'non-past' by Ø, 'past' by -am and 'habitually, able to' by -may. 'Finite' verbs, by contrast, are affixed by one of eight tense/aspect markers (Chapter IX).

To the participle so formed other suffixes may apply. Whereas the R-relative sentence is never marked for case (see [6.31]) the P-relative may be. Both the cases of the P-relative and the case postposition of the NP in the matrix S may affect the affixation on the participle.

(6.35) in pigipig anbamand ewal ay, pigipig

   meat [bank-on]_L see-RPAST I
   ari-n-am-Ø-Ø.
   kill-E-PPAST-obj-obj

'I saw a pig on the bank, one that someone killed.'

In the matrix sentence (top line of [6.35]), the relativized NP in pigipig is 'under' the O constituent. So also is the identical NP of the P-relative S. As the O postposition is typically zero no case inflection appears on the participle ari-n-am.

Now ari-1 requires an Agentive case, and for ari-n-am to appear without an Agentive implies a rule of AGENTIVE DELETION (6.48) which operates (at least) in P-relative sentences. Sentence (6.35a) represents the 'surface' realization of a sentence which could equally have been embedded in (6.35).
(6.35a) in pigipig udal ari

meat pig [dog-AG] kill-RPAST they-2

'The two dogs killed the pig.'

Failure of the AGENT DELETION rule to operate on the embedded S
(6.35a) produces another sentence (6.36), which is in all respects
grammatical.

(6.36) in pigipig anbaman dog-AG meat 

[bank-on] see-RPAST I dog-AG

ari-n-ami-y.

kill-E-PPAST-subj

'I saw a pig on the bank, one that the dogs had killed.'

The realization of the Agentive udal has resulted in a correspond-
ing change in the participle, where the typically Agentive -iy now
appears.

Another possibility is that the relativized NP in pigipig
is manifesting an 0 case in the matrix S, and the 'identical' NP
in the P-relative S is Agentive. Sentence (6.37) exemplifies this
possibility.

(6.37) in pigipig anbaman dog-AG meat 

[bank-on] see-RPAST I dog kill-E-PPAST-subj

'I saw on the bank the pig that killed the dog.'

Once again the participle evinces the -iy suffix, although the
'identical' (Agentive) NP has been deleted.
Other possibilities could be explored endlessly; by varying the case of the relativized NP, the case of the 'identical' NP, and the verbs in the two sentences, an impressive array of almost pointless sentences could be presented. Instead, just four further instances are worth noting before rules are presented which account for the phenomena involved in P-relativization.

(6.38) ergel ay iqun agRaD, abm ay aRtaRtinaγaγ, say-RPAST 1 him w.man [person I work-for-to]D "ambul ataγday ayin iguγ?" we-pl-ex [crayfish-PRP] QUEST go-RINT 'I said to the white man that I work for, "Could we go for crayfish?"'

Note that it is the Dative case of (6.38) that is relativized, and that the 'identical' NP is also a Dative. The participle reflects both the Dative postpositions, and is assumed to be aRt-aRti-n-γ-ay-ay; a word typical of the most complicated morphology Oykangand has to offer.

The matrix S of (6.38) contains therefore a dative of the following structure:
Of the Dative in the P-relativized S, only K, D remains. The EQUI-NP DELETION RULE which operates on the 'identical' NP of the P-relative S has deleted the Dative agnorey after K, D was copied onto the participle.

The second sentence is (6.40) where the verb in the P-relative S is elke-2 'return'. This verb does not permit an A in its case frame, but selection is made of 0 as subject. The -iy nevertheless appears on the participle elke-n-∅. This indicates that it is the selected subject, rather than the Agentive case (which is of course always selected as subject) that--along with the case of the 'identical' NP--that influences affixation on the verb of the P-relative S.
(6.40) abm elke-n-∅-iy-ar uk oRgaqan aliy.

person return-E-PNP-subj-subj wood chop-IFUT we-2-in

'(When we are) returning, we'll chop the wood.'

The structure of the matrix A case is (6.41) below:

(6.41)

(6.42) ukel uwal ay lalaŋ abmal in

bullets give-RPAST I [uncle [person-AG] meat pigipig elgoR arinamiyay.]D

pig many kill-E-PPAST-subj-dat

'I gave some bullets to my uncle, who had killed a lot of pigs.'

The third example (6.42) requires no additional theoretical apparatus in order to render a correct account of it, but establishes that the affixes to the participle may be 'mixed',
i.e. not all of the one surface case. *ari-n-am* is affixed by -iy because *abmal* appears, and -ey because the P-relative S is introduced under the D case.

(6.43) match amb armel akow, uk arțeniyar.

PR finish-RPAST [cigarettes INT-cook-E-subj-inst]

'(My) matches are all finished, in lighting cigarettes.'

The final example (6.43) requires a slight modification to the theory developed so far. *match*, the relativized NP, is in the O case, but becomes the subject of *armel* according to the regular rules of SUBJECT CHOICE outlined in Chapter V. *artarbe-n-∅* is nevertheless affixed by -iy (since *match* is the deleted 'identical' NP and the I case of *artarbe-1*) and also by -ar. The conclusion then, is that the *surface* function of an NP in either matrix or embedded S that is the determining factor in participle affixation. It is therefore not unreasonable to suggest parallels between what has been discussed and pronominalization, which also reflects surface relationships.

The data presented above require a sequence of transformational rules for their correct derivation, a sequence that accounts for all the P-relative sentences of Oykangand. Some rules within the sequence are motivated by other requirements of the grammar, or are variants of such rules; others are specific to the P-relative.
SUBJECT CHOICE RULE

The conditions of subject choice have been already outlined in Chapter V. The effect of the rule is to move the selected case from 'under' the P node to S initial position, dominated directly by S.

(preliminary formulation)

(6.44) \[ M \ [ Y \ X \ Z ]_P \ ]_S
1 2 3 4 5 6 => OBL
1 4 2 3 5 6

(The conditions of subject choice are discussed later in this chapter.)

EXTRAPOSITION RULE

The relative S may be extraposed with respect to the matrix S. P-relatives make use of this transformation more frequently than R-relatives, and postpositions are more usual than prepositions.

(6.45) \[ S \ Y \ NP \ (R) \ S \ Z ]_S
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 => OPT
1 2 3 6 7 5 # 4 + 5
5 # 4 + 5 1 2 3 6 7

REFLECTION RULE

This is a convenient term for the rule which copies the case postposition of the 'identical' NP onto the participle. The rule is required to keep track of the source of this case
postposition, so that 0 case subjects realize the K as iy and not zero in this position. That is to say, the rule recognizes surface relationships.

(6.46) \( NP \ Y \ [NP \ K] \ Z \ V \ tns \)

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 + 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

where 1 = 3, i.e. 1 and 3 are coreferential 2 contains no R.

EQUI-NP DELETION RULE

All instances of S embedded in NPs are required to meet the conditions for Equi-NP deletion. Those that do not are marked by the grammar as deviant. The sources of adjectives, apposition, relativization and genitives (sentential) are among those that undergo Equi-NP deletion.

(6.47) \( NP_i \ Y \ (R) \ Z \ NP_i:[-pro] \ K \)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

OBLIGATORY if \( Y = \emptyset \)

OPTIONAL otherwise.
AGENT DELETION RULE

(preliminary formulation)

(6.48) \( P \quad A \quad Q \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \Rightarrow \)

\( 1 \quad \emptyset \quad 3 \)

where \( P, Q \) are variables

and \( P \) contains two instances of \([S\)

\( Q \) contains two instances of \( ]_S\)

A,K COPYING RULE

(6.49) \[NP \quad K]_A \quad Y \quad V \quad tns \quad K \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \Rightarrow \)

\( 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad \text{-iy} \)

where 6 is phonologically null.

A,K Copying accounts for the \text{-iy} of (6.36) and (6.37) and similar instances where 6 is the phonologically null K,0 and the A case appears as subject.

It is possible to trace the derivation of various P-relative sentences through these rules. Take for example the (surface) sentence (6.35a) which appears as a relative in both (6.35) and (6.36). The deep structure proposed for these examples would include the following.
Operations on this (sub-)structure, and their effect upon it, are as follows.

(6.50) Subject Choice
(6.51) Extrapolation

(6.52) Reflection (follows transformations dealing with M)

Equi-NP Deletion (not applied).

Agent Deletion (not applied).
For sentence (6.35), the derivation is similar, but the AGENT DELETION rule does apply, and as a result A,K COPYING does not. The realization is therefore

\[ \ldots \text{udal pigipig arinamiy}]_S \]

The postposition \(-iy\) on certain participles performs an important function in disambiguation. Note sentences (6.54) and (6.55) which differ only in this feature.

(6.54) abm ay an ewal ay inun, idnan ar ambeam.
    person I quite see-RPAST I you body wasted became
    'I saw you all right, when you were tired.'

(6.55) abm ay an ewal ay inun, idnan ar ambeamiy.
    'I saw you all right, when I was tired.'
In other cases -iy alone is ungrammatical; its addition to the participle of (6.56) requires further changes to be made and an entirely different structure underlies the result.

(6.56) in pigipig uṇḍinaṇa arinam, edndelay amb meat pig [yesterday], kill-PPAST completely PR idar arong aguñAND edn.
eat-RPAST [child young-AG] they
'The young children ate up the pig killed yesterday.

The participle arinamiy would in this case imply that either

(1) in pigipig is the subject of the embedded S, but lacks the Agentive postposition; or

(2) in pigipig is the Agent of the matrix S, which it obviously is not, or again (and most reasonably) that

(3) arong aguñan is the deleted NP of the embedded S. In this instance it is arong aguñan which is relativized, not in pigipig, and the Agentive postposition properly belongs on the participle, so that (6.57) is the correct sentence.

(6.57) in pigipig, uṇḍinaṇa arinamiyar, arong aguñan edndelay amb idar edn.
'The children that killed a pig yesterday ate it all up.'
One final fact of relativization is important: The embedded S must contain a 'true verb'. That is, the relative must conform to the structure (6.58) before it is grammatically acceptable.

\[(6.58) \text{NP } (R) \ [ \text{Y } \text{V } [+\text{V}, \text{-Adj}] \text{ Z } ]_S \]

There is no parallel in Oykangand to the English

The dog that is black...

or

The spear that is crooked...

In cases where it is desirable to identify a noun by means of an adjective, the adjective must be introduced directly, as in the next section (see [6.59]),

\[(6.59) \text{alk edgedangan} \]

\[\text{[spear crooked ]}_\text{NP}\]

' the/a crooked spear...

or in a relative S having the 'true verb' \textit{ambe-2} 'become' (see [6.60]). The semantic effect of \textit{ambe-2} may not be so desirable, however, as in (6.61).

\[(6.60) \text{alk edgedangan ambe\text{\textdiameteram} } \]

\[\text{[spear crooked became]}_\text{NP}\]

' the spear that became crooked...'
In many of its applications, the $P$-relative $S$ has the sense of a 'Consequence' clause in English, rather than the sense of a strict relative. (6.43) is a typical example; another such follows.

(6.62) elber ay inun elaŋar uy $a_R$ artemamiy.
scold I her $y$.sister fish not cook-PAST-subj
'I scolded my younger sister for not cooking the fish.'

The English gloss makes much better sense and a closer approximation to the illocutionary force of the sentence (see Austin 1962) than the literal 'I scolded my younger sister who did not cook the fish'.

Some sentences contain a verb with typically participle inflection, but no NP that is obviously 'identical' to any NP in the matrix $S$. (6.63) is an example.

(6.63) ukan ewal angdan, al aŋti $a_RtaRtinam$, g.fire see-RPAST we-pl-ex fire smoke INT-climb-PAST
ukan it artər edn og abmbamand. g.fire [there]$_L$ cook-RPAST they [swamp-at ]$_L$
'We saw a grass fire, with smoke rising; they had set fire to the grass in the swamp.'
The writer earlier postulated an 'Absolute S' to account for embedded sentences like al anṭiR aRtaRtinam. The model for this analysis was that traditionally employed in Greek and Latin. There were several problems with the analysis, one being that the informant would not accept sentences that were produced according to the rules proposed.

Accordingly, the analysis was abandoned, but that which is now proposed is not impeccable. The 'identical' NP of the embedded S of (6.63) is ukan al anṭiR, of which only ukan is deleted. The structure is shown in (6.64).

\[(6.64)\]

Unhappy though this analysis appears, language evidence favors it. Consider (6.65).

\[(6.65)\] aロー$n$ いご$m$ いだ$n$ い amban$m$ い い$n$ い, る$f$ む え$l$ い y.woman that run cause-RCUST he her breast eye ernepam.

stand-PPAST

'He eloped with that high-breasted young woman.'
The 'identical' NP of the P-relativized S is inin 'her', so perhaps the translation should read '...young woman whose...'. Nevertheless, inin with its adnominal dative source, has been deleted from the embedded S and in fact must be deleted, (6.66) being ungrammatical.

(6.66) *alogene itom idanjin ambanm il inun, afum el inin erneman.

Both (6.63) and (6.65) introduce another problem, seen also in certain P-relative sentences where the 'identical' NP is more easily identified. The problem is that although the surface subject of the sentence has not been deleted, no -iy appears on the verb. Note (6.67) also.

(6.67) ang angunan algar andan, school orbenam.
child young carry-RPAST we-pl-ex drop-off-PPAST
'We took the young children with us since school had broken up.'

This sentence remained for some time the cornerstone of the 'Absolute S' analysis, but Mrs. Kathleen Major insisted that the correct form of the participle was orbenamiyar. This in effect meant that -iyar had been deleted from (6.67) and that prior to its deletion the structure of (6.67) included (6.68).
Sentences (5.81), (6.13) and (6.14) provide similar L case examples where the -iy is deleted; (5.74) and (5.80) provide examples of its retention. These examples suggest the analysis: -iy is optionally deleted if no ambiguity results, much after the fashion of K,A DELETION discussed in Chapter V (5.10). The locative -ar depends on the retention of -iy, and is never realized without -iy. Informants unanimously reject *orbeñamar.

On the other hand, -ay 'direction to' can be realized without -iy:

orbeñamay.

Adjectives

The argument that adjectives are in fact 'tenseless' verbs is fairly well established. George Lakoff's 'On the nature of syntactic irregularity' (1965) contains, in Appendix A, a summary of ten 'very general rules of English in which adjectives and verbs are treated identically.' The ten arguments constitute the work of Lakoff, Postal and Rice (Lakoff 1965:Al). Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968
incorporated this view into their conservative treatment of English grammar and Zeno Vendler provided further insights in his 'Adjectives and nominalizations' of the same year. Fillmore 1968a:27fn. adopts this view, as does Lyons 1968 who traces it back to Plato and Aristotle. 'Heretics' who have opposed this formulation include Ross 1969b, who sees adjectives as noun phrases and Bach 1968b, who in search of a grammar more firmly based in semantics, reduces all major lexical categories to one. However accurately Bach's proposal may reflect the ultimate 'truth' of the matter, it is the 'adjectives-as-verbs' hypothesis that is adopted for the practical description of Oykangand.

For want of a better mnemonic, the categorial formula for adjectives is \([+V,+Adj]\), and that for true verbs \([+V,-Adj]\). The terms 'adjective' and 'true verb' are still useful designations for the formulae, but for the category as a whole the term 'verb \([+V]\)' will have to serve. Like true verbs, adjectives have case frames which specify the cooccurrence of any lexical entry with various cases. The most common case frame is \([0\ (D)\___(S)\]) and sentences corresponding to \(0+D+V: [+V,+Adj]\) structure have already appeared in Chapter V (sentences [5.37] and [5.50]).

It is a necessary condition on the structure of any S containing an adjective that it contain no D if that sentence is to undergo the transformational cycle which introduces the adjective into a matrix sentence. That is to say, neither (5.37) nor (5.50),
which contain a D, could be embedded into any matrix sentence. Sentence (6.69), which resembles (5.50) but contains no D, could be embedded into a matrix, as in (6.70).

(6.69) abm il Geraldine ebmborŋ.
person she tall
'Geraldine is tall.'

(6.70) abm il Geraldine ebmbor igigun il.
INT-go-RPRES
'*Geraldine is tall going about.' (This is poor English but an acceptable translation fails to reflect the Oykangand.)

The above condition permits the EQUI-NP DELETION rule to reduce the embedded S to an adjective which is 'raised' to the matrix S in the correct sequential position. A second condition on sentences containing a verb [+V,+Adj] has already been noted: such sentences do not immediately dominate other sentences containing [+V,+Adj] verbs. This condition was discussed in Chapter V, and illustration can be found in examples (5.28) to (5.31).

Adjectives frequently share another feature of verbs—partial reduplication. Since reduplication is more extensive and varied for 'true verbs' than for adjectives, the rules and discussion of this phenomenon will be left until Chapter X. Just a few examples will be offered at this point, by way of illustration.
(6.71) alk alaw algalgal amban alul or spear rod INT-straight cause-RPRES [[fire-INST] cold arțenîy.
cook]I
'We straighten spear rods by warming them in the fire.'

Certain adjectives are always reduplicated. edngedngan 'crooked' (examples [6.59] and [6.60]), elbmbelbmben 'red', ebmbelbmbol 'flat, smooth' and erñerñar 'wrinkled' are typical. These adjectives are marked in the lexicon with the feature [+INTENS], while others are optionally reduplicated. The feature [+INTENS] triggers transformations which effect the necessary changes, and has the semantic effect of intensification. algalgal therefore means 'really straight', or 'dead straight' (see Chapter X).

(6.72) alk elbmbelbmben ilg. egəanm edn uñțiR.
[spear INT-red with]C dance-RCUST they [night]L
'They danced with red spears last night.'

Comitative and Privative (C/P)

The discussion to follow will range beyond the immediate account of the C/P case to conjunction, pronominalization and several 'grey' areas of the grammar. The C/P case itself is basically uncomplicated and not particularly interesting. Like
the Locative postpositions, Comitative ilg and Privative aRem
are introduced from the lexicon with the meaning 'with' and
'without' respectively.

(6.73) ĩn ăr̥g ilg udnəŋ il.
meat [child with] C lie-RCUST she
'The animal was lying with its young.'

(6.74) ambul ĩn araŋq aRem elkel ambul.
we-pl-in [meat duck without] p return-RPAST we-pl-in
'We came back without any ducks.'

Ilg and aRem resemble certain of the Locative postpositions (such
as andand 'through') in being words rather than affixes. That is,
they are entered in the lexicon as 'free' forms, have stress as-
signed according to the rules, and may be pronounced in isolation.
Ilg is exceptional in being the only word to date encountered by
the writer which does not fuse with following postpositions.
Instead both stand also as full words. Postpositions to ilg and
aRem have their source in the case X that dominates the C/P case,
as in the following structure.

(6.75)
aRemar, aRemay and aRemam thus correspond to ilg ar, ilg ay and ilg am, according to the affixes of Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4 respectively.

\[(6.76)\] uwand ıgur alıŋ ey, og arfañ ilg ar [west]_<sub>L</sub> go-RPAST we-2-ex [water [mangrove with]<sub>C</sub> at]<sub>L</sub> alıŋar alıŋ. 

descend-RPAST we-2-ex

'We two went westwards, and crossed over at the wild mangroves.'

It is not possible to relate ilg to any genitive construction. With the exception of one unusual structure discussed further on (in connection with \([6.79]\) and \([6.80]\)) ilg is always commanded by a verb, and hence never appears in the complement to a Dative topic, as the 0 case does. Frei's example (quoted by Fillmore 1968a:64)

Sylvie est jolie des yeux

does not become an acceptable Oykangand sentence in translation without a verb.

*Sylvia el udnam ilg.

eye beautiful with

The most usual verb in such sentences would be ıgu-ı "go, walk" and partial reduplication often occurs (Chapter X).
(6.77) Sylvia el udnam ilg igigun.

    eye beautiful with INT-go-RPRES

'Sylvia goes about with beautiful eyes.'

C/P phrases within the subject NP can lead to interesting pronominalizations. Compare the following three sentences.

(6.78) bebaŋ (il) akaŋar ilg elkel il
    o.sister (she) [y.brother with] return-RPAST she
    olon.

[thither]L

(6.79) bebaŋ il akaŋar ilg elkel ul olon.

    they-2

(6.80) *bebaŋ akaŋar ilg elkel ul olon.

    (assuming the same deep structure as [6.78] and [6.79];
    [6.80] is grammatical enough if bebaŋ is dual in number,
    but this is not the sense of [6.78] and [6.79])

'My older sister returned with my younger brother.'

These sentences give evidence for (1) the position of the pronoun in the sequence of elements in the NP, and (2) the details of pronominalization. Pronominalization is the concern of Chapter VIII, but it is important to note that 'computations' are involved which 'read' ilg as 'plus' and aRem as 'zero' (not as 'minus', see [6.81]).
(6.81) bebaŋ il, ağañaɾ aRem elkel il olon.
'My older sister returned without any younger brother.'

'ilg and aRem occur in one rare structure which still defies analysis or any principled explanation for it.

(6.82) og aRemar.
water without-at
'There is/was no water there.'

(6.83) al elgoR ilg ar.
f.wood many with-at
'There is/was plenty of firewood there.'

No anaphoric processes appear to have applied in the production of (6.82) and (6.83), and only an L case such as itod awaR 'there to the east', can be added without disrupting the structure. Sentences of this nature remain somewhat of an enigma; any account offered for them would be strictly ad hoc at the present stage of analysis.

'ilgay (one word) and aRemay occur in the grammar outside of the domain of the C/P case. For morphological reasons it is tempting—but not plausible—to relate these forms to ilg and aRem respectively. aRemay is a negative; ilgay--by far the more interesting—will be discussed here. The analysis proffered at this point is only tentative; the finer semantic distinctions are all too elusive.
Four lexical entries of Oykangand can be glossed as 'together'. *i1gay* 'together (with person/s unspecified)', *idndamay* 'together (the one as well as the other)', *erbaniv* and *erbang* 'together (mixed up with things'). In many sentences any of the four forms would be acceptable, but in others semantic considerations select one or another form in preference to the rest.

The analysis proposed for these forms is that they are unique verbs, introduced under an S node immediately dominated by the case X, as in (6.84).

(6.84)

```
X
/   \
NP_1... NP_n S K
```

The well motivated convention for case postposition adjunction is that K,X is adjoined to all the other 'daughters' of X: NP_1... NP_n S. This fact gives a principled explanation of (6.85), the deep structure of which resembles (6.86).

(6.85) 1alaf)a1 ninaf)a1 idndamayiY. ari!.

[uncle-AG][aunty-AG][together-AG] hit-RPAST they-2

me

'Uncle and aunty both hit me.'
idndamay, as the verb of the embedded S, accepts the Agentive (subject) postposition -iy. ilgay behaves exactly as idndamay.

Evidence for the verbal nature of these forms is exemplified in (6.87) where ilgay is the verb of a matrix S.

(6.87) Q: abm inaq ingod uw?

   person you where then

   'Where were you then?'

A: abm ay ilgay uw ay.

   person I together then I

   'I was with someone (else) then.'

Just what is the structure of the embedded S (6.86) of which idndamay is the verb? Presumably, if all Ss under a case X must meet the conditions for Equi-NP Deletion, the structure is:
Does *idndamay*, *ilgay*, etc. each require a conjoined NP subject, then? Apparently not; recall (4.26) and the deep structure (4.27).

*idndamay* appears here with the meaning 'same in appearance'.

Together with *ilgay*, *idndamay* offers the only means of expressing this concept in Oykangand. *ow onbaR* could be plural, since there is no plural morpheme, but (6.84) indicates that a singular subject is permitted. *ow onbaR*—so far as my informant is concerned—is 'one face'.

*ilgay* and *undamay* can also be 'transitive', both independently and in embedded Ss.
(6.89) kakaŋ ilgay ednaŋan.

'y. brother together them
'Our younger brother is/was with them.'

(6.90) akanar aŋen undaman ur ilgayiy ankin ambanm

[y. brother my E-AG] [dog together-AG] hunt cause-RCUST
il in oyboyay.
he [meat wallaby-PRP]
'My younger brother went hunting for wallabies together
with (his) dog.'

erbaniy and erbang (despite intensive eliciting I could
find no instance where one could apply but not the other) accept
[-animate] subjects as well as [+animate] subjects. (6.91) illus-
trates this, as well as the phenomenon of extraposition.

(6.91) agar aŋen oren ikir ay, eg0,
bedroll my [behind]L throw-RPAST I food
kontelkont erbang.

billy-can together
'I threw my bedroll on the back, together with (my)
food and billy-can.'
FOOTNOTES

1 The nasal n interposed between the verb stem ari- and the past participle marker -am is another 'empty morph' introduced by the phonological realization rules. For discussion, see Chapter III.

2 ukan 'grass, grass fire' parallels al 'wood, firewood, fire' in that both the fire and its source are denoted by the one word.
Chapter VII

NOUNS AND CLASSIFIERS

Nouns

Early in the 'structuralist' era of linguistics the term noun fell into disrepute, perhaps as much in reaction to the naïve 'schoolroom' definition of the term as anything else. In linguistic descriptions of that era one finds reference to 'Class I' words that are obviously substantives. Although Bloomfield made unashamed use of noun in his 1933 Language, by 1951 the term had been ostracized, so that Harris' Methods in structural linguistics of that year mentions it once, and Hockett 1958, finding the term useful despite its social status, uses it albeit surreptitiously and without adequate definition.

The transformational definition of a noun is only a slight improvement. Nouns are marked [+N] in the lexicon and occur as the obligatory or 'head' category of an NP. Linguists still appear to be suffering from an indisposition to call a spade a noun, and are reticent about offering the world a universal definition.

The nouns of Oykangand are a recognizable class of words which may be inflected for case by postpositions but which are never inflected for tense. They are the head category of the NPs that have been developed by rules in Chapter VI. (It is by no means clear that these NPs are universally valid.)
Nouns are entered in the lexicon with a matrix of syntactically relevant features. These features include number (singular, dual, plural) person (I, II, III or combinations thereof; see Chapter VIII), and semantically derived features such as [IN], [EGN] etc. discussed later in this chapter. The features [pro], [EMPH], [kin], [INTENS] are also relevant.

Within the grammar devised to this point, one important fact has been left unaccounted for, and the reckoning for it can no longer be postponed. In certain instances, an NP specified by the case frame feature of the verb has been deleted. How can the theory account for the deletion of an obligatory NP into which lexical items are presumed to be inserted, without affecting the semantic reading of the sentence? This study presumes those tenets of transformational theory which maintain that (1) all lexical items are inserted prior to transformations, that (2) transformations do not change meaning, and that (3) deleted items are recoverable.

It appears to be necessary, then, to resolve the problem by setting up some noun U which is a dummy, semantically null, unspecified entity that admits of no sister categories, and is always deleted. Sentences such as (6.35), in which the transitive verb ari-1 appears without its A case, are understood to contain U. (Sentences which lose some NP by the operation of the Equi-NP Deletion rule do not of course require any U.)
Is there any other justification for \( U \)? In the discussion of question sentences, an unspecified noun is required by certain question (QUEST) words or the sentence is ungrammatical. Once again, the conditions on the occurrence of \( U \) are the same---it is always deleted. There appears to be a justifiable place for it in the grammar, despite its counter-intuitive nature.

Included also as nouns are the classifiers (see next section), personal pronouns, \( \text{amb} \) and its derivatives, and \( \text{abmban} \); all of these are discussed in Chapter VIII.

There are virtually no derivational processes in Oykangand. Where the need exists for both a substantive and a verb to denote some activity or other, two morphologically unrelated forms are found in the lexicon.

(7.1) \begin{align*}
egg\text{ga-} & \quad [+V,-\text{Adj}] \quad \text{'dance'} \\
o\text{d\text{fg\text{den}}} & \quad [+N] \quad \text{'dance'} \\
i\text{ki-} & \quad [+V,-\text{Adj}] \quad \text{'throw, spear'} \\
\text{alk} & \quad [+N] \quad \text{ 'spear'}
\end{align*}

Certain entries in the lexicon do appear to be morphologically related, but the number is very small. Entries presumably based on \( \text{el} \ 'eye' \) include

\begin{align*}
el\text{wan} & \quad [+N] \quad \text{ 'sleep'} \\
el\text{wan\text{d\text{j}}} & \quad [+V,+\text{Adj}] \quad \text{ 'sleepy (of eyes)' }.
\end{align*}
but the category resulting from the addition of -ŋ and assimilation of the final n is entirely different. The process is not productive.

Classifiers

Although Oykangand is a 'suffixing' language, it shares with many of the 'prefixing' languages (Capell 1956 q.v.) a system of noun classifiers. These have already been mentioned in connection with the syntactic arguments of Chapter V. Classifiers have traditionally been treated as instances of word morphology, and attempts made to assign each classifier to some semantic domain. A typical analysis of this sort, and one which is more thorough than most, is Oates' 1964 account of Gunwinggu classifiers.

Dixon 1968, 1970 is another contributor to the literature on noun classifiers, and worth quoting:

In many Australian languages at least some of the noun class prefixes are degenerate forms of generic terms. Languages that have not developed noun classes often include the appropriate generic term immediately before a specific noun in an NP:.. (1970)

Dixon implies that noun classifiers are bound forms—prefixes which occur on specific nouns. Where the syntax of a language requires a 'generic term' to precede a specific noun, it is one of those 'languages that have not developed noun classes'.
The facts of Oykangand will require that this view be regarded as perhaps misconceived. Consider the nouns oyboy 'wallaby', adal 'bream' and igay 'bloodwood', which respectively require the generic terms in 'meat, animal', uy 'fish', and uk 'tree'.

(7.2) in oyboy
     uy adal
     uk igay

Under phonologically determined conditions (see Sommer 1969 for details) phonological rules reduce these forms to

(7.3) /noyboy/
     /yadal/ (rare)
     /kigay/3

To suggest—as Dixon has—that the latter nouns have classifiers while the former ones do not is incongruous. The difference is due simply to a phonological rule which proves to be independently motivated, rather than to some exotic grammatical structure.

The position taken in this account of Oykangand is as follows below. It claims to be valid for all Australian languages with noun classifier systems, and certainly is for both those Cape York Peninsular languages which the writer has encountered and those which have been adequately described in the literature.
The classifier is a noun which is transformationally introduced by features on the 'head' noun of an NP. Language-specific rules determine whether the classifier is a bound morpheme, or a phonologically distinct word which may also have independent occurrence. In some cases where the classifier has been reduced to a prefix, it is identifiable with reconstructed nouns in the proto-language. In Oykangand, and in most other Cape York Peninsular languages the classifiers still occur independently as nouns themselves.

(7.4) in ayin afar inaq?

meat QUEST get-RPAST you

'Did you get the meat?'

At the other extreme Gunwinggu (Oates 1964) has only four classifiers (na-, gal-, gun-, man-) and these are bound forms which Oates does not relate to any synchronic noun. 4

What is being countered by this proposal is the traditional view that noun classification is a morphological rather than a syntactic process. This is not to undermine the fine pioneering work done in the north of Australia by Capell and his students, but rather it is to insist that the noun classifiers they identified be recognized at the syntactic level. It is also maintained that languages like Oykangand evince a noun classifier system which is as valid and as obligatory to the language as those systems reported elsewhere which appear to be merely morphological.
The grammar of Oykangand then must account in a systematic way for the following facts about nouns:

1. that some forms occur both as classifier and as 'head' noun in an NP;
2. that some nouns do not occur without a classifier;
3. that other nouns never cooccur with a classifier.

The grammar must also provide rules which will derive the correct sequence, (Classifier) + Noun, in a natural manner.

The proposal which will meet these conditions is not new, nor is it particularly profound. It echoes work on Trukese by Benton 1968 and proposals for Ulithi by Sohn 1969, although neither language has a noun classifier system in the same sense as Oykangand. Herein lies the novelty of the proposal: its importance lies in the claim that the same rules are adequate to derive noun classifiers in Australian languages generally.5

The classifiers are recognized as [+pro] forms of the nouns to which they are adjoined, derived by a copying transformation.

**CLASSIFIER PRO-COPY RULE**

(7.5) \[ Y \ N:[+CL] \ Z \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 2 & 3 \\
1 & 2:[+pro]+2 & 3
\end{array} \]

The transformation creates the structure (7.6).
Nouns which require a classifier are marked by the feature [+CL] and undergo the transformation. Oykangad oybov, adal, and igay are nouns of this type.

The classifiers under this proposal are that subset of nouns marked [+N, +pro, -CL] in the lexicon. As the 'head' noun of an NP, classifiers introduce no [+pro] copy, since they are specified [-CL]. Classifiers are inserted as the [+pro] copy of other nouns, since they each share this feature.

The classifiers are each selected by another transformation which 'reads' the features of the head noun and inserts the necessary classifier. Some head nouns are entered in the lexicon with variable features. elyay is an example. elyay can select in for 'animal bone', uy for 'fish bone' or eg0 for 'pip, seed, kernel'. These possibilities are representable by semantic features associated with elyay thus:

\[[\alpha IN][\beta UY][\gamma EGN]\]

For n such features, the values must sum to 1-n. That is, only one such feature can be marked (+). It is this feature which selects the classifier.
The converse also applies. oRe k 'bag, sugar-bag, chaff-bag' selects uk, but antiy 'yam-straining bag' and abmbin 'dilly bag' select no classifier at all. Physically the latter two are of an open weave pattern, and the contents can be seen, but the former is close woven and may contain anything. Such fine semantic distinctions are reflected by the feature [UK] which is responsible for the selection of the classifier.

Yet other nouns select Ø, i.e. [-CL] as a possibility. Such nouns constitute a considerable percentage of the category. Nouns descriptive of geographical topography, the heavens and heavenly bodies, most man-made articles and instruments, body parts and 'unrelated' things such as ayoyal 'wax', awin 'road' or odöden 'dance' do not normally select any classifier. Classifiers themselves belong to the subset of nouns which select no classifier. Some nouns have Ø as one of several possibilities, as noted above. That is to say in or eno may be selected, or no classifier at all. Note the following:

(7.7) eten       'skin'
    in eten     'hide, scalp'
    eno eten   'fruit peel, banana skin'

Where eten occurs without a classifier it must be assumed that the value for [CL] is negative. When the value of the features above sums to -n, then a redundancy rule specifies [-CL]. This value for [CL] is also specified for [+pro] nouns.
The classifier system of Oykangand is an important feature of the grammar and is highly flexible. For instance, the one entry atulwaŋd, signifies the tree by means of uk, its fruit by means of egn, and firewood from the limbs of the tree by al.

(7.8)  

| uk atulwaŋd | 'Leichhardt tree' |
| egn atulwaŋd | 'fruit of the Leichhardt tree' |
| al atulwaŋd | 'firewood from the Leichhardt tree' |

atulwaŋd never occurs without a classifier. It is typical of many lexical entries, both for its flexibility, noted above, and for its obligatory specification of one classifier.

Of interest also are homophonous forms which select different classifiers but which, because no semantic connection can be clearly maintained, must be entered separately in the lexicon. Note the following instances.

(7.9)  

| argel | 'policeman' |
| ip argel | 'sea-eagle' |
| uk idndiR | 'tree sp., gutta-percha' |
| ip idndiR | 'large reptile (goanna or crocodile)' |
| uk oygŋgorgon | 'tree sp.' |
| egn oygŋgorgon | 'wild onion sp.' |
| alk alaw | 'spear rod' |
| (uk) alaw | 'black ant sp.' |
Between the members of these pairs it is sometimes possible to conceive of a semantic connection. But it is not possible to predict the sense of, say, in idndiR from uk idndiR, or vice versa. oygorgan comes closer to being predictable, with the basic meaning of [+EDIBLE BUT CAUSES VOMITING]. But it is still not possible to predict that egn oygorgan is a species of wild onion, and not, for instance, a species of bitter turnip or sour fruit.

Since NP expands to N (N) [BR 6] it becomes an analytical problem to decide whether two nouns are structurally [classifier + head], [head + attribute], or a compound noun. For example ew eten 'lip' has the same apparent structure as in eten and egn eten in (7.6). Is ew 'mouth' also a classifier? ew alfaR 'chin' and ew ayom 'beard' also occur. Other body parts function similarly.

(7.10) ow 'nose' ow onbaR 'face'  
afum 'breast' afum el 'breast nipple'  
eg 'head' eg ulbaR 'fontanel'  
ebmal 'foot' ebmal elkal 'toenail'  
uyam 'hand' uyam amanar 'thumb'  

None of these combinations produces an entirely predictable semantic outcome. onbaR 'recognizable (of land or landmarks)', el 'eye (or nest- or burrow-outlet)', ulbaR 'hiccough', elkal 'nail, shell of turtle', and amanar 'mother' occur elsewhere as nouns. It appears to be necessary to enter the nouns in the right column of
Table 7.1

List of the most common Oykangand classifiers, their meanings as independent nouns, and the general semantic area of nouns which select them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>Meaning as Independent N</th>
<th>Selected by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>'meat, animal'</td>
<td>birds, animals, reptiles and some miscellaneous items, as in odnd ('string') = 'lightning'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uk</td>
<td>'tree, bush'</td>
<td>trees; also multi-legged creatures, as spiders, ants and crabs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uy</td>
<td>'fish'</td>
<td>fish; turtles and other reptiles select in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alk</td>
<td>'spear'</td>
<td>spear types and parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odaw</td>
<td>'woomera'</td>
<td>woomera types and parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ednbal</td>
<td>'frog'</td>
<td>frog species; (tadpoles, oddly enough, select uk).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ukan</td>
<td>'grass'</td>
<td>grass species and creepers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egŋ</td>
<td>'food'</td>
<td>vegetables, fruit, and cooked, tinned or prepared foods, including sugar, flour; also some vines and creepers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>og</td>
<td>'water'</td>
<td>types of water: spring-, sea-, brackish-, muddy-, clear-, milky--; also whirlpools, waterfalls, rapids and strong drink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abm</td>
<td>'person'</td>
<td>'status' terms such as 'old woman', 'young man' etc. and kin terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al</td>
<td>'fire, firewood'</td>
<td>types and parts of a fire; smoke, charcoal, etc. and types of firewood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(7.10) as compound nouns. That is to say, as [+N] in the lexicon, made up internally of N + N, but semantically unpredictable from the simple addition of features associated with the two Ns. (For dozens of parallel English examples see Lees 1960.)

One argument in favor of this analysis is the fact that classifiers do not themselves introduce yet another classifier, i.e. classifier insertion is non-recursive. The example eg in (7.10) can select the classifier in when compounded with alng ("cranium"). eg is not therefore itself a classifier.

(7.11) in eg alng away alngal!

hither bring

'Bring the head of the animal here!'

Example (7.11) offers an attractive explanation for the fact noted in Chapter V, that body parts are not necessarily inalienably possessed. in eg alng aden (aden 'my') is the head of some animal or dead person that I have claimed. (abm) eg alng aden is my own head, and part of my own body. The classifier system thus effects the semantic differentiation effected in other languages by a distinction in possession. This is not, as has been shown, the sole function of the classifier system, but it is one of them. Note what Fillmore says of Fijian (quoting Lévy-Bruhl):

Fijian uluqu means the head which is now firmly attached to my neck, while kequ ulu, also translatable as 'my head', would refer to the head which, say, I am about to eat. (1968a:62)
Fijian ulugu is Oykangand (abm) eg alng aden; kegu ulu is in eg alng aden.

To return briefly to arguments in favor of the compound N analysis, a strong indication of the correctness of the proposal can be adduced from forms beginning adn-. In isolation adn means 'excrement', but adn- forms the first syllable of most nouns to do with the lower part of the body: adnump 'hip', adnung 'backbone near anus', adnokoR 'buttocks', adnod 'cheek of buttocks', adneR 'waist', adnubman 'thigh, lap', etc. adn- behaves, in fact, much as the classical or Dixonian noun classifiers are expected to, but like eg alng, words with adn- can introduce the classifier in, e.g. in adnump. The suspicion that these are also compound nouns, despite their phonological unity, is strengthened by the last example, whose last part is historically traceable to *kuman, a Proto-Paman stem reconstructed by Hale 1964. ubman (without the adn- prefix) has also been recorded. So then the adn- forms are probably also compound nouns which phonologically have become single words.

To complete the argument, it must be pointed out that eg alng becomes (accentually) one word in the speech of some informants, as does afum el (7.10).

At the height of the goose-egg season, the following noun phrases are quite common. They represent typical examples of the classifier + noun + attributive noun construction.
(7.12)  \textit{in alwañar añañar} \quad 'a goose mother'  \\
\textit{in arad, alwañar} \quad 'a goose's nest'  \\
\textit{in onmon alwañar} \quad 'a goose egg'

\textit{alwañar}, \textit{arad}, and \textit{onmon} each independently can select the classifier \textit{in}; it would be incongruous if it were not so. The last noun in the sequence, \textit{añañar}, and the two instances of \textit{alwañar}, are attributive nouns which independently also can select \textit{in} and which add their semantic features to those of the head noun. These attributive nouns are those introduced by \textit{BR 6} which (in part) is \textit{NP} + \textit{N (N)*}. To date no examples have been found which realize the potential of \textit{N} recursion; the rule could equally well be \textit{NP} + \textit{N (N)} so far as present data go.

**Classifier Deletion**

In certain instances the classifier is deleted. The most usual instance is in serial listing, as in (7.13).

(7.13) uy \textit{arfir} ay, uy \textit{adal, ermbal, alongol}  \\
\textit{fish hold-RPAST I fish bream catfish saratoga}  \\
\textit{arfir} ay.  \\
\textit{hold-RPAST I}  \\
'I caught some fish; I caught bream, catfish and saratoga.'

Another typical instance of classifier deletion is (6.36) (derived in examples [6.49] to [6.53]).
(6.36) in pigipig anbamaŋød ewal ay, pigipig udal meat pig bank-on see-RPAST I pig dog-AG arinamiy.
killed
'I saw a pig on the bank, one that the dogs had killed.'

These cases are accounted for in the successful formulation of the PRONOMINALIZATION and PRONOUN DELETION rules of Chapter VIII.

Noun Classifiers in Review

It is fair to ask whether the proposal offered above for Oykangand classifiers is relevant outside the language, and whether it constitutes any theoretical advance on the work done to date. The features which select the classifiers are obviously the crux of the analysis. Various examples in the foregoing section indicate that these features are not solely semantic in origin, but can be formal, without semantic basis. In other words, there appears to be little or no progress beyond Worsely's question 'Formal or Semantic?'. Worsely 1954:287 concludes his discussion,

The difficulties and limitations of any scheme of classification of the many aspects of life are thus partly overcome by using formal criteria; it is not suggested, therefore, that formal criteria have no significance whatsoever. On the other hand, dismissal of all correlation between classes and ideas is plainly erroneous.

The transformational view of the lexicon, especially as conceived by G. Lakoff 1965, permits an advance to be made on a
mere notational variation of the problem. If the formal features $[IN]$, $[EGN]$ etc. are derived in the lexicon from semantic features, then the basis of noun class membership is semantic, as indeed Dixon maintains for Djirbal. Oykangand oRe, already mentioned, would have the formal feature $[UK]$ as a part of the lexical entry for the word, since a 'bag, sugar-bag, chaff-bag' is not a tree, and is hence unable to derive $[UK]$ from semantic considerations as for example atulwaNd, 'Leichhardt (tree)' does. Similarly the unexpected selection of the classifier in 'meat' by odNd 'lightning' must be accounted for by a formal feature associated with that word in the lexicon.

There is no doubt that the use of a certain classifier with any noun in the language alludes to or illustrates the speaker's beliefs about that noun. Dixon 1968:120-2 gives an excellent account of the beliefs of Djirbal speakers in this connection insofar as these affect the noun class of the words for 'willy wagtail (a bird species)', 'sun', and 'moon'. He nevertheless fails to realize that these factors are not truly semantic; they cannot be accounted for in any universal theory of semantics, but only by reference to the cultural values recognized by the Djirbal speaker.

Dixon's 'conflation' of noun classes (as described by Worsely 1954, and Capell 1956) is simply due to two or more sets of features being relevant to classifier selection. In the case
of Enindiljavaugwa there appear to be three relevant parameters: gender, number, and genus. Similarly, the point(s) at which the [+pro] copy of the noun is inserted in the sentence is a language-specific phenomenon. The phonological rules of the language then determine whether the classifiers are morphologically compounded with other words, or retained as independent entities.

It is claimed for the proposal offered above that it accounts for the data of Oykangand, and for that reported of other Australian languages, in a natural way. It is to be regretted that after Dixon had come so close to this position in his 'Noun classes' ('Noun classes are recognized as a syntactic phenomenon;..' [1968:116]) he apparently abrogated it in 1970 (cf. the earlier quotation).

FOOTNOTES

1The traditional definition runs like this: 'A noun is the name of a person, place or thing'.

2Oates 1964 mentioned later in this chapter, offers a typical case of this type of analysis.

3I am using the virgule / at the beginning and end of these forms to indicate that phonological realization rules have operated on the underlying phonological forms.
It is tempting to relate Oates' gun- 'earth neuter' prefix to Capell's 1956 *gunaŋ 'excrement' or Hale's 1964 *kuna 'excrement'.

It is abundantly evident from work on Enindiljaugwa by Capell 1942 and Worsely 1954 that the features on nouns which affect syntactic processes within the sentence are indeed complex, and that these processes themselves are not always simple. The claim made here nevertheless appears to be borne out by the data and analysis that Worsely and Capell make available, and also by the details of Kirton's 1969 analysis of the incredibly complex Yanyula.

Two informants independently volunteered that to eat either ego oygorgon or uk oygorgorgan would 'really make you sick up'. oyngk occurs in Wik-Munkan with the meaning 'vomit' and it seems not unlikely that the Oykangand noun is historically related to the Wik-Munkan one.
Chapter VIII
PRONOMINALIZATION

Introduction

Pronominalization is another of those topics that transformational grammarians have dwelt upon. Vanek 1969:533 writes: 'In the course of the last twelve years a great deal of effort has been expended on the analysis of such syntactic problems as pronominalization, relativization, and extraposition.' Pronominalization has been issued with rules (Lees and Klima 1963), chained to 'command' (Langacker 1969), declared cyclic (Ross 1967c) pronounced non-cyclic (G. Lakoff 1968a), and even re-visited (Vanek 1969). Another important contribution to pronominalization theory is Postal's On so-called "pronouns" in English (1966). Postal claims that English pronouns are actually determiners. He does this by rejecting the more orthodox view that pronouns are nouns, but without adequately establishing that determiners are not nouns. Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968 take the position that pronouns are deep structure nouns, but surface determiners, following Postal's analysis fairly closely.

Oykangand—the prime target of this study—has a noun classifier system that could be regarded as either pronominal or determinant in function, but the classifiers are nevertheless [+pro] nouns, as established in Chapter VII. The classifiers can be introduced
by a pro-copy rule in the same manner as pronouns, and can also function as pronoun/determiners. Note the following:

(8.1) in erñd, ewal il udnudnam,
      meat crocodile see-RPAST he INT-lie-PPAST
      uk ermber. arix il ijun, ilimb
      [tree log-under] hit-RPAST he him then
      arix uw il ijun. alkar il agun,
      hit-RPAST again he him call-RPAST he me
      "awey! in aog arix."
      hither meat [here] kill-RPAST
      'He saw a crocodile lying under a log. He shot it, then shot it again, and called out to me,
      "Come on! (I) killed it/the crocodile here."

The English gloss of (8.1) stands as no literary masterpiece, but it reflects the Oykangand rather well. The second occurrence of in can equally well be rendered by pronominal it, or the Determiner + N the crocodile. (8.1) has its parallel in (8.2), a sentence from Lauri Karttunnen's 1969 Pronouns and variables where the first pronoun it could equally well be the/his cookie.

(8.2) I am going to give each of you a cookie. If someone doesn't want to eat it now, he can save it for later.1

The difference between English the and Oykangand in lies in the
cooccurrence of the noun ernd 'crocodile' (in [8.1]). Oykangand permits cooccurrence; English requires it. urb would have been quite appropriate in the second conjoined sentence of (8.3), but it does not appear there. It does appear in (8.4).

(8.3) uy urb alkand idur ay, uy amay fish barra. [spear-INST] spear-RPAST I fish big idgan idur ay.
really spear-RPAST I 'I speared a barramundi, a really big one.'

(8.4) alkar ul iqun, "uy urb aqg ey!
shout-RPAST they-2 him fish barra. here uy urbay inaq ayin ambey?" il
[fish barra.-PRP] you QUEST want-RPRES he alkar, "iyaq! uy urb aqun uw!" shout-RPAST yes fish barra. me give-IIMP 'They shouted to him, 'There's a barramundi here! Do you want it?" He shouted, "Yes! Give it to me!"

It is not necessary, of course, for the noun classifiers to always refer to a preceding NP. The speaker can elect to ignore what species of fish it was that 'uncle' caught (8.5), since the classifiers are themselves independent nouns (Chapter VII).
To account for the 'pronominal' character of *in* (8.1), *uy* (8.3), and other classifiers, it is proposed that the pronominalized NP be Chomsky-adjoined to a [+pro] copy from which the classifier is derived. The original, [-pro] NP is then deleted. The rules involved are discussed later in this chapter.

As with all pronouns, the classifiers in pronominal function replace an entire NP, not merely another N. An NP with the feature [+pro] can only introduce lexical items also marked [+pro]; in this instance, the classifiers.

*amb*

Oykangand *amb* (for convenience labelled 'prereferential' [PR]) has the function of a definite determiner, but resembles a pronoun in that its form, *amb*, *ambiy* or *ambay*, is dependent on the surface relationship of constituents (see next section). Note the following example (from Chapter VI).

(6.56) **in** pigipig uūdinay arinam, edndelay
meat pig [yesterday]. kill-PPAST completely
*amb* idar arŋ anguñang edn.
PR eat-PPAST [child young-AG] they
'The young children ate up the pig killed yesterday.'
amb appears in the matrix S in place of the relativized in pigipig.

Langacker 1969 suggests that constraints on English pronominalization can be explained by reference to two 'primacy' relations that can exist between coreferential NPs. At least one of these primacy relations must hold between an NP and its pronominal equivalent if the pronominalization rule is to produce a grammatical result. These primacy relations are that NP\textsuperscript{a} must either precede or command NP\textsuperscript{b} if NP\textsuperscript{b} is pronominalized. In some instances, both primacy relations hold. (For the details of the notion 'command' and a thoroughly readable and well illustrated account of its application to pronominalization see Langacker [supra].) In (6.56), in pigipig precedes amb. (8.8) is a case where in pigipig both precedes and commands amb.

(8.8)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{aróg angùñand edndelay in pigipig idar edn} \\
\text{uññinay amb arinam}
\end{array}
\]

'The children ate up the pig (which something/someone) killed yesterday.'

The remaining possibilities, where amb precedes in pigipig, are really answers to a question rather than independent statements. The question (8.4) could elicit (8.8) or (8.9) as possible answers:
Sentence (8.9) was one which native speakers insisted must be preceded by a question such as (8.7); it was ungrammatical in isolation. The in of the question (8.7) is the 'antecedent' NP of amb in example (8.9), as shown below.
Sentence (8.8) in which \textit{amb} precedes but does not command \textit{in pigipig} was more easily accepted in isolation, although this was an academic exercise that the informants--always very practical--were not always too willing to perform. Certainly (8.8) comprises a grammatical answer to the question (8.7), and preposing (8.7) always dispelled any uncertainty.

Langacker discusses similar sentences in English (1969:169) in his examples (63) and (66).

(63) The woman who rejected \textit{him} is hated by Peter.

(66) The woman who rejected \textit{him} hates Peter.

He further suggests that his examples (61) and (62) are, according to 'a certain intuitive sense', 'more natural' or "unmarked" members of the paradigm.

(61) Peter hates the woman who rejected \textit{him}.

(62) The woman who rejected Peter is hated by \textit{him}.

The same judgments are implied by native speakers of Oykangand, who reject (8.9) without the antecedent question (8.7), and who react uncomfortably to (8.8). (8.9) could be characterized as 'unnatural', and (8.8) as 'less natural', when compared to the 'natural' (6.56) or (8.6).
Langacker offers a principled account for these judgments in his notion of 'primary relations'. Oykangand bears out the evidence of English and French (Langacker 1969:186) that 'precedes' and 'commands' are valid concepts within the sentence. Since (8.8) and (8.9) are acceptable in other contexts, the notion 'precedes' will be called on again.

**amb and Independent Sentences**

*ambiy*, the 'subject' form of *amb*, is frequently used to identify the participants involved in a narrative account or personal anecdote. The following example is taken from the end of a brief personal anecdote where the speaker, the persons mentioned as 'we', and 'the children' have already been introduced to the hearer. *ambiy* identifies these and signifies that they are not new actors or participants in the plot, but the same ones again. One would scarcely imagine that the narrator's 'I' would require this identification, yet it is consistently supplied.

(8.12)

(1) uy urb onder uw idur ay. (2) elken ambar

fish barra. more again spear-RPAST I bring back-RPAST

edn arog anguñan aqun edn, uggir ambiy. (3) edn ogog

they child young me they leave-RPAST PR they [first]
'(1) I speared another barramundi. (2) The children brought it back for me, and left it. (3) They went back west to Shalfo first, to (4) the place where we were camped. (6) I came behind, and returned that way. (6) The children came home first. (7) I was tired, and lagged behind--came back and lay down.'

Note that *ambiyo* occurs each time the 'actor' changes. For example, the children are re-introduced in sentence (2) with *ambiyo*, and in sentence (5) the speaker re-introduces himself the same way. Only in sentence (6)—a recapitulation of sentence (3)—does a new 'actor' appear briefly without *ambiyo*. Sentence (7) re-introduces the speaker, and again *ambiyo* appears.
amb and related forms occur frequently in the answers to questions.

(8.13) Q: in pigipig ayin idar edn edndelay?

meat pig QUEST eat-RPAST they completely

'Did they eat up all the pig?'

A1: iyaq, edndelay ambiy idar.
yes completely PR eat-RPAST

'Yes, they ate it all.'

or A2: aphaeq amb armen ambar edn.

NEG PR finish cause-RPAST they

'No, they didn't finish it up.'

(8.14) Q: lelaqan ayin ergen inaq?

[y.sister-DAT] QUEST speak-RCUST you

'Were you speaking to your younger sister?'

A: iyaq, ergen ambay ay.
yes speak-RCUST PR I

'Yes, I was speaking to her.'

ambay is the PR form of the Dative case. No PR could be elicited for the Causal or Instrumentive cases.
Q: udayal ukel uwal inaŋ lalanān
QUEST
'You gave uncle the bullets because of the dogs, did you?'

A: iyaŋ, ukel ambay uwal ay.
yes bullet PR give-RPAST I
'Yes, I gave him some bullets.'

amb is the prereferential form of the Locative (L) case, not ambiy, which is reserved for surface subjects. Note the following:

adnidu Ray adel alin. ikōd amb
[(place-name) L] come-RPAST we-2-ex [there] L PR
udnal alin.
camp-RPAST we-2-ex
'We came to AdniduRagh and camped there.'

amb, ambiy, and ambay do not occur in conjoined sentences to refer to any included NP. For example (4.29) is grammatical, but note (8.17).
(4.29) lalaŋal uy arfir il, arṯer, idar.
[uncle-AG] fish hold-RPAST he cook-RPAST eat-RPAST
'Uncle caught a fish, cooked (it) and ate (it).'

(8.17) lalaŋal uy arfir il, arṯer (*amb), idar (*amb).

(8.18) uy uwal ay lalaŋan, ilimb abm
fish give-RPAST I [uncle-DAT] then [person
enongiy iy elkoy (*ambay) uwal (inun).
other-AG] meat turtle PR give-RPAST him
'I gave uncle some fish, then someone else gave
him a turtle.'

Another interesting example is (8.19) where in atawang is the
object of arir, arṯer, and idar.

(8.19) lalaŋal in atawang amay arir il.
[uncle-AG] meat p.turkey big kill-RPAST he
niñaŋal arṯer (*amb) il. abm ay eray
[aunty-AG] cook-RPAST she person I some
(*amb) idar, eray ar ambel. il
eat-RPAST some waste become-RPAST he
lalaŋal eray ambiy idar awiy.
[uncle-AG] some PR eat-RPAST too
'Uncle shot a big turkey. Aunty cooked (it). I
ate some, and some went bad. And uncle ate some,
too.'
While the object (surface realization of an objective of a transitive verb) remains *in atawang* it cannot be replaced by *amb*, it is simply 'gapped' out. *amiy* reappears to assert that the 'uncle' who shot the turkey was the one who later ate some of it.

From these sentences, an interesting conclusion can be drawn: sentences which meet the structural description for the GAPPING rule are those which cannot undergo *amb* pronominalization. On the basis of mutually exclusive structural descriptions, the GAPPING rule and *amb* pronominalization cannot both apply to the same sentence.

In earlier discussions it was shown that gapping occurred beyond the domain of any one independent S node. From example (8.12) it is evident that *amb* pronominalization is a parallel case. Within the sentence, however, one rule suffices to account for *amb*, the classifiers, and gapping. Beyond the simple sentence, problems of anaphoric reference are encountered which are still the subject of lively debate. (Lakoff 1968a, b; Kartunnen 1968, 1969.)

The rule which is proposed to account for these facts is as follows.

PRONOMINALIZATION (preliminary formulation)

\[(8.20) \quad W \quad NP_1 \quad Y \quad NP_1 \quad Z \]

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \quad 2 & \quad 3 & \quad 4 & \quad 5 \\
\end{align*}
\]
(1) GAPPING:

\[ \text{OPT} \Rightarrow 1 \; 2 \; 3 \; \emptyset \; 5 \]

Condition: 2 and 4 are in conjoined Ss.

(2) CLASSIFIER/amb PRONOMINALIZATION:

\[ \text{OPT} \Rightarrow 1 \; 2 \; 3 \; 4\#4[+\text{pro}] \; 5 \]

Conditions:

(i) One or more primacy relation holds between an NP and its [+pro] copy.

(ii) Classifier insertion depends on the unchanged NP containing [+pro].

(iii) amb insertion only if 2 and 4 are not in conjoined sentences.

An NP deletion rule is obligatory if a classifier is inserted, optional if amb is selected. This rule prevents *pigipig in but allows (pigipig) amb.

CO-NP DELETION

\( (8.21) \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{NP:}[+\text{pro}] \quad \text{K} \)

\[ 1 \; 2 \; 3 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{OBL only if } 1 = [+\text{CL}] \]

\[ \emptyset \; 2 \; \emptyset \]

Condition: 1 and 2 are coreferential.

Sentence (6.56) can thus appear with three possible surface representations, depending on the options available in rules (8.20) and (8.21).
These possibilities are represented in the scheme below:

amb can therefore be categorized \([+N, +pro]\) in the same manner as the classifiers. It is prevented from appearing as a classifier by the requirement that it occur only following the pronominalized NP \([-pro]\)NP.

**Personal Pronouns**

In the introduction to Section III of their Modern studies in English, the editors Reibel and Schane write: 'Pronominalization is the process that replaces one or more coreferential noun phrases
in the deep structure of a sentence with the corresponding personal pronouns in the surface structure' (1969:143). From the foregoing sections it is evident that their remarks on English pronominalization are inadequate for Oykangand, as pronominalization embraces more than 'personal pronouns'. Nevertheless, it is to personal pronouns that this section will turn.

Oykangand has no bound pronominal forms; all the personal and other pronouns are independent words. Tables 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3 outline these. Capell 1967 somewhat oddly calls such languages 'non-pronominalised' and notes that 'some areas of North Queensland, as far as the information to hand allows an assessment, also appear to belong to this group...' (26). The matter can now be placed beyond doubt: Oykangand, and to the writer's knowledge, also Olgo1, Koko-Bera, Yir-Yoront and Bakanha belong to Capell's 'non-pronominalised' group.

Capell also notes that 'In the Cape York languages a dual has never developed apart from the first person, except in Mungkan' (1956:15). As can be seen from the tables relevant to this chapter, the record needs to be set straight: Oykangand and the other Cape York Peninsular languages just listed have a full set of dual pronouns.

Pronominalization is not only the replacement of a noun phrase, as suggested by Reibel and Schane, but the complementation of a noun phrase also. In the following example (from Chapter IV)
ul 'they-2' occurs twice: once as the complement of lalaŋal, niñaŋal, and the second time following the verb idam. (4.15) lalaŋal niñaŋal ul uy idam ul.

[uncle-AG] [aunty-AG] they-2 fish eat-RCUST they-2

'Uncle and aunty were eating fish.'

This suggests the mechanism of pronominalization. A rule reads the features of the subject NP (or NPs) and inserts [+pro] copy. This pro-copy (pronoun) is itself copied and inserted subsequent to the verb. The original pro-copy, the second pro-copy, or both can further be deleted as required. The sentences of example (8.12) above exemplify all four possibilities: both pronouns retained, only the original pro-copy retained, only the subsequent pro-copy retained, and finally neither pro-copies retained in the sentence. The deletion of one or other of the pro-copies—or of both—is effected by optional rules.

Not only the pronouns, but the deep structure [-pro] NPs are the subject of deletion. English sentences of the form

Uncle he speared a wallaby.

would be ungrammatical for an overwhelming majority of English speakers, but Oykangand bi-linguals reproduce this pattern quite frequently. The deletion of the [-pro] 'original' NP is optional in Oykangand (and in Czeck, according to Vanek 1969) but obligatory in English. Again, the text example (8.12) provides instances of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+I</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>aliy</td>
<td>ambul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-II,-III</td>
<td>+II</td>
<td>+II, +III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aliŋ</td>
<td>agdan</td>
<td>+III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person</td>
<td>inaŋ</td>
<td>ubal</td>
<td>ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person</td>
<td>il</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>edn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1

Table of Subject Pronouns in Oykangand
both NP deletion and NP retention, depending on the operation of the (optional) rule (8.21). To take as an example the last sentence of (8.12), it is assumed that *udnal ambiya* has the deep structure of (8.24).

(8.24)

After SUBJECT CHOICE and the incorporation of M, the structure is as follows:

(8.25)
The concern of this section of the grammar is to show the derivation of (8.26) from (8.25).

From (8.26) udnal ambiy av is produced by the Scrambling Rules (Chapter XII).

Note that the 'subject' is structurally defined as that case immediately dominated by S. The remaining primary cases and V are dominated by P, which parallels closely the VP category of more orthodox Chomskian grammars to about 1968. (See Chomsky 1957, 1965, 1968.) The feature assignment rules of Goldin 1968 are therefore not necessary to Oykangand grammar. The subject needs no further definition.

The Dative, which can appear on the surface as subject, genitive or dative is the case with the most varied surface structure potential. Even so, the Dative subject is defined as D,S, the Dative as dative by D,P and--but for some problem areas--as the genitive by G,NP,X.
These surface relationships determine the form of both personal pronouns and of the amb pronouns. Subject pronouns (personal and ambiy) depend on the structure X,S and so also does K in the Reflection Rule of Chapter VI—(6.46). Dative, Location 'to', and Objective pronouns fall together, and ambay reflects these cases also. The genitive pronouns are different again, as are the committatives.

To accommodate the personal pronouns, Rule (8.20) is expanded to that of (8.27).

PRONOMINALIZATION

(8.27) Z  NP  W

1  2  3  =>  OBL

(1) GAPPING

Conditions:

Z contains NP = 2 (i.e. an NP which is coreferential).

Coreferential NPs are in conjoined Ss.

OPT => 1  φ  3

(2) CLASSIFIER/amb PRONOMINALIZATION

(i) W or Z contains NP = 2.

(ii) Classifier: coreferential NP contains [ N,[+CL]].

(iii) amb: one or more primacy relation is held by the coreferential NP over 2, and 2 and 4 are not in conjoined sentences.

OPT => 1  2 ≠ 2:[+pro]  3
(3) PERSONAL PRONOMINALIZATION

OBL => 1  2 # 2:[+pro,+pers] 3

The rule is capable of multiple application within the sentence, as evidenced by

(1) the possibility of more than one NP being 'gapped out';

(2) the appearance of more than one personal pronoun in any S.

Note that personal pronouns are distinguished from other pronouns by the [+pers] feature.

After repeated application (but see next section), Rule (8.27) produces the structure (8.28) from (8.25).

(8.28)

Since the two [+pro] copies of abm share its features, (see Vanek 1969 for discussion of this) the sequence
is not derived; and since *abm is dominated by 0,S, and not D or PRP,
is not derived.

At several points where the insertion of various sentence elements is effected, as well as at the point(s) of lexical insertion, Chomsky's concept of 'distinctness' is a valuable one.

If $Q$ is a complex symbol of a preterminal string and $(D, C)$ is a lexical entry, where $C$ is not distinct from $Q$, then $Q$ can be replaced by $D$ (1965:84).

The next step in the derivation of (8.26) is effected by a copying rule, (8.29).

**PERSONAL PRONOUN COPYING**

(8.29) $NP: [+pro, +pers]$ $Y$ $V$ $Z$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>=&gt; OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or, optionally, if 1 is NP,X,S, and Z = $\emptyset$

(II) 1 2 3 4 1
This rule copies subject pronouns to a position subsequent to the verb, and transports other pronouns to a position following the subject pronoun or verb. It correctly accounts for the ungrammaticality of the following, where 'him' should not be copied, but transported (i.e. copied and deleted).

(8.30) *udal ɨunj aɾar il ɨunj.

[dog-AG] him bite-RPAST it him

'A dog bit him.'

In example (8.12) the conjoined sentence

uwand əlk ɤrkiy.

west return-RPRES homeward

appears. The subject pronouns and subject NP have all been deleted. This is not an infrequent occurrence in narratives, and the deletion is not limited to subject constituents. From example (8.31) the object NP and its pronoun are also missing.

(8.31) anay əriɣ.

finish hit-RPAST

'(I tried again to hit it for keeps.)'

Some speakers delete the pronouns subsequent to the verb more frequently than the pronouns associated with the respective NP. Other speakers prefer to effect deletions more frequently when the pronoun follows the NP. Beside this idiosyncratic preference, the deletion
is stylistically controlled. The deletion rule is simple to state; like most other pronominalization rules it applies as frequently as required within any \( S \).

**PERSONAL PRONOUN DELETION**

\[
(8.32) \quad Y \quad \text{NP: [+pro, +pers]} \quad Z
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \quad 2 & \quad 3 & \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{OPT} \\
1 & \quad \emptyset & \quad 3
\end{align*}
\]

The rules which derive \((8.26)\) from \((8.25)\) have now been accounted for, and it is possible to trace the derivation of this sentence.

\[
(8.25) \quad \text{abm} \quad \emptyset \quad \text{udna-} \quad 1
\]

Rule \((8.27)\)

\[
\text{Rule (8.27) abm ay} \quad \emptyset \quad \text{udna-} \quad 1
\]

\[
\text{Rule (8.27) abm ay ambiy} \quad \emptyset \quad \text{udna-} \quad 1
\]

\[
\text{Rule (8.21) ay ambiy} \quad \text{udna-} \quad 1
\]

\[
\text{Rule (8.29) ay ambiy} \quad \text{udna-} \quad 1 \quad \text{ay}
\]

\[
\text{Rule (8.32) ambiy} \quad \text{udna-} \quad 1 \quad \text{ay} = (8.26)
\]

The rules as stated may not necessarily apply in that order (in fact, there is some evidence to the contrary) but the desired derivation is obtained in a way which accounts for other sentences and marks deviant those sentences that violate the rules.

It is possible to have \(\text{iqun}\) occur twice in a sentence; once as the dative pronoun, and once as the object pronoun.
Table 8.2

Table of Object and Dative Pronouns
in Oykangand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td>+I: аqun</td>
<td>+II: алишан</td>
<td>+II, +III: амбинан</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-II,-III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person</td>
<td>+II: инун</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person</td>
<td>+III: илун</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some speakers prefer ubалан.

The Comitative Pronouns are formed by the addition of the suffix -dar to the above stems, the final n of which becomes ̃. Locative 'to' and 'from' Pronouns have the same form, but are followed by the optional undama and undaman respectively.
The usual order of occurrence of pronouns following the verb is Subject, Object.

Some speakers insist on this word order, and rarely delete the pronouns subsequent to the verb. In their speech, the pronouns are perhaps on the way to becoming bound forms affixed to the verb in the above order. This change has not yet occurred, of course, but the order of elements in example (8.34) tends to be rigidly adhered to by the argonaand families. Before the incorporation of subject and object pronouns could be regarded as complete, the deletion of the forms in question must be no longer permitted by rule (8.32) and the grammar must re-assign stress and word boundaries.

So fixed is this order for some speakers that the first pronoun in the sequence is regarded as the nominative, despite its form. In a long (and exciting) narrative the narrator switched from
Table 8.3

Table of Genitive Pronouns
in Oykangand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+I</td>
<td>agen</td>
<td>aliŋ</td>
<td>ambuŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-II,-III</td>
<td>+II</td>
<td>+II,+III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alinaŋ</td>
<td>aŋdaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+III</td>
<td>+III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+II</td>
<td>inin</td>
<td>ubaŋa</td>
<td>uraŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+III</td>
<td>iŋin</td>
<td>ulaŋ</td>
<td>ednaŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSome speakers prefer ubaŋa.*
edn ulağan
they them-2 (as in [8.34])
ton the incongruous (so far as the narrative was concerned)
ednağan ul
them they-2

This change was maintained for several sentences. It apparently
did not disturb the hearers. Pressed about the incongruity of
this change my informant nonchalantly admitted that 'she (the
narrator) meant edn ulağan all right!'

The Pronominal Cycle

The genitive pronouns (see Table 8.3) can appear after
the verb in transitive sentences where the genitive is part of
the object, as in (8.35).

(8.35) ud arîr il âden.
dog kill-RPAST he my
'He killed my dog.'

This constitutes a fully grammatical paraphrase of (8.36).

(8.36) ud âden arîr il înun.
dog my kill-RPAST he him
'He killed my dog.'

As a result of this evidence, it has been found necessary to
recognize a Pronominal sub-cycle within the cyclic sentence
transformation.\textsuperscript{2} The sequence of operations appears to be as follows (within the matrix $S$):

\begin{align*}
\text{abm} & \quad \text{ud} \quad \text{a\textsuperscript{den}} \quad \text{arir} \\
\text{Rule (8.27)} & \quad \text{abm} \quad \text{il} \quad \text{ud} \quad \text{a\textsuperscript{den}} \quad \text{arir} \\
\text{Rule (8.29)} & \quad \text{abm} \quad \text{ud} \quad \text{a\textsuperscript{den}} \quad \text{arir} \quad \text{il} \\
\text{Rule (8.21)} & \quad \text{ud} \quad \text{a\textsuperscript{den}} \quad \text{arir} \quad \text{il} \\
\text{Rule (8.27)} & \quad \text{ud} \quad \text{a\textsuperscript{den}} \quad \text{i\textsuperscript{num}} \quad \text{arir} \quad \text{il} \\
\text{Rule (8.29)} & \quad \text{ud} \quad \text{a\textsuperscript{den}} \quad \text{arir} \quad \text{il} \quad \text{i\textsuperscript{num}} = (8.36) \\
\text{Rule (8.32)} & \quad \text{ud} \quad \text{a\textsuperscript{den}} \quad \text{arir} \quad \text{il} \\
\text{Rule (8.29)} & \quad \text{ud} \quad \text{arir} \quad \text{il} \quad \text{a\textsuperscript{den}} = (8.35)
\end{align*}

Note that each of the last four rules of the proposed cycle apply to the object of $\text{arir}$, and that Rule (8.29) applies twice. As a result, it is not possible to constrain the pronominal rule to one cyclic application per case constituent. In the next section a further instance of this will be given.

The recognition of a pronominal sub-cycle does away with the vague 'multiple application' of pronominal rules that is the inevitable alternative. If the cycle is constrained to operate from the first, i.e. leftmost NP, then the subject pronoun will be the first to be inserted, and subsequently copied to the right of the verb. The object pronoun will follow it, and be inserted correctly after the subject pronoun. The order of pronouns exemplified by (8.34) will thus be assured.
Reciprocal and Reflexive

The classic work on pronominalization is Lees and Klima 1963 which is the only treatment known to the writer in which both reciprocal and reflexive pronouns are treated. The passing of time has brought substantial changes to the theory upon which Lees and Klima based their article, and for various reasons their proposals are inapplicable here.

Reciprocal and reflexive pronominalization has since fallen on hard times, although the reflexive is still discussed in various articles and appealed to as a syntactic argument. The reciprocal has been almost entirely neglected, Franz's treatment (1968) being a rare exception.

The difference between the two is representable by the following:

(8.37) (a) Reflexive

\[(X \ \text{ V'ed }\ X) \ \text{for each of } \ Y\]

\[= \ Y \ \text{ V'ed } \ Y\text{-self}\]

\text{e.g. Molly hit herself.}

(b) Reciprocal

\[(X \ \text{ V'ed } \ (Y\text{-1}) \ \text{for each of } \ Y)\]

\[= \ Y \ \text{ V'ed } \ \text{one-another}\]

\text{e.g. The children hit one another.}

where \( X \) is singular.

This difference suggests a method for treating the two. The reflexive will be accounted for in a manner similar to that
proposed for English. Where two coreferential NPs occur within one S, the second is replaced by the feature [+reflex] and a verb with the same feature is inserted.

REFLEXIVE/RECIPROCAL RULE

(8.38) NP Y NP Z V

1 2 3 4 5 => OBL

where 1 = 3

(i) 1 2 3:[+reflex] 4 5+5 [+reflex].

or

(ii) 1 2 4 5+5 [+reflex]

if 3 = [+sing].

The [+reflex] NP is abmban, the [+reflex] verb is erbe-2 in the following example.

(8.39) iyarwiyan erbe1 i1.

r-repair RECIP-RPAST he

'He prepared himself.'

Option (ii) has been taken in example (8.39), and the subject NP is reflected only by i1. This example relates to (8.37a) where X = Y, i.e. both are [+III,+singular]. The correctness of the above proposal is indicated by (8.40) where abmban represents the replaced NP and has the dative postposition.
(8.40) abm inaŋ abmbany erẹŋ erẹŋ
  person you REFLEX-DAT speak RECIP-RCUST
  'You were talking to yourself.'

(8.41) elaŋar adẹn atind idun erbel
  y.sister my [yamstick-INST] spear RECIP-RPAST
  abmban il.
  REFLEX she
  'My younger sister poked herself with a yamstick.'

abmban has another function in Oykangand syntax: Just as himself in English has both reflexive and emphatic functions, so abmban can also be emphatic in Oykangand.

(8.42) eti inaŋ abmban ayin agogan ambal!
  try you EMPH QUEST look cause-IIMP
  'Why don't you see if you can find it yourself?!!'

(8.43) eloR abmban il inin, Leanne.
  alone EMPH she INT-sit-RPRES
  'As for herself, Leanne is sitting all alone.'

abmban in its emphatic function is introduced by the pro-copy rule 8.27(3) as a pronoun. Nouns of which the pro-copy is made have the optional feature [EMPH] specified positively at the point of lexical insertion. abmban is therefore yet another pronoun, and has the features [+pro,+EMPH].
The occurrence of both a personal pronoun and abmban, much like the cooccurrence of a personal pronoun and amb, strengthens the argument for a pronominal sub-cycle of rules within the transformational cycle, since both may pronominalize the same deep structure NP.

The Reciprocal is more awkward, because of ambiguities that the language permits. Take for example (8.44):

(8.44) Dundas, Nita, Gracie edn elben erbe₁ edn.

they scold RECIP-RPAST them

'Dundas, Nita and Gracie were arguing with one another.'

This could express the fact that Gracie was arguing with Nita and Dundas, or that Nita and Gracie were berating Dundas and so on, or that each was scolding the remaining two. The erbe-2 RECIPROCAL constructions do not specify the details, but simply sum the participants. Of course when there are only two participants, only one reading of the erbe-2 construction is valid, as in (8.45).

(8.45) Maudie, Willie ul edədan erbe₁ ul.

they-2 copulate RECIP-RPAST they-2

'Maudie and Willie copulated together.'

The tentative suggestion here proposed is that reciprocals be derived from conjoined phrases that have their source in
conjoined sentences, so that (8.44) has its source in (8.46).

(8.46) Dundas elber ulaña₃₁, Nita elber ulaña₃₂,
     scold-RPAST them-2
     Gracie elber ulaña₃₃.

The PHRASAL CONJUNCTION rule gives

(8.47) *Dundas, Nita, Gracie edn elber ulaña₃₁(123).

ualaña₃₁(123) is somehow coreferential with edn, so that it is
deleted without replacement, and a verb with the feature [+RECIP]
is inserted. (8.44) is the result of these operations.

The sentences (8.46) and (8.47) by no means reflect the
structural descriptions of rules, or their outputs, in more than
sketchy fashion, but one fact stands out clearly; the Reciprocal
Rule is a variant of the Reflexive Rule. The modification that
must be made to (8.38) is the precise specification of the condi­
tions necessary for the application of option (ii) in the case of
the reciprocal. abmban is therefore never inserted.

The proposal stands on admittedly shaky ground. It never­
theless reflects the logical formulation of the reciprocal in
(8.37b), and also the intuitively necessary inclusion of the
reciprocal with the reflexive in the one rule. It suggests a
source for the possible ambiguity of reciprocal statements with
plural subjects (as in [8.44]) in multiple phrasal conjunction
(see the discussion with respect to [4.20] and following). Beyond
these, the proposal is groundless, but this is not to say without
merit. There is, however, counter-evidence of a rather unusual
nature.

(8.47) ergen amban erben il ebaŋar ilg ul.

'speak cause RECIP-RCUST he o.sister with they-2

'He and his older sister were talking (together).'

In (8.47) the SCRAMBLING rule (Chapter XII) has permuted the subject
NP. The deep structure of (8.47) is as follows.

(8.48)

In computing the features of the subject NP the PRONOMINALIZATION
rule has taken account of abm and inserted il at l. In its second
cycle, the rule has 'read' ilg as plus, and added the features of
ebaŋar to those of abm, inserting ul at 2. The combined features are those of the Dative abm, which is coreferential with the Objective (subject) abm + ebaŋar. The result is reciprocal, not reflexive, and unless ilg is to be regarded as a phrasal conjunctive in its function (a not unreasonable but unsubstantiated hypothesis) then (8.47) and a similar instance, (8.49), constitute counter-evidence to the proposal.

(8.49) andaŋar ilg ew-argan erbel ul.

daughter with kiss-RPRES RECIP they-2

'He and his daughter kissed each other.'

Deleted Pronouns

In certain styles of speech, notably impersonal descriptions similar to English technical articles, the occurrence of pronouns is greatly reduced. There is no passive construction in Oykangand, and instead speakers rely for this impersonal effect on a wholesale deletion of pronouns. In the following brief description of the manufacture and use of antiy ('yam-strainer bag') only one personal pronoun occurs.

(8.50)
antiy anen iyan,  igogany  igun, aR abmbiny
bag if make-RPRES [raffia-PRP] go-RPRES [like dillybag-PRP]

uw igogan afan,  orțan,  igogan ufam iyan.
again raffia get-RPRES chop-RPRES raffia strips make-RPRES
'If a yam-strainer bag is made, one goes for raffia as if for a dilly-bag. One gets raffia, chops it, and makes the strips. Then the raffia strips are rolled. When they are dry, the bag can be made. Sometimes it takes three days to make—a long time. The string is threaded to close it up. Food can be carried, sweet lily, or yams or eggs when you go hunting.'

1The someone of this example is unacceptable to me; my dialect requires the substitution of anyone.
I recognize this as a departure from the more orthodox concept of cycle in several respects, and the theoretical validity of the sub-cycle may be questionable, to say the least. It nevertheless gives an acceptable account of Oykangand pronominalization, and in view of the violently opposing counter-proposals for English pronominalization being put forward by G. Lakoff 1968a and Ross 1967c, I am convinced the claim can be profitably explored. It will no doubt be a simple matter to re-interpret the rules proposed here into any scheme of pronominalization ultimately adopted.
Chapter IX

THE MODALITY CONSTITUENT

Introduction

In his pursuit of a theory of case, Fillmore pays scant attention to the structure or internal content of the Modality constituent. But what he does say is worth quoting:

In the basic structure of sentences, then, we find what might be called the 'proposition', a tenseless set of relationships involving verbs and nouns (and embedded sentences, if there are any), separated from what might be called the 'modality' constituent. This latter will include such modalities on the sentence-as-a-whole as negation, tense, mood, and aspect. 28

The exact nature of the modality constituent may be ignored for our purposes. It is likely, however, that certain 'cases' will be directly related to the modality constituent as others are related to the proposition itself, as for example certain temporal adverbs. 29

The first base rule, then, is 28, abbreviated to 28'.

28. Sentence → Modality ¬ Proposition
28'. S → M ¬ P

There are probably good reasons for regarding negation, tense, and mood as associated directly with the sentence as a whole, and the perfect and progressive 'aspects' as features on the V. See for a statement of this position Lyons (1966, pp. 218, 223).

In my earlier paper I suggested that sentence adverbials in general are assigned to the modality constituent. I now believe that many sentence adverbs are introduced from superordinate sentences (by transformations of a type we may wish to call 'infractions'). This possibility has long been clear for unmistakable sentence adverbs like
unfortunately, but there are also quite convincing reasons for extending the infrajection interpretation to adverbs like *willingly*, *easily*, and *carefully*. (1968a:23-4)

Unlike the Proposition, which has a clearly defined structure of a more or less 'permanent' nature, the Modality consists of isolated elements which are absorbed at various places in the structure of $P$ when $M$ as a constituent is 'dissolved'. This dissolution is effected by transformations which transfer the sentence elements of $M$ to indexed positions within $P$.

These transformations are not altogether unlike Fillmore's 'infrajections', but there is a principled reason for retaining Oykangand adverbs as adverbs, and not as derived from superordinate sentences. Fillmore's English examples (fn. 29, supra) have no parallel in Oykangand. There is no regular morphological process that derives *ubuy* 'half finished', *agagwin* 'quickly' or *onder* 'more again' from any other category.

Nor do such words function as verbs independently. Note the following (9.1) where a true verb *igur* is necessary to make the sentence grammatically acceptable.

\[
\text{(9.1)} \quad \begin{array}{cc}
\text{abm} & \text{ay} \\
\{\text{ubuy}\} & \{\text{agagwin}\} \\
\{\text{onder}\} & \{\text{*igur}\}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{person I} \quad \begin{array}{cc}
\{\text{*go-RPAST}\}
\end{array}
\]
Three adverbs apply to both case constituents and verbs; two others apply only to case constituents. The remainder are inserted either prior to or subsequent to the verb. Adverbs associated with the verb add their features to the reading of the sentence as a whole. That is to say, the proposition as such is negated or otherwise modified by adverbs associated with the verb.

The constituents of the Modality are each assigned an index, which may be regarded as a (sometimes variable) specification of the frame into which the constituent may be transformationally inserted. *awiy* 'also', *en* 'might' and *idnam* 'truly, really, very' are the three adverbs which modify both case constituents or verbs. These are entered with the frame

\[
\left[ \{ X \} \ V \right]
\]

to indicate that they are inserted following any case X or verb V. *ak* 'like' and *iy* 'each, again' are inserted in connection with case constituents only. The vast majority of sentence particles introduced under the M constituent are specified either \([V \_\_]\) or \([\_\_\_V]\), or both.

Fillmore suggests that certain cases are 'directly related to the modality constituent', and gives instances of 'certain temporal adverbs' (1968a:23). A moment's thought establishes the truth of his assertion. The sentence

Uncle took my spear tomorrow.

is as anomalous in English, as is its Oykangand translation. The
past tense of take is incompatible with the Locative tomorrow. To prevent the derivation of such anomalies, Chomsky's notion of distinctness will be called upon once more at an entirely different level. By general convention, no element of the M constituent may be inserted into the P constituent if any of the features of P's constituents is distinct from that element. The feature [+past] that is inherent in the past tense could therefore never allow the past tense to be inserted into a P constituent containing tomorrow with its [-past] feature.

Similar restrictions exist within the Modality constituent itself. ay 'once before' is inherently [+past] and is semantically incompatible with future, imperative or even present aspects. Certain antonyms do not cooccur: agagwin 'quickly', eland 'slowly'. These semantic restrictions can be accounted for by requiring that the constraint on M element insertions be applied at the point of each insertion, so that if the insertion of agagwin is possible, eland will be 'blocked' because of the new feature specifications of P.

No element derived under M can occur more than once in any Oykangand sentence. The 'dubative' en 'might' has a wide privilege of occurrence, and is associated with case constituents, verbs, and even other adverbs (see under Exceptional Cases). Note (9.2a)
(9.2a) lalañal en uy afar il ongol andañan.

[uncle-AG] might fish fetch-RPAST he [here]L us

'It might be that it is uncle that has caught a

fish for us.'

and also (9.2b) and (9.2c)

(9.2b) lalañal uy en afar il ongol andañan.

(9.2c) lalañal uy afar en il ongol andañan.

and so on, where each major sentence constituent is capable of

modification by en. The dubative en can nevertheless only occur

once in any S. This general restriction on the elements of M is
descriptively superior to developing en in the base as an optional
element adjoined to each of the cases and to the verb. Such an

alternative would require unhappy ad hoc restrictions to prevent

(9.2d).

(9.2d) *lalañal en uy en afar en il ongol en andañan.en.

idnán 'truly, really, very' and awiy 'also' can cooccur with en

although they share the same privileges of occurrence and the same

restrictions as en. These are also treated further under

Exceptional Cases.¹
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(9.3)

ecl;eR amay

idnan §.!l awiy

adef)an

ambUf) an.

rain big really might also come-lFUT us-pI-in
'A really big storm could come up, too.'

Modal Adverbs (SA): General
Adverbs, together with tense markers and the reduplicative
potential of verbs are introduced by the expansion of M.

M + (SA)* (tns) (r)
Oykangand does not possess a large stock of adverbs, and many are
restricted to cooccurrence with 'true' verbs.

The semantic func-

tions of the adverbs of English are often expressed by Oykangand
verbs (9.4).

The language retains flexibility and expressiveness

by realizing the recursive power of BR 7, as in (9.5).

(9.4)

iyarwiyaniy
repairing

amb

algoa,!.
descend-RPAST

[down]L [tail-toll PR

ul.
they-2

'Carefully they went down to the tail.'

(9.5)

in.!:lay inun i:Y.

abm

person could you
SA

adndadnduR!Y.

ergel

again [INT-ear-INST] speak-RPAST
(= make understand)
SA
r

inun ay, ey?
you

I

'How can I make myself understood to you, eh?'


The examples of fourteen of the more important adverbs follow.

These illustrations have been extracted from text materials.

**ay** 'once before' \([V][V]\)

(9.6) \(\text{i} \text{u} \text{ŋgul \ am} \ \text{a} \text{wa} \text{R \ udn \ il \ og} \text{meat \ [there]} \text{PR \ [east]} \text{lie-RPRES he water} \text{ardand \ i} \text{том \ i} \text{дьмб} \text{в,} \text{i} \text{n} \text{anaman} \text{[deep-in]} \text{L} \text{[that middle]} \text{L} \text{meat \ [long ago]} \text{L} \text{ay \ i} \text{нун \ i} \text{dur} \text{ ay.} \text{The animal lay there away to the east in the middle of that deep water (where) once before long ago I speared another.'} \)

(9.7) \(\text{elke} \text{n \ u} \text{wand,} \ \text{erk \ abmb \ u} \text{ŋgul \ abm} \text{return-RCUST \ [west]} \text{L} \text{[place swamp there]} \text{L} \text{person} \text{o} \text{ŋgom \ ogog \ udnal \ ay \ ambul.} \text{[this]} \text{L} \text{[before]L lie-RPAST once we-pl-in} \text{We went back down to the swamp where once before we had camped.'} \)

**uw** 'back again, once more' \([V]/[V]\)

(9.8) \(\text{i} \text{тол} \text{y \ a} \text{нган} \text{ uw \ a} \text{Rtil \ ubal \ adniy.} \text{[there-to close]} \text{L} \text{again climb-IIMP you-2 [up]} \text{L} \text{You two go back up just there.'} \)

**uw** tends to be inserted before the verbs with imperative endings,
and subsequent to those with past endings. The position of its occurrence with other tenses appears to be entirely optional.

(9.9) il awaR iďďi çm, olon uw elken; uwand he [east] run-RCUST [hither] again return-RCUST [west] il, olon uw elken. 'He ran eastwards, and came back again; westwards, and came back again.'

In sentences without a 'true' verb, uw has the sense of 'then again'.

(6.87) Q: abm inaŋ ingoš uw? person you where then 'Where were you then?'

A: abm ay ilgay uw ay. person I together then I 'I was with someone (else) then.'

odnd 'vainly, merely pointlessly' [V]

(9.10) abm ay odnd amb igigun, andandaŋ. person I vainly PR INT-go-RPRES nephew 'I'm just walking around, nephew.'
(9.11) odnd amb udnal alin.
  merely PR lie-RPAST we-2-ex
  'We two just slept (implied: without some expected
   facility, as food, fire or shelter).'

edndelay 'completely, altogether' [__V]
(9.12) egali q analin edndelay armarmel analin.
  food ours-2-in completely INT-finish-RPAST ours
  'Our food is all quite gone.'

abmand 'still, yet' [__V]
(9.13) il oRaŋar udnap amb il; abmand amb udnap il.
  he husband lie-RCUST PR he still PR lie-RCUST he
  'Her husband lay asleep; he was still sleeping.'

anay 'couldn't, tried to...but failed' [__V]
(9.14) anay ari̇r il Ĭnun, anay ari̇r--
  couldn't hit-RPAST he him couldn't hit-RPAST
  il uŋgul ambiy adniy aRtin ambar.
  he [there PR up ]L climb-RPAST
  'He tried to hit it, tried again and failed--it
   climbed up (a tree) there.'

odndoRay 'for dead, until death' [__V]
(9.15) il uadal Ĭtom onelbmban ātar Ĭnun odndoRay.
  [he dog-AG] that neck bite-RPAST him for dead
  'That dog bit the (animal's) neck until it died.'
enoly 'once, for one time' [__V]

(9.16) iyaŋ, abm 'ongod udnanay ay enoly, ongeR
yes person [here]₁ lie-RFUT I once [tomorrow]₁
elkenay ay.
return-RFUT I
'Very well, I'll sleep here this once, but tomorrow
I'm going home.'

_on_. This particle is not directly translatable. The speaker
will insert this when discussing the activities of a 'poison'
relative to whom special respect or avoidance is due. [__V]

(9.17) ay iŋun elaRëndaray on ergel: "karey ambul!"
I [her y.sister-DAT] speak-RPAST o.k. we-pl-in
'I said to my younger sister: "Let's go!"'

etŋ 'try out' [__(ak) V]

(9.18) in 'ongom aRtiŋan en, il in 'ongod,
meat [this]₁ climb-IFUT might he sit-RPRES [here]₁
etŋ ak in aŋ.
try let sit-RPRES I
'This animal might perhaps come up—he stays here.
I'll try sitting (here).'
try axe look-for-RFUT
'I said to my husband, "Let's see if we can find the axe."'

ak 'let' [___V]. ak appears frequently with et (q.v.). It is not limited solely to occurrence with the present tense, but this combination is by far the most frequent.

(9.20) mamboŋ ak iguyen il.
little-one let go-IPAST she
'(You) could've let the little girl go.'

(9.21) ak elk il!
let return-RPRES he
'Let him go back!'

(9.22) inaŋ oŋgoŋ uw in, et ay ak elk
you [here]L again sit-RPRES try I let return-RPRES
in ewanay.
[meat see-PRP]
'You sit here again and let me try to go back and look for that (crocodile).'
ingal 'it's o.k. for...' [__V]

(9.23) ud a덴 ingal in a덴 ididan!
dog my all right meat my INT-eat-RPRES
'It's all right for my dog to be eating my meat!'

puy 'right! o.k.!' [__V]

(9.24) puy igul ur!
o.k. go-IIMP you-pl
'Right you are, go!'

karey resembles puy (above), but tends to be used more with verbs where motion is not implied.

(9.25) karey atuwil!
o.k. hold-IIMP
'Right! You hold it!'

Both puy and karey occur most frequently with the imperative, but also occur with the present tense.

Modal Adverbs: Negatives

The most frequently used negative is anaŋıd 'not, no, nothing', but there are good reasons for the proposal that anaŋıd is a verb, and not a constituent of the Modality. In the first place, it occurs as a verb in sentences such as (9.26), and (as [9.1] established) M constituents cannot so occur.
This example can mean 'I don't like him', 'I don't want him', 'I won't have him' or the like. \textit{a\=n\=a\=n\=\=d} is shown to be a type of 'middle' verb.

Secondly, \textit{a\=n\=a\=n\=\=d} can cooccur with negative adverbs (such as \textit{aRe\=m\=a\=y} [9.27]), intensifying the negation.

A further argument in favor of this analysis is adduced from embedded sentences. The structure of (9.27) is shown in (9.28), but if the first sentence of (9.27) is embedded into the second (as in [9.29] and [9.30]) then \textit{a\=n\=a\=n\=\=d} cannot occur. Not only is \textit{a\=n\=a\=n\=\=d} introduced as the verb of a sentence, but this sentence must be the 'matrix' sentence, and not itself embedded.
One difficulty with the proposed analysis is the failure of *aŋənd* to appear with imperatives. (See Chapter XI, Introduction.)

*(9.31)*  

*aŋənd* igul!  

NEG go-IIMP

No well motivated rule accounts for this exception, and the analysis may have to call on the still relatively undeveloped theory of 'performative verbs' and 'hypersentences' for rescue. (Ross to appear; Sadock 1969a, b.)

In the earliest and perhaps still most comprehensive account of negation in English, Klima 1963 makes reference to two matters of interest at this point. The first is the concept of the 'scope' of negation. The scope of Oykangand negation is the proposition as a whole; it is not possible to negate any of the case constituents, and to negate the verb is to negate the proposition. The second is the inclusion of words like hardly, never, only, unable, doubted and failed in a discussion of negation. Klima is
able to differentiate 'adverbs of negative import' from negative not just as *anda*⁹ has been differentiated from the negative adverbs of Oykangand. It is not always so easy to draw a clear cut line between adverbs and negative adverbs; (9.5) provides a typical case.

(9.5) abm inay inun iy adndadnduy ergel

person could you again [INT-ear-INST] speak-RPAST (= make understand)

inun ay, ey?

you I

'How can I make myself understood to you, eh?'

The implication is that the speaker could not make himself understood, but *inay* is not necessarily a negative. *anay* (9.14) 'tried to...but failed, couldn't' is similar in its 'negative import'. The distinction of 'negative adverb' is therefore simply one of convenience rather than a formal one required by the grammar.

Instances of various negatives are the following.

*āR* '(habitually) do not, not (in embedded S), not possible' [__V]

(9.32) abm anenand inen aR iγur?

person what's-the-matter you not go-RPAST

'Why don't you go?'

(9.33) aR amb arir igun.

not PR hit-RPAST him

'(I) can't have hit him.'
(9.34) abm ay aR igur inun!

person I not go-RPAST you

'I didn't come for you!'

(9.35) Q: bībīn, aliy al ayin oRtay awing?

dad we-2-in wood QUEST chop-RINT [road-on]L

'Dad, can we chop some wood on the road?'

A: aŋaŋdj, aR amb oRŋaŋŋ aliy.

NEG can't PR chop-IFUT we-2-in

'No. We can't.'

(9.36) abm aR iguy ambul ondeR,

person can't go-RINT we-pl-in [tomorrow]L

ondeR ilimbam awiy.

[next day ]L also

'We can't go tomorrow or the next day.'

aRemay 'without, but not' [___V]

(9.37) abm ay aRemay igur, work amay aRtaRtinam

person I without go-RPAST big INT-work-PPAST

amp uw,

because

'I didn't want to go, because I had a big job
to do.'
This dog used to find wallabies without ever smelling them out.'

'They simply gave out the meat without ringing the bell!'  

'The old man and young woman look at one another, they should be speaking to one another.'

'I should have hit him with a big bullet (but I didn't) so he ran away still alive.'
arufaly 'not too close, not too long' [___V]
(9.42) uw ilg elar ay iqun, il arufaly
[speech with] send-RPAST I him he not long
elkel aqun.
return-RPAST me
'I sent him with a message and he was soon back again.'

intaR 'no more' [___V]
(9.43) ubal intaR uw ay arkey! armey ambiy!
you-2 no more more once fight-IIMP finish-IIMP PR
'Stop it! Don't you two fight any more again!

enenoly 'not too much' [___V]
(9.44) abm elkenay ambul, enenoly in
person return-RFUT we-pl-in not too much sit-RPRES
ambul ongoq.
we-pl-in [here]L
'Let's go home, we mustn't sit here too long.'

aR oyon 'supposed that' [___V___]
(9.45) abm aR igur oyon il.
person not go-RPAST suppose he
'I thought he had gone, (but he hadn't).'
(9.46) aR uw ermepam oyon il, abmanq amb
not again finish-PPAST suppose she still PR
ergerg il.
INT-speak-RPRES she
'I supposed she was finished but she's still talking.'

iy occurs in what might be regarded as sentences, rhetorical
questions or imperatives where a negative response is anticipated
or implied. [V___]

(9.47) Q: arin aR unqin ambar inaq?
which way not swim-RPAST you
'Why was it you didn't go swimming?'

A: abm ay arin al unqin ambayen iy?
person I which way go-RPRES swim-IPAST NEG
'How was I to go swimming? (I couldn't!)'

(9.48) agagar edn awin, abm arin
look-for-RPAST they road person which way
igur iy?
go-RPAST NEG
'They looked for the road. Which way did they go?'
(9.49) "alkiday onongab 'izom amb 'aden, shoot'em iv aril
wire spear one that PR my NEG kill-IIIMP
inun!" ungul uŋgañamiy alanday alkidayamand
PR spear-RPAST he

"That's my one and only wire spear! Shoot it!" On the
north bank uncle speared it with a wire spear.' (The
speaker is trying to persuade alanday to shoot the
crocodile instead of using—and perhaps breaking—his
only spear. iv anticipates that his persuasion was in
vain.)

Modal Adverbs: Exceptional Cases

Mention—and exemplification (in [9.3])—of the three
adverbs which associate with either X (case) or V (verb) constit-
uents has already been made. In this section, further exemplifi-
cation of these important adverbial forms will be provided,
together with examples for ar 'like, as if' and iv 'each, again'
which are the adverbs that modify case constituents.

awiy 'also, too' [ \( \{X\} \ [V] \) ]

(9.50) ilimb uy artemm andan, in elkoy awiy.
then fish cook-RCUST we-pl-ex meat turtle too
'Then we cooked the fish, and the turtle too
(we cooked).'
We came back hungry, our food completely finished, and our tobacco, too.'

'(He) speaks Oykangand, too! (not merely understands it).'

'(Our) son might be coming now from there in (his) motor car.'

'They are waiting perhaps for fish.'

'The old woman there will perhaps cry for me.'
en also occurs subsequent to other sentence adverbs.

(9.56) agagwin en adeŋan il olon.

quickly might come-1FUT he hither

'He might be coming quickly.'

Oykangand questions cannot be answered by anything with the meaning 'I don't know'. Instead, the respondent repeats the QUEST-word of the interrogator's sentence, and adds en. Presumably the response is identical with the question with en added, but anaphoric reduction leaves only QUEST + en and occasionally another category or two.

(9.57) Q: abm indolŋ igur il?

person to where go-RPAST he

QUEST

'Where did he go to?'

A: indolŋ en igur?

to where might go-RPAST

QUEST

'Where indeed?'

(9.58) Q: uy ayin arfir edn?

fish QUEST hold-RPAST they

'Did they get any fish?'

A: ayin en arfir?

QUEST might hold-RPAST

'Might they have, indeed?'
idnan 'truly, really' '{X}_{V} / \{X\}_{V}

(9.59) inanaj in idnan idnan, ay adjun idnan!
you meat truly eat-RPRES I tail eat-RPRES
'You eat the good meat, I'll have the tail!'

(9.60) lolaq elber idnan amb il injun.
'(My) older brother really scolded him.'

idnan also occurs as a noun, with the meaning 'body, flesh', and appears as idnan ar ay 'my body is tired' = 'I am tired'. Note also (9.61).

(9.61) idnan ar idnan ay.
body wasted truly I
'I am really tired.'

iy 'each, again' [X__]. The case constituent X may be represented by its pronominal copy.

(9.62) urmur ambiy, udal iy urmur adjun.
bark-RPAST PR [dog-AG] each bark-RPAST me
'They barked; each dog barked at me.'

(9.63) abm adjun aqanaj money uw inanaj iy!
person me NEG give-RPRES you again
'It's just like you again, never giving me money!'
'He never used to scold me.'

'What's that going there like a goanna?'

'What's that sitting like a big opossum?'

This appears to be a stylistic variant of

which is produced by the SCRAMBLING rule.  

as if NEG cause-RPRES I

'I'm not expecting anyone.'

'He went, not thinking anyone was there.'
Tense

Under the heading 'tense' are subsumed the morphemes suffixed to the verb and marking the time/aspect of the action or state identified by the verb. Oykangand verbs [+V,-Adj] are marked in the lexicon according to their membership in one of two classes. For convenience, verbs have been assigned a numeral, e.g. armi-1, ade-2, but more properly the distinction would be effected by a syntactic feature, say Z, such that all verbs were marked either [+Z] (for class 1) or [-Z] (for class 2).

The tenses associated with class 1 verbs contrast with those of class 2 verbs; Table 9.1 sets out the different tense forms. Class membership for verbs cannot be related to any semantic or syntactic property other than the differences in spellings.

The tense tns morpheme is transferred from the Modality constituent by a transformation which also effects a structural change; all true verbs are required to undergo this transformation.

tns MOVEMENT

(9.69) tns Y V:[-Adj] Z
   1 2 3 4  =>  OBL
   $ 2 3#3+1 4

Rule (9.69) derives the structure

(9.70)
As a result, it is possible to refer to the V constituent in SCRAMBLING rules and by reason of the 'A over A convention' not have a verb stem 'scrambled' away from its tns. 3

Adverbs can be so scrambled; the transformation which moves these from the M constituent effects no structural change in P.

SA, r MOVEMENT

(9.71) SA Y C (tns) Z

1 2 3 + 4 5 => OBL

∅ 2 3 + 4 + 1 5

∅ 2 1 + 3 + 4 5, depending on the index of SA or r

where C is the category specified by the frame of the SA or r

The remainder of this section will be devoted to a brief exemplification of tense morphemes.

Realis Present--1: -n, 2: -y. The present is frequently encountered in descriptions and in narratives where it has the force of an 'historic present'. It is also used in directions or instructions where the imperative would be too 'forceful' or impolite.
Table 9.1
Table of Oykangand Tense Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense Form</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-yb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>-nayc</td>
<td>-nayc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customary</td>
<td>-nm</td>
<td>-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>-r</td>
<td>-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>-yd</td>
<td>-yd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrealis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>-may</td>
<td>-may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>-yen</td>
<td>-yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>-l</td>
<td>-yb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>-ηan</td>
<td>-ηan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participle Forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-past</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>-am</td>
<td>-am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>-may</td>
<td>-may</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Capell notes the only grammatical fact about Oykangand that I have found in the literature on Australian languages. Referring to tense forms, Capell found '...-n as...present...in a number of the languages of Cape York Peninsula (Gundjun, Kantju, etc.)' (1956:72). The identification of Capell's Gundjun with Kunjen is made in Sommer 1969:3.

*b* and the preceding vowel are deleted from certain verbs. See Chapter III.

*c* See under Purposive, Chapter VI.

*d* For the spelling of the Realis Intentive see 'Alternation involving γ' in Sommer 1969:43.
(9.72) alk anen iyan, abmal iyan, abm spear if make-RPRES [person-AG] make-RPRES [person arkand igun il ey, alaw agogan amban. man-AG] go-RPRES he look-for-RPRES 'When someone makes a spear--a man, that is--he goes and looks about for a rod.'

(9.73) "abm agagwin igun." person quickly go-RPRES '("Let's) go quickly."'

(9.74) "arin ambey ambul?" which way become-RPRES we-pl-in '"What do we do now?"'

Realis Future--1: -nay, 2: -pay. (See note under Purposive (PRP) in Chapter VI.)

(9.75) abm awaR igunay aliy ednajan. person [east], go-RFUT we-2-in them 'We must go up to them.'

(9.76) in idanay ambul, in aqul uwanay meat eat-RFUT we-pl-in meat [who-AG] give-RFUT ambuan oon god? us [here], 'We must have some meat to eat--who here will give us meat?'
Realis Customary—l: -nm, 2: -n. This translates the English 'used to' or 'were V-ing' where it corresponds to a past continuous.

(9.77) alay awiy edndelay afanm anđan.
crab also completely get-RCUST we-pl-ex
'We were getting all the crabs (there).'

(9.78) uy elgoR ungul afanm anđan.
fish many [there]L get-RCUST we-pl-ex
'We used to get lots of fish there.'

(9.79) in pigipig udnan edn, elwan udnan ungul.
meat pig lie-RCUST they sleep lie-RCUST [there]L
'Pigs used to lie down and sleep there.'

(9.80) abm antudjil anaman igum ul.
person (mythical) [long ago]L go-RCUST they-2
'The (mythical creators) used to live long ago.'

Realis Past—l: -r, 2: -l.

(9.81) uwand igur anđan ey, og uland ey ey amban
[west]L go-RPAST we-pl-ex water flood show
alol ay ulanjan.
go-RPAST I them-2
'We went westwards; I went to show them the ocean.'
(9.82) idpan ar ambel ay.

body waste become-RPAST I

'I got tired.'

Realis Intensive--1: -ŋ, 2: -ŋ. This tense has no ready English equivalent, and translates 'should', 'would' and 'intends'. It is also used in the immediate report of some unexpected event, as in (9.83).

(9.83) iŋ almbəł ininay aliŋ!

meat opossum INT-sit-RINT ours-2-in

'There's an opossum sitting here!'

(9.84) uy ay ayin ikiy aliŋ?

fish I QUEST throw-RINT ours-2-in

'Should I fish for us?'

(9.85) abm ay ayin elkay ay?

person I QUEST enter-RINT I

'Can I come in? (I want to).'

(9.86) abmənd iguy ay.

still go-RINT I

'I'm still going.'

Irrealis Potential--1, 2: -may.

(9.87) abm ilimbəłəŋən AR ewamay edn.

person then me not see-IPOT they

'They won't see me.'
(9.88) abm ermbemay ambul!
  person fall-IPOT we-pl-in
  'We might fall!'

(9.89) ipal itom abm ambuñan ow ulfin ambamay.
  [meat-AG that] person us-pl-in nose die cause-IPOT
  = drown
  'That (crocodile) might drown us.'

Irrealis Past--1, 2: -yen.

(9.90) anen uw idayen ay? egŋ aRem ay.
  what again eat-IPAST I food without I
  'What would I have eaten? I had no food.'

(9.91) abm ay arin unŋayen iy?
  person I how dive-IPAST not
  'How could I have swum (for it),'

(9.92) egŋ uŋal idayen ay, ilimb abm amb adel,
  food now eat-IPAST I then person PR come-RPAST
  egŋ ubuy uŋgiŋ ay.
  food half-finished leave-RPAST I
  'I would have eaten my food by now, but that fellow
  came and I left my meal half finished.'

Imperative--1: -₁, 2: -y. The Imperative will come into fuller
treatment in Chapter XI.
(9.93) aR eg0gaRey 'adun!

don't laugh-IIMP me

'Don't laugh at me!'

(9.94) er igul!

away go-IIMP

'Go away!'

Irrealis Future--1, 2: -nan. This tense is more frequently used as the normal future, apparently reflecting the Oykangand philosophy that nothing is certain until it is a past fact. It is usually translated as 'might' or 'might be'.

(9.95) "in ayin alg0ay? in aRndal imday oRnd,

meat QUEST carry-RINT meat heavy could too much

alg0an nan aliy.'

carry-IFUT we-2-in

"'Can we carry this (hide)? It could be too heavy for us to carry.'"

(9.96) aŋ awaR iguman ay, adn alyaR ibmbu0an ay.

here east go-IFUT I worm dig-IFUT I

'I'll go up here and dig for some worms.'

Participle Forms

Participle forms are affixed to verbs which appear in sentences meeting the structural description of P-relative or Absolute S.
Non-past--1, 2: Ø. (Examples for the Non-past Participle form are segmented to show where the zero morpheme occurs.)

(6.40) abm elke-ŋ-Ø-iy-ar uk oRTañan aliy.  
person return-PNP-subj-subj wood chop-IFUT we-2-in  
'When we are returning, we'll chop the wood.'

(9.97) erk iŋog iŋ alŋ ama-ŋ-Ø-iy-ar uŋoɡir ay.  
[place there meat pit-roast-PNP-subj-at] leave-RPAST I  
'I left (it) at the place where I'm pit-roasting the meat.'

(For further examples see Chapter VI.)

Past--1, 2: -am.

(9.98) abm alŋgeŋ ewaŋ ay uday ididañanam.  
person y.woman see-RPAST I [dog-PRP] INT-wait-PAST  
'I saw the young woman waiting for the dog.'

(9.99) abm ay alkalkanam ebmal oRTan erbe numérique.  
person I INT-shout-RCUST foot chop RECIP-PAST-subj  
'I shouted out when I cut my foot.'

Potential--1, 2: -may.

(9.100) lalaŋ, abm unbal arinarimayiŋ, aŋōŋ egōgēl.  
uncle person drum r + hit-PPOT-subj-subj pain fall-RPAST  
'Uncle, who is (our) drummer, has fallen sick.'

The -may form has been 'frozen' in a number of phrases which
specialists' activities or unusual reputations, such as 'drummer' above. These phrases almost always contain a reduplicated verb, and frequently an object. Each can be analyzed as P-relative Ss.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{abm idaliddamayiy} & \quad (ida-1 \ 'eat') \quad \text{'maneater'} \\
\text{in ekarekamayiy} & \quad (eka-1 \ 'cut') \quad \text{'butcher'} \\
\text{egu uwaluwamayiy} & \quad (uwa-2 \ 'give') \quad \text{'storekeeper'} \\
\text{aly afalifamayiy} & \quad (afa-1 \ 'fetch') \quad \text{'hunter'} \\
\text{motor car algolalgamayiy} & \quad (alg-1 \ 'carry') \quad \text{'driver'} \\
\text{egu aRteraRtemayiy} & \quad (aRte-1 \ 'cook') \quad \text{'cook'} \\
\text{ewalewamayiy} & \quad (ewa-2 \ 'see') \quad \text{'crack shot'} \\
\text{odden afalafamayiy} & \quad (odden \ 'dance') \quad \text{'songman'} \\
\text{iyarwiymayiy} & \quad (iyarwiya-1 \ 'repair') \quad \text{'mechanic'} \\
\text{kuRa iyaliwyamayiy} & \quad (kuRa \ 'house', iy-1 \ 'make') \quad \text{'carpenter'}
\end{align*}
\]

Most of these specialist occupations or unusual abilities are not presumed to have been part of the fabric of Oykangand society before the coming of the white man. The above forms represent an unusual capitalization on the potential of their language by Oykangand speakers over the last generation or so.

In one instance a form

\[
\text{in ekarekapayiy}
\]

was used to denote 'he who was the butcher' (cf. ekarekamayiy above). The replacement of m by the Realis Past r in this instance is paralleled by

\[
\text{abm idalidanmayiy}
\]
'which used to be a man-eater' but these replacements are not productive and probably these entire phrases would have to be entered as separate entries in the lexicon.

These forms are not the only ones with -may, but contain some unusual applications of this morpheme. Note also (9.101) below.

(9.101) abm er igumayiy, kuŋaR ew inin odngel.

person away go-PPOT-subj house mouth yours shut-IIMP

'When you leave, shut the door of your house.'

FOOTNOTES

1Once again I fear the opening of a veritable Pandora's box. There is no principled restriction on the operation of 'infrajections' that limits their use to components of the M constituent. The cost of this mechanism is high, too, and includes the addition to the lexicon of (variable) indices to each element of M in the lexicon.

2More accurately, the underlying representation should be Vv, to account for the variation in the vowel, which assimilates to a following vowel in the speech of some informants.

3The 'A over A' convention has already been attacked by Ross 1967a in a convincing manner. Whatever alternative is finally proposed will have to account for the Scrambling Rules necessary to a grammar of Oykangand.
Chapter X

VERBS

Introduction

The idiosyncratic properties of the verbs of Oykangand are responsible for a great deal of its sentence structure. The case frame specification mentioned in Chapter II and again in Chapter V restricts the types of sentence into which a verb may be inserted. This feature is the most general and most powerful, but there are others. The feature [Adj] on a verb affects the syntactic arrangements in which it may appear.

In this chapter the 'true verbs' [+V, -Adj] of Oykangand are described, both formally and with respect to idiosyncratic properties that they may have. These properties may include admissibility to certain transformations and structures.

Form of Oykangand Verbs

Verbs are frequently independent words, affixed for tense according to their class membership (see Chapter IX). There are also lexical entries which cannot be analyzed so simply. These are compound verbs, consisting of some element F followed by an independent verb V. The element F may be a noun, verb, adverb or some unidentifiable formative which occurs only in compound(s). The following V element retains its phonological shape and class
membership, but is entered with F as a separate item in the lexicon because the compound FV does not have the semantic reading of the simple sum of F and V [F+V] but has some other reading--H.

The following are examples of compound verbs.

Verb + Verb

afa-1 'get', erbe-2 (RECIP); afan erbe-2 'fight'
adiya-1 'force', erbe-2 (RECIP); adiyan erbe-2 'allow another to exact punishment or revenge on oneself'

idndi-1 'run', aRti-1 'climb'; idndin aRti-1 'run away, flee in fright'

Noun + Verb

or 'cold, dew', arte-1 'cook, burn'; or arte-1 'to singe the hair or fur off a dead animal, heat a spear rod to straighten it'

adnd 'interception', abmi-1 'steal'; adnd abmi-1 'hide (it)'

uy 'fish', iki-1 'throw'; uy iki-1 'to fish with a line'

Adverb + Verb

awiy 'also', ata-1 'bite, tie up'; awiy ata-1 'to join them (in company)'

A large number of these compounds involve verbs which cooccur with words that have no independent function. These words
appear in the lexicon only as the first member of the compound, or—more rarely—in compound forms as nouns, etc.

at, ida-1 'eat'; at ida-1 'to hinder, confuse, "humbug"

ilfanay, ida-1 'eat'; ilfanay ida-1 'to smash to pieces'

idām, ari-1 'hit'; idām ari-1 'to waste, spend unnecessarily'

arçar, ambe-2 'become'; arçar ambe-2 'to die (polite term)'

ugoguR, idādji-1 'run'; ugoguR idādji-1 'to jump'

okoR (but adnokoR 'buttocks'), ambe-2 'become';

okoR ambe-2 'to sneak up on game'

Another type of [Noun + Verb] compound is that in which the noun is a body part. These occur with sufficient frequency to merit separate comment. Like the previous instances, the noun of the compound has no place in the case frame of the verb, and cannot be substituted by even the most obvious alternatives.

Body Part + Verb

el 'eye', atuwi-1 'hold'; el atuwi-1 'to keep an eye on'
eg 'head', erña-1 'scrape'; eg erña-1 'to sharpen the end'
ew 'mouth', arta-1 'hold'; ew arta-1 'to kiss'

anānal 'image, spirit', afa-1 'fetch'; anānal afa-1 'to photograph'
eg 'head', urūda- 1 'bump'; eg urūda- 1 'to batter to death'
ow 'nose', ulfi- 1 'die'; ow ulfi- 1 'drown'

In some instances the body part is in some specific case, or has some specific case postposition not usually associated with the verb.

el 'eye', arki- 1 'follow'; elend arki- 1 'to look about in various places'
adnduR 'ear', erge- 2 'speak'; adnduRiy erge- 2 (1) 'to whisper'; (2) 'to make understand'
el 'eye', amba- 1 'cause'; eley amba- 1 'to show'

Note also the following multiple compound.
el 'eye', iggi- 1 'leave', amba- 1 'cause';
el iggin amba- 1 'to leave someone to do your task'

Homophonous pairs are more frequent amongst Oykangand verbs than amongst the nouns. Note the following examples.
egga- 1 (1) 'dance'; (2) 'rain'
arūde- 1 (1) 'protect from a blow'; (2) 'fill up'
ata- 1 (1) 'bite'; (2) 'tie up'

True verbs are positively specified in P- and R-relative constructions; adjectives are not permitted to be inserted in these constructions (see Chapter VI, Adjectives). Verbs are also specified
in certain embedded S constituents when the S constituent is 'governed' by certain other verbs (see later in this chapter, ambe- 2 and amba- 1).

Auxiliaries as Main Verbs

The heading of this section was chosen as the title of a paper by Ross which was circulated widely but semi-privately prior to its publication in 1969(a). The analysis proposed by Ross will be followed in this instance, namely that auxiliaries are themselves the main verbs of superordinate sentences. Successive embedded sentences are introduced by the S constituent mentioned in Chapter V. It will become apparent that this S cannot be assigned to any case (as proposed by Fillmore) but is an independent constituent.

The 'auxiliaries', which Oykangand requires are

the negative anaŋd,

amba- 1  'cause'
ambe- 2  'become'
al- 2    'travel, move about'
igu- 1   'go, walk', etc.

The negative anaŋd has already been mentioned in Chapter IX, and its status as a verb suggested by its occurrence in sentences like (10.1).

(10.1) abm onalkalŋanday anaŋd ay ednaŋan.

[person island-from-DAT] NEG I them.
'I don't like Islanders.'
(10.1) has the typical Subject-Object/Dative order of personal pronouns following the verb, and the Objective (0) \( (abm) \textlt{sy} \) is selected as subject rather than the Dative (D) \( abm \text{ onalkal} \text{nanday} \) (see Subject Choice Rules, Chapter V). These facts argue strongly for the status of \( a\text{nandj} \) as a verb. The case frame specification of \( a\text{nandj} \) is (minimally) \( [0(D)(L)(S)] \). Negated sentences are introduced by the S constituent, and negative structures of this sort can be represented thus:

(10.2)

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (S) {S};
  \node (O) [below left of=S] {O
  \ldots
  S \text{ a}\text{nandj}};
  \draw[->] (S) -- (O);
\end{tikzpicture}
\]

(10.3) ud a\text{den} \text{olbon} \text{a}\text{nandj}.

\begin{itemize}
  \item dog my black NEG
  \item 'My dog is not black.'
\end{itemize}

(10.4) abm \textlt{ay} \text{ukir}\text{g} \text{a}\text{nandj}.

\begin{itemize}
  \item person I o.man NEG
  \item 'I'm not an old man.'
\end{itemize}

(10.3) and (10.4) illustrate the structure (10.2), the former with the verb [+V,+Adj] \text{olbon} 'black', the latter with no verb in the embedded sentence. Sentences containing a true verb [+V,-Adj] most frequently undergo the rule of NEGATIVE FLIP which interchanges the verb and \( a\text{nandj} \). NEGATIVE FLIP operates only where the verb is marked [-Adj]; its operation on sentences containing an adjective as the main verb produces ungrammatical sequences like (10.5).
(10.5) *ud aḏen ānaṇḍ ]; olbon.

Contrast this with

(10.6) ud aḏen ānaṇḍ ]; ulfîr.

dog my NEG die-RPAST

'_MY dog didn't die.'

The rule of NEGATIVE FLIP is

(10.7) V: [-Adj,-NEG] (NP: [+pers]) V: [+NEG]

1  2  3  =>  OBL

3  1  2

NEGATIVE FLIP is normally obligatory, but the speaker may choose to emphasize the negative by stressing it heavily, and by failing to observe the NEGATIVE FLIP rule. As a result, there are sentences like (10.8).

(10.8) egeo breakfast iḍař  ay ānaṇḍ]

food eat-RPAST I NEG

'I didn't have any breakfast!'

The remaining 'auxiliaries' are introduced in the same position as is ānaṇḍ in the structure (10.2). Because the discussion of these is somewhat protracted, each is treated in a separate section to follow.
The verb *amba*-1 is made frequent use of by speakers of Oykangand. It appears both independently and as the main verb of sentences into which other sentences are embedded. It is uncertain just exactly how many entries with the phonological shape *amba*-1 must be included in the lexicon. The writer, as a non-native speaker, but possessing a fair competence in the language, proposes only one entry; but it may turn out to be necessary to admit more. As an independent verb, *amba*-1 requires a number of English glosses.

(10.9) abm inan adun ungula y ambann inan, ey?

person you me [there-DAT] RCUST you

'You are talking to me about that tree, are you?'

(10.11) abm ang anen a amban adun?

person [here]L [what-AG] RPRES me

'What happened to me?'

(10.12) edeR ang arin amban?

rain [here]L which way RPRES

'What happened to the rain?'

(10.13) ebmaR aR in oyboy ambann, idur ay.

a.bed like meat wallaby RCUST spear-RPAST I

'I speared an ant bed that looked like a wallaby.'
(10.14) əŋ en ewal ay? ar inaq amban, abm ɨɗan
who might see-RPAST I like you person truly
onoŋ il.
another he
'Who was it I saw? He was really someone else causing
himself to appear like you.'

(10.15) uw anaŋd ambanm il.
speech NEG -RCUST she
'She made no noise.'

(10.16) "Kow!" ambar il.
-RPAST he
'He made a "Kow!" sound.'

The basic meaning of amba-1 appears to be 'cause, initiate, be responsible for', and the instances of this verb in (10.9) to (10.16) above are relatable to this meaning. By far the most frequent use of amba-1 is made in compound, rather than independent sentences, where amba-1 serves as an 'auxiliary' to adjectives, transitive, intransitive and middle verbs.

(10.17) kotakot əŋŋ'angoŋand iyalmen ambanm aliŋ.
axe [child young-AG] play -RCUST ours-2-in
'The children were playing with our axe.'

Although iyalme-2 'play' is intransitive, and selects an animate Objective case as the subject of the sentence, əŋŋ'angoŋand
appears with the Agentive case postposition. This fact is accounted for by positing the deep structure (10.18).

(10.18)

(10.17) is derived from (10.18) by EQUI-NP DELETION and tns MOVEMENT. The former rule deletes the second occurrence of arʊŋ aŋgʊŋan (in the lower S). iyalme- 2 has the class 2 'empty' morph described in Chapter III. The rules necessary to the syntax of amba- 1 and sentences embedded 'under' it are those already found to be necessary to the grammar, and hence require no additional complexity beyond a reformulation of the tns MOVEMENT rule (9.69) to accommodate these data.

The constraints on amba- 1 center on the nature of the identity condition which exists between the subject of amba- 1 and some case in the subordinate S. In (10.18) this identity condition was maintained when the subject of amba- 1 and the subject of iyalme- 2 were identical. (10.19) is a parallel case.
(10.20) and (10.21) exhibit identity between the object of amba-1 and the subject of the intransitive verb in the embedded S.

In (10.17) the matrix S subject and embedded S subject were identical. (10.19) is a parallel case, while (10.20) and (10.21) show that alternatively, the object of amba-1 can be identical to the subject of the intransitive verb in the embedded S.

(10.19) egŋ idŋx edn, egŋ armŋp ambar edn.
food eat-RPAST they food finish -RPAST they
'They ate the food, and finished it up.'

(10.20) lalanţal uy urb amay uk oReray elkan ambar il.
[uncle-AG] fish barra. big [tree bag-to] enter -RPAST he
'Uncle put (= caused to enter) the big barramundi into the bag.'

(10.21) abm ūŋgul elkeŋ ambanay ednæŋan adnim.
person [there]L return -RFUT them-pl up
'We must take those people back up there.'

Instead of a true verb, the embedded S can contain an adjective, as in (10.22) and (10.23).

(10.22) elkont elkontk Ḣeden olbon ambar ay, al eg adnim
billy-can my black -RPAST I fire head above = on-top-of-the-fire
arţaţerənam.
INT-cook-PPAST
'I made my billy-can black by cooking on the (open) fire.'
(10.23) in arin ar ambambam ambuṣan?
meat which way waste INT- -RPRES us-pl
'How will the meat go bad on us?'

When the embedded S contains a transitive or middle verb, then there are four cases available to meet the conditions of the EQUI-NP DELETION rule. Sentences embedded under the CSL, PRP, and L cases (Chapter VI) place no constraints on the case or surface function of identical NPs, but amba-1 places strong constraints on the necessary identity of NPs. Thus, in (10.24) the object of amba-1 is identical with the subject of the verb in the embedded S. Two objects therefore appear in the surface structure.

(10.24) lalaq il alkalkanamiyar niṇaŋ iṅun arin ambar il
[uncle he INT-shout-subj-AG] aunty her hit -RPAST he
iṅun ud aqen.
him dog my
'Uncle's shout caused aunty to clout my dog.'

Ignoring for the moment the P-relative S source of alkalkanamiyar, the structure (10.25) underlies (10.24).
Once again only the EQUI-NP DELETION and tens MOVEMENT rules are required to give a natural account of (10.24). In (10.26) the embedded sentence contains a middle verb; it otherwise follows closely the structure (10.25).

(10.26) abm ay niñaŋ iŋun ergen ambar uw ay iŋun
person I aunty her speak -RPAST again I [her
lelaŋan.
y.sister-DAT]
'I caused my aunty to speak to my younger sister
once again.'

These sentences illustrate that identity between the object of amba- 1 and the subject of the embedded S is permitted by the grammar. The grammar does not recognize any of the following as a sufficient condition for the output to be grammatical.

(1) Identity between the object of amba- 1 and the (dative) object of the embedded S.

(2) Identity between the subject of amba- 1 and the subject of
embedded S, except where amba-1 has no object (see later in this section) or the verb in the embedded S has no (dative) object.

(3) Identity between the subject of amba-1 and the object of the embedded S, except where there is also identity between the object of amba-1 and the subject of the embedded S.

The latter possibility of (3) above—the addition of the identity between the subject of amba-1 and the object of the embedded S to conditions already proved to be acceptable—produces a surprising output.

(10.27) arŋ ugoganiyar u di il iŋun abm
[child frighten-PPRES-subj-AG] dog he him person
aŋanay ambar.
bite -RPAST
'The frightened child caused the dog to bite him.'

The -ay suffix to the verb in the embedded sentence occurs on transitive verbs (ata-1 [10.27]) and on middle verbs (erge-2 [10.28]) also. Its appearance is, to say the least, unexpected.

(10.28) abm aŋ arŋ aŋen iŋun aŋun ergenay ambar.
person I child my him me speak -RPAST
'I caused my child to speak to me.' (in teaching it to talk, for example)
-\textit{ay} is obligatory to the verbs of (10.27) and (10.28) with their dual pairs of identical NPs, and was found to be optional when the object of \textit{amba-1} is identical with the subject of transitive or middle verbs. That is to say, it occurs optionally in examples (10.24) and (10.26) as well as in the following.

(10.29) $\text{adagina}l$ $\text{il agun inun \ ukeley \ ampayin(ay)}$
$[\text{g'father-AG} \ \text{he} \ \text{me} \ \text{you} \ [\text{bullet-PRP}]$\ambar.$$
-\text{RPAST}$
'Grandfather caused me to ask you for bullets.'

(10.30) $\text{ina}q$ $\text{agun agar \ inin idun(ay) \ ambar}$.$$
\text{you} \ \text{me} \ \text{clothes} \ \text{your} \ \text{poke} \ \ -\text{RPAST}$
= wash
'You caused me to wash your clothes.'

(10.31) $\text{abm ay ninaq iqun \ lelaq elben(ay) \ ambar}$.$$
\text{person} \ \text{I} \ \text{aunty} \ \text{her} \ \text{y.sister} \ \text{scold}$
'I caused aunty to scold my younger sister.'

The principle at stake here is the same one embodied in the REFLECTION rule (6.46). The SD of that rule requires only two modifications:  
(1) concerning the element \textit{tne} which does not appear in the sentences discussed immediately above, and  
(2) the phonological shape of \textit{K} which must be specified as \textit{-ay}.  

Note that the optional deletion of -a is taken care of by the same rule that optionally deletes -iy. (See the discussion involving examples [6.63] to [6.68] in Chapter VI. The rule of K,A DELETION [5.10] re-introduced at that point is obviously in need of a new name to account for the increased scope of its application. I suggest 'REDUNDANT K DELETION'.)

The identity between the subject of amba-1 and the subject of the embedded S ([2] above) has already been shown to produce grammatical results (10.17) where the embedded S contains an intransitive verb. The same condition holds with transitive or middle verbs if amba-1 has no object. The proposal is that amba-1 be entered in the lexicon as optionally transitive. The intransitive form appears in (10.12)--where it parallels the transitive form (10.11)--and in compound sentences where it has the meaning 'repeatedly or continuously over a period'. It implies 'without great time lapse between successive performances of the act'. The structure (10.32) underlies the output (10.33). lalaŋal in the embedded S is deleted, and no Agentive appears in the surface realization.

\[(10.32)\]

```
S
  /\  \
 P M
  /\  |
 O S   V
  /\    |
 M P   S
  /\   |
 lalaŋal M P amba-1
  /\ |
 A  O I  V
 lalaŋal uy urb uk oReiy oriki-1
```
(10.33) lalaŋ uy urb uk oReɾiy orikin ambanm il.
uncle fish barra. [tree bag-INST] insert -RCUST he
'Uncle put the barramundi in the bag (each time he
cought one uncle secured the barramundi by means of
the bag).' (Compare [10.33] with the instance of
intransitive əlka- 1 'enter' [10.20].)

(10.34) in oyboy oŋəŋ oŋəŋ ewal inaŋ? abm ay
meat wallaby dead where see-RPAST you person I
ōŋəŋ agŋagan amban!
too much look-for -RPRES
'Where did you see that dead wallaby? I've looked
about everywhere (for it)!

The identity of the subject of embedded intransitive sen­tences with the subject of amba- 1 has the same reading. Compare
(10.17), where the object of amba- 1 is kotakot, with (10.35)
where no object appears.

(10.35) abm ay ərmbeŋ ambanm ay.
person I fall -RCUST I
'I kept falling over.'

Compare (10.17) also with (10.36) where amba- 1 is clearly
transitive.
The proposal is that *amba-₁* be regarded as optionally transitive, on the grounds that in independent usage both forms of the verb have the same meaning, and both share the \$-constituent as an optional feature of the case frame. The difference in meaning when the two forms appear in compound sentences can be perhaps regarded as a structural phenomenon. What may necessitate the admission of two homophonous lexical entries are sentences such as (10.37). The relevant structure underlying (10.37) is represented in (10.38).

(10.37) ibaŋar alyuR aRtinamiyar arŋ uyam elgoR

[father temper climb-PPAST-subj-AG] child hand many = light fingered

ulaŋan kotakot agŋan amban ambar il ulaŋan.

'their angry father made those two thieving children keep looking for the axe.'
The discussion of *ambe*-2 in this section will lead to a consideration of other verbs with similar syntactic properties. *ambe*-2 shares with *amba*-1 the ability to occur in simple sentences as the only verb, and to introduce embedded sentences as complements. Like *amba*-1, *ambe*-2 has several meanings.

(10.39) endeR ang arin ambeY?

rain [here]L which way -RPRES

'What happened to the rain?' (Compare [10.12] which has the same semantic reading.)
(10.40) arin ambey ambul?
  which way -RPRES we-pl-in
  'What will happen to us?'

(10.41) ūngul anen eRon ambey?
  [there]L what voice -RPRES
  'What's that making a noise?'

(10.42) antuntal oŋgom ambey alijan motorcar-am.
  crack [this]L -RPRES us-2-in [ -from]L
  'The sound of that backfire came to us from the car.'

(10.43) udal ambiy urmur iŋun. "Iyow!" ambel edn.
  [dog-AG PR ]A bark-RPAST it -RPAST they-pl
  'The dogs barked at it. "Iyow!" they went.' (See
  also [10.16] for a parallel case with amba-.)

  ambe- 2 has the meaning 'become' when the S of its case
  frame is realized.

(10.44) āng inaŋ amay ambel oŋgol.
  [here]L you big -RPAST here now
  'You've grown big now.'

Once again the conditions of Equi-NP deletion must be met, this
time between the subject of ambe- 2 and the subject of the verb
in the embedded S. This verb must be an adjective, [+V,+Adj].
In example (10.44) is found the same sort of 'identical NP' as was noted in discussion of (6.65).

(10.45) el elend ambey ur!
    eyes awake -RPRES you-pl
    'Wake up, you-all!'

(10.46) og edndelay aŋaŋə ambel; og ulfir.
    water completely dry -RPAST water die-RPAST
    'The water had completely dried up; it was gone.'

The analysis of ilgay, idndamay etc. as verbs (Chapter VI) receives support from sentences such as (10.47).

(10.47) abm inaŋ ilgay ambey uw, ey?
    person you together -RPRES again
    'You got together (with her) again, eh?'

The implication is that these words are adjectives, but adjectives of unusual nature (see [6.82] and [6.83] with the pertinent discussion).

    ambe- 2 conveys the sense of 'remain Adj' rather than 'becoming Adj' in some sentences.

(10.48) orŋij arir inun, udng ambel il.
    too much hit-RPAST him alive still-RPAST he
    'I fired too often at him, and he was still alive.'
ambe-2 also occurs with the Purposive (PRP) case with the meaning 'want (to)'.

(10.49) abm ay ipay ambey.
   person I [meat-PRP] want-RPRES
   'I want some meat.'

When the PRP case is realized by S, rather than NP, two possibilities exist. The first is exemplified by (10.50) where the subject of ambey is identical to that of ankinay.

(10.50) lalaŋ ambey il ip oyboay ankinay.
   uncle -RPRES he [[meat wallaby-PRP] hunt-PRP]
   'Uncle wants to go hunting for wallabies.'

The second is exemplified by (10.51) where the subjects are not identical.

(10.51) abm ay inun ambey alaŋar ilg ankinay inaŋ.
   person I you want-RPRES [uncle with]COM [hunt-PRP] you
   'I want you to go hunting with uncle.'

The appearance of inun requires some explanation. It is proposed that ambe-2 be entered in the lexicon as optionally either middle or intransitive, with the case frame

\[
  [ 0 (D)_{PRP} \_ ]
\]
The analysis of *ambé*-2 as optionally a *middle* verb is borne out by sentence (10.52).

(10.52) *lalaŋ il ɪŋun niŋaŋaŋ ambey in onmon alwaŋaR*

uncle he [her aunty-DAT] -RPRES [meat egg goose
gather-PRP]

'Uncle wants aunty to gather some goose eggs.'

This proposal requires once again that the sentence embedded under PRP meet the condition of the EQUI-NP DELETION rule. Support for it is drawn from the syntactic properties of other verbs with PRP as a constituent of their case frame. The following verbs are transitive or middle.

(10.53) *adjía- 1 'force, oblige'*

[A O (PRP)___]

*ugögi- 1 'leave, put'*

[A O (PRP)___]

*erge- 2 'speak, talk'*

[O D (PRP)___]

*alka- 1 'shout, yell'*

[O D (PRP)___]

When the optional PRP is realized as a sentence (see Chapter VI) the subject of that sentence must meet a condition of identity with the object or dative object of the above verbs. The identity of the embedded subject with the matrix subject is not an adequate condition on the grammaticality of the sentence. (10.54) means
The following verbs are intransitive.

(10.55) elke- 2 'return, go back' [ O (PRP) ]
igu- 1 'go, walk' [ O (PRP) ]
olo- 2 'travel, move about' [ O (PRP) ]

When the optional PRP of the case frame is realized by a sentence, the subject of that sentence must be identical to the subject of the matrix sentence.

(10.56) egel afanay igun ay uwand.

[food get-PRP] go-RPRES I west

(10.56) can only mean, 'I am going (for me) to get food'.

The requirement that intransitive verbs meet subject-subject identity conditions, and that middle or transitive verbs meet subject-(dative) object identity conditions suggests that ambe-2 is optionally either intransitive, or middle/transitive. The middle verb analysis is established by (10.52) where lalan lacks the Agentive postposition, but ninan appears with the Dative -an.

Note that the PRP case introduces indirect speech, but that the Equi-NP conditions impose a restriction: the (dative) object must be identical to the embedded subject.
Where the subjects are different, indirect speech is effected by juxtaposition.

(10.58) ergel ay iṣun, abm ay al oRṣan aliŋ.

'I told him that I am chopping our wood.'

The indirect speech construction is less frequently used than the direct quotation of the speaker's words, complete with intonation. Intonation, in fact, is the only distinguishing difference between the indirect speech of (10.58) and the direct quote of (10.59).

(10.59) ergel ay iṣun, "abm ay al oRṣan aliŋ!"

'I told him, "I'm chopping our wood!"'

amba-1 and ambe-2 are not the only verbs with an optional S in the specification of their case frame. The following 'verbs of motion' also have this feature.

(10.60) olo-2 'travel, move about'
igu-1 'go, walk'
elke-2 'return, go back'
ugngi-1 'leave, put'
As a result of the realization of this S, sentences such as (10.61) are grammatical.

\[\text{(10.61) \( \text{ego afan olol ay uwand.} \)}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{food get travel-RPAST I [west],} \\
\text{= down-River}
\end{align*}
\]

'I went down getting food.'

This S is an optional alternative to the PRP case.

\[\text{(10.62) \( \text{ego afana olol ay uwand.} \)}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[ PRP]} \\
\text{'I went down to get food.'}
\end{align*}
\]

Despite my informant's assertion that (10.61) and (10.62) 'meant the same', a study of text material suggests that this is not so. (10.62) implies that the speaker's whole purpose in going was to fetch food. (10.61) implies that the speaker was able to get food as he travelled. The deep structure differences which these two sentences reflect appear to correspond to differences in semantic readings, but just what the differences are is difficult for the non-native speaker to ascertain.

\text{erbe-2}

The syntax of \text{amba-1}, \text{ambe-2}, and the 'verbs of motion' such as \text{igu-1} and \text{olo-2} invite the suggestion that the 'reciprocal' verb \text{erbe-2} be accounted for in the same manner; namely by
assigning erbe-2 a case frame specification and entering it in the lexicon. The rules which introduce erbe-2 in Chapter VIII are consistent with the principles embodied in the rules for English (Lees and Klima 1963), and are internally consistent also. In this section a brief justification of the proposed analysis is offered, and the syntax of this unusual verb further explored.

The case frame of amba-1 and ambe-2 includes an optional S constituent. Failure to realize this S results in sentences in which amba-1 and ambe-2 stand as independent verbs. Examples can be found under the description of these verbs. erbe-2 on the other hand cannot stand independently as a verb, and while the S constituent could of course be positively specified, erbe-2 would become the only verb to require an embedded S. This would not be the only exceptional feature assigned to erbe-2. The verb of the embedded S must be specified as either transitive or middle, and the following NPs specified as identical:

the subject of erbe-2
the (dative) object of erbe-2
the subject of the embedded S
the (dative) object of the embedded S

In addition, ad hoc rules must delete all but the first of these.

It is claimed that a grammar which provides a REFLEXIVE/RECIPROCAL rule (8.38) and introduces erbe-2 transformationally with the feature [+RECIP] is to be valued for its greater
simplicity and consistency with other grammars, than the alternative outlined above.

On the other hand, the formulation of the REFLEXIVE/RECIPROCAL rule is open to another serious objection. The rule does not allow for the derivation of quite acceptable sentences such as

(10.63) andandaŋ! lelaŋ ayin alganı̂ ı̂ erb ı̂ ubal?!

daughter y.sister QUEST carry RECIP-RPRES you-2
'Daughter! Will you carry your little sister?!

The deep structure of (10.63) is representable as (10.64).

(10.64)

There is a case of partial identity between the 0 and the A. Strictly speaking, it is an instance of inclusion such that semantically

\[ 0 \supset A. \]

Nevertheless, erbe-2 is introduced, without the deletion of any NP.
It appears to be necessary to admit a great deal more into the concept of 'identity' than heretofore, yet at the same time to recognize a strict identity. Strict identity is a condition on the deletion of the 'identical' NP; inclusion is an adequate condition on the transformational introduction of erbe-2.

The differentiation of these two concepts—strict identity and inclusion—is relevant at other points of Oykangand syntax also. (10.65) illustrates the kind of sentence encountered under the section on ambe-2, but note that the subject of anki-1 includes laqan and so the structure is grammatical, but (abm) ul is not deleted by the EQUI-NP DELETION rule.

(10.65) ninaŋ il ʔinun laqan anbe'y abm anqinaŋ
aunty she [him uncle-DAT] want-RPRES [person hunt-PRP]
ul.
they-2
'Aunty wants uncle to go hunting with her.'

Even P-relative sentences are subject to this constraint.

(10.66) ejŋ og idanam ul, iqin anbanm il awar.
food water eat-PPAST they-2 run cause-RCUST he [east]
= tea
= up-river

'When they had had a drink of tea, he drove on up the river.'
(10.67) abm erab ininaply ilimb ul iγun abm emonggab
person three INT-sit-subj then they-2 him person one
iγun amban ul.
go cause-RPRES they-2
'The three of them sat there, two of them making the
other go (for something).'

Other cases where inclusion appears to be a valid concept include
(6.65), (10.45), and the 'promotion' of adnominal D.

It is also incumbent on the grammar to offer some account
for sentences such as (10.68) where an NP occurs which cannot be
the subject of ewa-2 'see, look' and where erbe-2 also occurs.

(10.68) kuŋaR aliŋ arfan ewaŋ erb.
house ours-2-in bright see RECIP-RPRES
'Our house looks gay.'

At first glance (10.68) would seem to be a passive. There is no
Agentive, and an 'active' form (10.69) is not only feasible but
could well be assigned the same deep structure.

(10.69) kuŋaR aliŋ arfan ewaŋ edn.
house ours-2-in bright see-RCUST they-pl
'They saw our gay house.'

A rule of AGENT DELETION has already been found necessary
(6.48), and accounts for the failure of edn to appear in the surface
realization of (10.68). What then accounts for the appearance of erbe-2?

In Langacker's review (to appear, 1970) of Goldin's Spanish case and function 1968, the reviewer presents a nice argument for the source of the 'automatic reflexive' se in Spanish. A parallel analysis is maintained for (10.68) in this study of Oykangand.

Langacker begins by observing that

Formally, a transportation rule involves two operations, copying and deletion. If B is transported to the left of A, as in the hypothetical derivation 54, first a copy of B is inserted to the left of A, and then the original instance of B is deleted.

\[(54) \ A \ B \Longrightarrow \ B \ A \ B \Longrightarrow \ B \ A \]

Implicit in any transportation rule, therefore, is the possibility of a derived structure containing two occurrences of the element being transported—this will come about whenever the first step is taken but the second is blocked for some reason.

The SUBJECT CHOICE rule is essentially a transportation rule of the type Langacker describes, and can conveniently be regarded as a copying rule (SUBJECT CHOICE I) and a deletion rule (SUBJECT CHOICE II). SUBJECT CHOICE I is obligatory in all circumstances in Oykangand; SUBJECT CHOICE II applies obligatorily for most Oykangand verbs.

\[\text{ewa-2 'see, look'}\] is a verb which undergoes SUBJECT CHOICE II only optionally. When the rule is not applied, the conditions for the operation of the REFLEXIVE/RECIPROCAL rule are met, and erbe-2 is introduced. AGENT DELETION becomes a possibility, and (10.68) represents a typical output from this rule.
More often than not, the verb which occurs with erbe- 2 as a result of the non-application of the SUBJECT CHOICE II rule is fully reduplicated.

(10.70) in pigipig ang aŋaŋg ewaŋewaŋ erb ambul. meat pig here NEG r-see RECIP-RPRES we-pl-in 'There's no pig to be seen by us here.'

(10.71) uw aŋg edn erdaŋerdaŋ erbel aŋun. speech [here]L they-pl r-keep-secret RECIP-RPAST me 'They kept one another from spreading the news as far as me.'

(10.72) in aŋaŋg uwaŋuwaŋ erbel edn aŋdaŋan! meat NEG r-give RECIP-RPAST they-pl us-pl-ex 'They didn't share their meat with us!'

The failure of abmban to appear as a result of the REFLEXIVE rule (8.38[i]) is presumably accounted for by the appearance of an 0 constituent (in pigipig [10.70]; uw [10.71]; in [10.72]) but there is no principled explanation of this phenomenon. The verbs which are optionally exempt from the SUBJECT CHOICE II rule are all transitive.

Reduplication

Reduplication can be 'partial', or 'complete'; both types are discussed in this section.
Partial reduplication occurs in nouns, adverbs, adjectives and true verbs, although not every member of each category undergoes this process. Reduplication of this nature is the result of the feature [+INTENS] on the lexical item concerned. As the feature suggests, partial reduplication is an intensifier in its semantic effect.

\[(10.73)\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ed} & \text{R} \quad [+N] \quad 'rain'; \quad \text{ed-}\text{edR} \quad 'heavy rain' \\
\text{oyelm} & \quad [+SA] \quad 'back again'; \quad \text{oyel-}\text{oyelm} \\
& \quad 'straight back again' \\
\text{algal} & \quad [+V, +Adj] \quad 'straight'; \quad \text{alg-}\text{algal} \quad 'straight as a ramrod' \\
\text{igu-1} & \quad [+V, -Adj] \quad 'go, walk'; \quad \text{ig-}\text{igu-1} \quad 'keep going' \\
\text{iyalme-2} & \quad [+V, -Adj] \quad 'play'; \quad \text{iy-}\text{alm-alme-2} \quad 'keep playing'
\end{array}
\]

The result of the reduplicative process (indicated above by the use of hyphens) is idiosyncratically determined by the individual lexical item. \text{ed}R, \text{algal}, and \text{igu-1} are typical of the majority of instances. In these, the reduplication is limited to the first syllable.\(^3\) \text{oyelm} typifies another frequent pattern; two syllables are reduplicated less the final member of the consonant sequence, m. \text{iyalme-2} is an example where it is the medial syllable \text{alm} that is reduplicated. This pattern is infrequent.

Partial reduplication is a syntactically determined phenomenon, but the form of the reduplication is the result of
idiosyncratic properties of the lexical items and of the operation of phonological rules.

The rule which effects the introduction of a copy of the [+INTENS] category is formulated below. Spelling rules are assumed to operate on the resulting sequence

\[ V: [+\text{Adj}, -\text{INTENS}] \ \text{algal}: [+\text{INTENS}] \]

and produce

\[ \text{algalgal}. \]

**PARTIAL REDUPLICATION RULE**

(10.74) \( Y \ C: [+\text{INTENS}] (\text{tns}) \ Z \)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
1 & 2: [-\text{INTENS}]+2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

There are restrictions on the PARTIAL REDUPLICATION rule so far as true verbs are concerned. The rule produces ungrammatical sequences if it operates on verbs introduced in sentences embedded under *amba*- l. That is to say (10.75) is ungrammatical; the correct form is (10.76).

(10.75) *ermbermben \ ambar

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{fall} & \text{cause-} \text{R Past} \\
\text{drop} \\
\end{array}
\]

'kept dropping'

(10.76) ermben \ ambambar

'kept dropping'
There are several ways of accounting for this—none of them any better than *ad hoc* devices and I would prefer to merely note the facts and refrain from flights of unprincipled fancy.

Complete reduplication is a feature of true verbs and is introduced by *r* in the Modality Constituent. Two reasons are offered for the 'categorial' analysis of complete reduplication as compared to the 'feature' analysis of partial reduplication.

(1) Semantically, complete reduplication has an 'aspectual' or 'adverbial' effect that partial reduplication does not. It is incompatible for semantic reasons with adverbs (such as *ay*), whereas partial reduplication is not.

(2) Complete reduplication is restricted to true verbs in the same way many adverbs are.

The grammar of Oykangand must account for the two types of reduplication in such a manner as to allow *both* to occur. Just what order must be proposed for the derivation is not clear; the order adopted in Chapter XII is somewhat arbitrary.

(10.77) ũntiR awind iguniy ay, ud awind udnal udnudanam
night road-on go-PNP-subj I dog road-on *r* INT-lie-PPAST
ergan erganm ay.

*r* step-on-RCUST I

'When I go on the road at night I invariably step on the dogs that always keep sleeping on it.'

*udna-* 2 'lie, sleep' is both partially and completely reduplicated;
erga-1 'step on' is completely reduplicated. 'Complete' is perhaps an inadequate characterization of this type of reduplication. 'Stem' reduplication would be more correct. The structure

\[ V \]
\[ r \]
\[ V \]
\[ \text{tense} \]

is realized by the sequence

verb stem₁ + empty morph + verb stem₁ + tense.

Once again the spelling rules are assumed to copy in the phonological shape of V under r, and the 'empty morph' is idiosyncratically determined by the verb itself. The shape of the most common empty morph is \(-l-\).

(10.78) iki-1 'throw'; iki-l-iki-1
uwa-2 'give'; uwa-l-uwa-2
ewa-2 'see'; ewa-l-ewa-2
eka-1 'cut'; eka-r-eka-1
elke-2 'return'; elke-\text{-}\bar{e}elke-2

The semantic effect of complete reduplication is best illustrated by (10.79).

(10.79) abm ay al ikilikir ay.

person I fire r-throw-RPAST I

'I kept the fire going (by throwing on wood from time to time).'
The sense is that an act was repeated several times with an interval or break between each instance.

The complete reduplication of some verbs has resulted in forms for which new meanings have been coined.

(10.80) afa-1 'get, fetch'; afalyafa-1 'to be loaded up with various edibles'
inya-1 'make, do'; iyalyiya-1 'to repair, make good again'
eka-1 'cut'; ekareka-1 'to butcher, or dress out a carcass'

Verbs which are exceptions to the normally obligatory SUBJECT CHOICE II rule are reduplicated before erbe-2 according to an alternative rule. Instead of ewalewa-2 (10.73), ewanewan appears. There is no motivation for incorporating this rule into the syntax; it is accounted for by spelling rules.

The Specification of Verbs

The syntax of Oykangand verbs has been described in some detail in preceding sections and earlier chapters. The following paragraphs condense these discussions and offer at least a firm outline of the specification of verbs required on the one hand by case theory and on the other by the language itself. In the Lexicon of Chapter XIII certain verbs are specified as fully as possible, and these should be consulted as examples.
Foremost among the specifications of Oykangand verbs is the case frame. The specification of transitive, middle and intransitive verbs is usually as follows:

Transitive \[ A \ 0 \ (D) \ (I) \ (L) \ (CSL) \]  
Middle \[ 0 \ (D) \ (I) \ (L) \ (PRP) \]
Intransitive \[ 0 \ (I) \ (L) \ (CSL) \]

Certain verbs require a [+Animate] Objective, such as iyalme- 2 (intransitive) 'play', adiya- 1 (transitive) 'force, oblige'. All middle verbs require [+Animate] Os. As was noted in Chapter V, certain verbs restrict the features on the L case (with which of course all verbs can occur).

Verbs which are marked as optional exceptions to the SUBJECT CHOICE II rule have a special form of complete reduplication when the option is taken.

While all verbs can select [+INTENS], a rare few do not cooccur with r. anda- 1 'splay, spread apart' and erge- 2 'speak' typify this latter restriction. Other verbs are marked [-RECIP]; ida- 1 'eat' is such a verb. amba- 1 is however [+RECIP], so that idan amban erbe- 2 occurs. Other specifications include the phonological shape of the 'empty' morph that appears in complete reduplications, and the 'class membership' of the verb. Exceptions to the general rule of first syllable reduplication for [+INTENS] verbs must be specified, together with any requirement that the selected subject of a sentence must be [+dual] or [+plural] (Chapter IV).
Intransitive verbs are not commanded by the 'intransitive' amba- l, only by the 'transitive' amba- l. This fact may require recognition of two amba- l verbs.

The mutual exclusion between CSL and PRP case categories suggested in the case frames of verbs above seems counter-intuitive. In fact, a sentence containing both cases was willingly accepted by Mrs. Major, but despite intensive eliciting no cooccurrence of the two was produced. The example is recorded below.

(10.81) Maudie uguñal ermay udnudn il afum arñoguy
now on-one-side lie she [breast child-DAT
uwandaj afum orñ iqanayał.
give ]PRP [breast juice eat ]CSL
'Maudie is sleeping on her side right now so as to
give (her) child the breast because of (his)
drinking milk.'

It is most probable that the sentence manifesting the CSL case is a constituent of the PRP sentence, and not of the matrix sentence, since arñoguñ 'child' appears only in the PRP sentence, and is presum­ably the deleted subject of the CSL sentence. The analysis proposed above therefore must stand, despite its counter-intuitive character.
FOOTNOTES

1There is in this instance a historical explanation for the homophony. Hale (cited in Sommer 1969:62 et seq.) reconstructs the stems

*ka:tYa- 'tie up'
and *pa:tYa- 'bite, taste'

for the Paman languages. By loss of the initial consonant, vowel length, and the development of a from *tY, the two forms have fallen together as Oykangand ata-.

2Capell 1956:68 notes, with respect to auxiliaries or 'catalysts', 'The particles were originally verbs in their own right, but in most of the living languages they are reduced to helping to express the details of circumstance in other verbal complexes.' In Oykangand, the auxiliaries are still 'verbs in their own right'.

3For the syllables of Kunjen, see Sommer 1969.

4That is to say, [+animate] is a feature of the head noun of the Objective case in Middle sentences.
Chapter XI

IMPERATIVES AND QUESTIONS

Introduction

Imperatives and Questions are treated together in this section because of the syntactic and semantic properties they share. For example, neither is acceptable in Oykangand as an embedded sentence. Ross (to appear), Lakoff 1968, Sadock 1969a, b, and others have laid the theoretical groundwork which explains this restriction, although the theory is far from complete or universally accepted. In various versions higher 'performative' or 'abstract' verbs are proposed which leave the results of idiosyncratic constraints on subordinate sentences long after their (sometimes) obligatory deletion.

Both have distinctive intonations that are basically 'final' in character—conjoined questions or imperatives do not occur (see Sommer 1969 for a brief treatment of intonation). Neither do certain adverbs occur with imperatives and questions: anay 'tried to...but failed' is typical. Added support for both the analysis proposed above and the analysis of anând is found in the failure of anánd to appear in either imperatives or questions. It may be that anánd can be proposed as the realization of a superordinate 'abstract' verb, or something of this sort, that is mutually exclusive with imperatives and questions.
Imperatives

The subject of imperative sentences is always marked by the 'second person' feature [+II]. The subject NP may cooccur with the subject pronoun, or else one or both can be deleted. Apart from the constraint on the subject—regarded as being imposed on the sentence by the abstract verb of 'command'—the account of imperatives proposed here requires no new rules.

The spelling of the imperative formative is 1: -₁, 2: -y.

(11.1) line ıkɨl alɨŋ uy arfnay.

throw-IIMP ours-2-in [fish hold-PRP]

'(You) go fishing for us.'

(11.2) inaŋ ęŋg ärŋel alɨŋ, ęŋg ọg ärŋel

you food cook-IIMP ours-2-in food water cook-IIMP = tea

aliŋ.

ours-2-in

'You cook the food for us—and the tea, too.'

(11.3) iday ągən!

wait-IIMP me

'Wait for me!'
and **andan**, the respective exclusive forms) in imperative sentences.

(11.4) **ondəray** **ugogil** **aliy**, **ondər** **elkenay** **aliy**.

[tomorrow-to]L leave-IIMP we-2-in tomorrow return-RFUT we

'Let's leave it until tomorrow—we'll have to come back tomorrow.'

(11.5) **egŋ** **idjal** **ambul** **ongogl!**

food eat-IIMP we-pl-in [here]L

'Let's eat here.'

(11.6) **iday** **aliy**.

wait-IIMP we-2-in

'Let's wait.'

Negative imperative or injunctive sentences have the same structure as imperatives, but incorporate the negative adverb **aR** and frequently the adverb **uw** 'once more'. **aR** **uw** + IIMP becomes a frequent combination of morphemes meaning 'stop...!' 

(11.7) **uw** **aR** **uw** **erg** **inaŋ!**

speech not once-more speak-IIMP you

'Stop talking!'

(11.8) **abm** **aR** **uw** **arkey** **ur**.

person not once-more fight-IIMP you-pl

'Stop fighting, you lot!'
(11.9) aR egõgaRey agun.
    not laugh-IIMP me
    'Don't laugh at me (now).'

enenoly 'not too much' (9.44) and intaR 'no more (9.43) are other
negatives which occur in imperative sentences.

(11.10) enenoly aril! ubmarubmanaY!
    not-too-much hit-IIMP r-smash-IPOT
    'Don't hit it too much! (You) might smash it all up!'

(11.11) intaR udn! aRtil inag!
    no-more sleep rise-IIMP you
    'Don't sleep any longer! Get up!'

Questions

Phonologically, questions differ from declarative sentences
in intonation. Syntactically, questions each contain a distinctive
QUEST word, which may be a wh-type word, such as anen 'what?',
apul 'who [AG]' or ayin—the particle used in yes/no questions.
Accounting for the QUEST word is not at all simple. Katz and
Postal's 1964 treatment of questions distills the best from Chomsky
1957 and 1964, and Lees 1963, but leaves certain real problems.
For instance, to adopt their framework—as Jacobs and Rosenbaum
1968 did—and to adapt it to a case grammar, makes the structure
(11.12) possible.
In Oykangand, transformational rules proposed for English could produce (11.13) (a) or (b).

(11.13) (a) abm apul uy afar aliŋ?
[person who-AG] fish fetch-RPAST ours-2-in
'Who caught our fish?'

(11.13) (b) abm anend uy afar aliŋ?
[what-AG]
'What person caught our fish?'

Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968:158 discuss a parallel case in English, with reference to which and what.

You will detect a semantic difference between the two sentences below:
which boy are you talking about?
what boy are you talking about?
Such differences as exist in the semantic interpretation of the two sentences have not yet been explained by grammarians.

The problem raised by interrogative words having apparent semantic content is perhaps greater in Oykangand than in English.

On the other hand, the Katz-Postal theory accounts very nicely for the ungrammaticality of (11.14).
(11.14) *abm aløgeñ apul uy afar aliŋ?

[person y.woman who-AG] fish fetch-RPAST ours-2-in

'Who was the young woman who caught our fish?'

The restriction on an 'who?' is that it must occur with 'non-specific' Oykangand NPs, and aløgeñ is 'specific'. A similar restriction exists for indod 'where'.

(11.15) erk indod ugøgir inaq iηun?

[place where]L leave-RPAST you it

'Where did you leave it?'

but

(11.16) *eroRam indod ugøgir inaq iηun?

(place-name) where leave-RPAST you it

anen 'what?' like English which and what (Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968:157) can occur with fully specified NPs.

(11.17) ud olbon ungul urmunamiy anen arir inaq?

dog black [there]L bark-PPAST-subj what hit you

'Which (of those) black dogs barking down there did you shoot?'

It appears to be necessary to accept 'unspecified' NPs (Langacker, to appear) in connection with P-relative sentences (Chapter VI) and Pronominalization (Chapter VIII). The deletion of a non-specific NP means that there is still a viable connection between the
semantic interpretation of the deep structure and the form of the surface structure. A dummy or non-specific noun as the head of an NP would presumably be only marked for third person [+III,-I].

Having introduced to the theory the 'infrajection' type transformation, with indices on the lexical entries to ensure the correct semantic interpretation and syntactic structure, the author can depart radically from the traditional treatment of questions. The proposal offered here may alternately prove to be a failure, even for Oykangand. It is an attempt to cope with the problem raised by sentences (11.13a) and (11.13b)--one that Jacobs and Rosenbaum admit to being unresolved.

Under the proposal concerned, QUEST words are entered in the lexicon and have semantic content. These QUEST words have indices like those of adverbs, the case postposition of the NP to which they are attached affecting the form of some QUEST words. In addition to its index, QUEST words can require the feature [-SPEC] on an NP, thereby limiting the structure of that NP. Alternatively QUEST words such as anen 'what' appear with [+SPEC] NPs. Whatever the problems of this analysis, it accounts for one of Katz and Postal's theoretical conclusions, and for certain details of Oykangand syntax.

Katz and Postal 1964:95 present evidence that their 'treatment of wh- questions...shows that so-called yes-no or simple truth-value questions are also wh- questions.' The coincidence of these question types is preserved by the proposal for Oykangand.
ayin, the yes-no QUEST word, and anen, an, etc. may be derived in the same way.

In the introduction of these words as adverbs there is support from the syntax of the word en 'might, indeed'. en is a adverb which appears with case constituents, verbs, and other adverbs (Chapter IX, examples [9.53] to [9.56]). It also appears on QUEST words (9.57) and (9.58)—a fact accounted for economically if QUEST words are also adverbs.

Some QUEST words—ipday, ayin, arin, ar—are homophonous with words with adverbial function introduced under the M constituent. It is assumed that only one lexical entry exists for each of these, with the feature [+QUEST] governing differences of both semantic reading and syntax.

Assuming the correctness of the above proposal, the QUEST words of Oykangand and their syntactic indices are listed below, with examples.

ayin [__V]. Declarative sentences differ from corresponding yes-no questions by ayin.

(11.18) abm elgoR ungul ayin ew inaŋ?
    person many there QUEST see you
    'Do you see all those people there?'

(11.19) og ayin ulgulgal?
    water QUEST INT-close
    'Is there water close by?'
(11.20) ud algar ayin ariy inaŋ?
dingo QUEST hit-IINT you
'Can you shoot that dingo?'

Other functions of ayin have already been noted (under R-Relatives) in Chapter VI. ayin also appears in sentences from which the verb has been deleted (11.21) and (11.22). It is homophonous with the present tense of ayi-1 'cry, weep'.

(11.21) ayin ambul? (iguy)
QUEST we-pl-in
'Are we ready (to go)?'

(11.22) uy ayin (afar) ur?
fish QUEST (fetch-RPAST) you-pl
'(Did you get) any fish?'

(11.23) ondeR ayin ay inun, aR eg0gaRey inaŋ.
tomorrow cry-RPRES I you not laugh-IIMP you
'Tomorrow I'll (still) be crying for you--don't laugh (at me)!

inday 'where at?' [[NP:[-SPEC] L]]. inday is restricted to Locative 'at' phrases where the whereabouts of movable things--persons, animals or small items likely to be left or found in different places--is being sought.
(11.24) abmel inin inday?
      lover yours [where?]L
'Where is your sweetheart?'

(11.25) abm il Elaine inday il?
      person she [where?]L she
'Where is Elaine?'

(11.26) il oroy alkar "agŋaR uŋal inday il?"
      he [across]L shout-RPAST w.man [now ]L [where]L he
'He shouted across (to us) "Where's that white man now?"'

In the above examples inday is associated with [-SPEC] erk
'place' which is later deleted. inday is also a adverb (see
example [9.5]) and means 'somewhere, thereabouts' as a locative,
(11.27).

(11.27) abm ay inun itơd awiy inday edal!
      person I you [there]L also [somewhere]L wait-RPAST
'I waited for you there somewhere too!'

indo- 'where...?' [[NP:[-SPEC]—]L]. indod 'where at?', indodam
'where from?' and indoly 'where to?' result from the case postposition
of the L case.

(11.28) indod uŋgir il iñun? elbel inan ağun!
      [where-at?]L leave-RPAST he her tell-IIMP you me
'Where did he leave her? Tell me!'
(11.29) indod udnay ay? -- ibmbuRiy udnay ay!
[where-at?]L sleep-RINT I [flat-on]L sleep-RFUT I
'Where can I sleep? -- I'll have to sleep on the flat!'

(11.30) indodam alon ubal?
[where-from?]L travel-RCUST you-2
'Where have you come from?'

(11.31) abm 'ongom indodam adel onporamp?
person [this]L [where-from?]L arrive-RPAST o.woman
'Where did these old women come from?'

(11.32) abm indoly iguL ambul?
person [where-to?]L go-RINT we-pl-in
'Where can we go to?'

(11.33) abm indoly alon amban inaŋ agun?
person [where-to?]L travel cause-RPRES you me
'Where are you taking me to?'

indod, indodam and indoly can cooccur with the [-SPEC] NP erk.

(11.34) erk indodam elkel il?
[place where-from?]L return-RPAST he
'Where did he return from?'

(11.35) arin igunan ambul?
[which-way?] go we-pl-in
'Which way will we go?'
(11.36) aṣin ịṣom arin ermben ambar inaq uRunḍ, ey?

y.stick [that]L how? fall cause-RPAST you [down]L

'How did you come to drop that yamstick, eh?'

ariñd 'how many' [[NP:[+SPEC]_]X]. Although apparently related to arin, no regular morphological process can be proposed in deriving one from the other. ariñd [[_]L] is used by some speakers for 'when' (see ane-).

(11.37) arng aŋguñan ariñd alganm ubal?

child young how-many? bring-RCUST you-2

'How many of the children did you bring?'

(11.38) abm ariñdar arir edn agun?

[person how-many-AG] hit-RPAST they me

'How many people hit me?'

(11.39) abm ariñday uwal inaq in aliŋ?

[person how-many-DAT] give-RPAST you meat ours-2-in

'How many people did you give our meat to?'

ane- 'what?' [[NP:+SPEC]_]X. ane- depends on case postpositions to become anen, anend, aney, aneqand, and aneval. anen has other functions mentioned in Chapter VI (under R-Relatives). It is the usual O case form. anend is the A, I, and L 'at' case form, aney is used for the D, L 'to' and PRP, aneval is the CSL form and aneqand the L 'from' case.
(11.40) oŋgom uRunɗ anen? Ko! in pigipig uŋjiin!
[ti̍s̃ down]L what meat pig dive-RPRES
'What's this in here? Oh! It's a pig swimming!' 

(11.41) in amay iqog anen ariŋ il?
meat big [there]L what hit-RPAST he
'What was the big animal he killed there?'

(11.42) abm ambul anenŋ igun?
person we-pl-in [what-in]L go-RPRES
'What are we going to go in?'

(11.43) in anenŋ atan ay?
meat [what-IN] tie-RPRES I
'What will I tie up the meat with?'

(11.44) in anenŋ atar inun og abmbamand it?
[meat what-AG] bite-RPAST you [water swamp-at there]L
'What was it bit you out in the swamp?'

anenŋ is the usual form for 'when' (= 'at what temporal "location?"').

(11.45) akanaŋ aŋ anenŋ elkenan olon?
y.brother my when return-IFUT hither
'When will my younger brother come back this way?'
'Why should I fetch a bream for you lot?' (inin indicates that one had already claimed it.)

'Why do you make pretences to me?'

'What made you speak to me in anger last night?'

'What's the matter that he is angry at me?'

'What's the matter with him that he never works?'

'Who?' [NP:[-SPEC] X]. Corresponding to the 0 form an is (1) the A case apul, (2) CSL, PRP, and D case anuŋan, and (3) genitive anuŋ.

'Who told you to go fishing?'
(11.52) abm ɪgʊm əŋ ədəl inun? er edndedndal!
   person that who come-RPAST you away INT-hunt-IIMP
   'Who was that came to you? Hunt him away!'

(11.53) abm inun anul əlɡʊay əl ęrkiy?
   person you [who-AG] carry-RINT he [place-to]L
   = homeward
   'Who can take you back home?'

(11.54) abm anęŋ ɪnəŋan əmbul əŋɡʊd? ɪn anul
   person what-for sit-IFUT we-pl-in [here]L meat [who-AG]
   ʊwəŋə̴ əmbuŋə̴?
   give-RFUT us-pl-in
   'Why will we stay here? Who will give us meat (here)عش?'

(11.55) abmə̴ əŋuŋə̴ ərgergə̴ ɪnəŋ unţiR?
   [lover who-to] INT-speak-RCUST you [night]L
   'Who of your sweethearts were you talking to last night?'

(11.56) ud anuŋ əndəmar əṭər ədəŋ?
   [dog whose E-AG] bite-RPAST me
   'Whose dog bit me?'

əR 'why not?' and əRay 'why not for it?' [___V]; the former in intransitive constructions, the latter in middle and transitive sentences.

(11.57) abm əR əl̲k̲ əmbul?
   person why-not return-RPRES we-pl-in
   'Why don't we go home?'
(11.58) abm aR igun ambul uy ikinay?

to person why-not go-RPRES we-pl-in [fish throw-PRP]

'Why don't we go fishing?'

(11.59) iñtìm inin ilimb aRay il abmban iyarwiyan?

house his then why-not he himself repair-RPRES

'Why doesn't he fix his house himself, then?'

(11.60) erk inin eg<J> coconut aRem; aRay ewal il?

place her food without why-not see-RPAST she

'Her place has no coconuts--why can't she see (them)?'

In an earlier work, the author maintained that '

(11.61) uwand igur alin ey, eg<J> akulaR.

[west] go-RPAST we-2-ex (place-name)

'We went on westward--(we went to) Fish Hole.'

From the above example, igur alin has been 'gapped out' of the second (conjoined) sentence. ey is thus sentence-final, as also in (11.62).
The addition of *ey* (with appropriate intonation) transforms the declarative sentence

\[
\text{ip amb udnudn}
\]

'*(that) animal is still lying there*' into the corresponding question, above. English speakers of North Queensland have been observed to use the same syntactic device:

\[
\text{It's a hot day, eh?}
\]

'Isn't it a hot day?'

In this sense, Oykangand *ey* forms tag questions.

The position earlier maintained on *ey* appears to be untenable. *ey* has both semantic and syntactic function, and is presumed to be an adverb with the feature [+QUEST] inserted with the index \[ _{\S} \].
Chapter XII
THE RULES REVISITED

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to offer a brief summary of the rules of Oykangand grammar found necessary in the preceding chapters, and to add occasional further comment as the need arises. Each rule bears some cross reference(s) to the preceding text, where germane discussion of it is to be found.

Some of the rules proposed in earlier chapters are found to be inadequate later, in that there is some wider generalization involved, which the rule formula does not capture. These wider generalizations do not always yield readily to precise formulation, as for example the REDUNDANT K DELETION rule. Still other rules—such as the REFLEXIVE/RECIPROCAL rule or REFLECTION rule—are formulated without a precise account of the conditions that govern the application of the rule. No apology is offered for these defects.

Reibel and Schane 1969 in their preface to Modern studies in English go so far as to say:

In the early studies linguists attempted to state precisely, using various symbols and notational conventions, the exact environmental conditions under which a particular rule applied. Unfortunately the notations were frequently cumbersome and showed much individual variation from author to author, so that the rules were hard to read. Partly in reaction to this overconcern with formalism and partly because of the feeling that it is premature, or even not possible, to write formal rules, later studies often merely state in ordinary language what rules are supposed to do. (ix)
Where possible, formal rules are proposed for Kunjen syntax, but in view of their admitted deficiencies, reference should be made to those places in the text itself which 'state in ordinary language what the rules are supposed to do.'

A remark must be made about transformational rule ordering. This has been difficult to establish definitively in many cases. Certain rules obviously precede certain other rules, but some cannot be at all easily placed within the scheme. The following order is not established by conclusive evidence, but is rather an approximation open to revision as the rules of language in general and those of Oykangand in particular are better established.

**Phrase Structure Rules**

**BR 1** \( S \rightarrow (sp) \ S \ (S)^* \)

See also Chapter IV.

**BR 2** \( S \rightarrow M \ P \)

**BR 3** \( P \rightarrow X, D, I \ (A, I, L, PRP, CSL, S, V) \)

See also Chapter V.

**BR 4** \( A, O, D, I \rightarrow NP \ (NP)^* \ (S)^* K \)

**BR 5** \( L, CSL, PRP \rightarrow NP \ (NP)^* \ (S)^* \ K \)

**BR 6** \( NP \rightarrow NP \ (R) S \ (N (N)^* \ (S)^* \ (D) \ (L) \ C/P) \)

These rules are discussed in Chapter VI.

**BR 7** \( M \rightarrow (SA)^* \ (tns) \ (r) \)

See also Chapter IX.
Transformational Rules

DATIVE PROMOTION. This rule transports an adnominal D ultimately to subject position. Discussion of this rule is found in connection with examples (5.51) to (5.56), Chapter V note 2, and with references to the concept of inclusion, under erbe-2 in Chapter X. It may be that DATIVE PROMOTION is actually a special SUBJECT CHOICE rule, since in (5.2) it is the 'promoted' D that becomes the surface subject, rather than the 'original' primary D. If this is the case, the difficulties of example (6.65) may be well on the way to being resolved.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
N & \{X\} & D & Y & K & X \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
1 & 2 & \emptyset & 4 & 5 & 6 & 3 \\
\end{array}
\]

K ADJUNCTION/X COPYING. If Lakoff and Peters' 1966 theory of phrasal conjunction is correct, this rule must precede SUBJECT CHOICE, as suggested in Chapter IV under Primary Conjunction.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
[ & NP_1 & NP_2 & \ldots & NP^n & K & ]_X \\
1 & 2 & 3 & n & n+1 & n+2 & \Rightarrow OBL \\
1 & 1 & 2 & n+1 & n+2 & 1 & 3 & n+1 & n+2 \ldots & 1 & n & n+1 & n+2 & n+2 \\
\end{array}
\]

Note: 3...n may be S rather than NP constituents also, as in appositives and sentences with ilgay, etc.

SUBJECT CHOICE RULES. The conditions on the rules are outlined at the close of Chapter V, and a formulation of the rule given as (6.44) in Chapter VI. This rule is seen as two separate rules in
Chapter X where in the discussion of erbe- 2 a copying rule (I) and a subsequent deletion rule (II) are proposed.

The case postposition of Dative subjects must be deleted.

SUBJECT CHOICE I

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6
\end{array}
\Rightarrow \text{OBL}
\]

SUBJECT CHOICE II

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 4 + 2 & 3 & \emptyset & 5 & 6
\end{array}
\]

EXTRAPOSITION RULE. Vanek 1969 subsumes relativization and pronominalization under the rule which also copes with extraposition. Extraposition appears to affect Oykangand relativization, so the two operations are kept separate. The extraposition rule accounts for relative Ss and also sentences with erbang, idndamay, etc. (at the close of Chapter VI).

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7
\end{array}
\]

INFRAJECTIONS. The tns MOVEMENT rule (9.69) and SA, R MOVEMENT rule (9.71) belong in this class. A structural change is effected by the tns MOVEMENT rule.
PARTIAL REDUPLICATION RULE. Formulated as (10.74), this rule provides the structural description for the Spelling Rule which in turn derives the correct form.

\[ Y \quad C: [+INTENS] (tns) \quad Z \]
\[ 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad \Rightarrow \quad OBL \]
\[ 1 \quad 2 \quad [-INTENS] + 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \]

REFLECTION RULE. A discussion of this is found in Chapter X in connection with (10.31) and other examples, and in Chapter VI (6.46).

\[ NP^r \quad Y \quad [NP^r K] \quad Z \quad V \quad (tns) \]
\[ 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \quad \Rightarrow \quad OBL \]
\[ 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 + 4 \]

EQUI-NP DELETION RULE. This is a rule of almost universal significance, and operates to introduce adjectives, appositional NPs,
sentential genitives and some relative expressions. Discussion of this rule appears in connection with (6.47).

\[
\text{NP}_1 \quad Y \quad (R) \quad Z \quad \text{NP}_1 \quad K \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \Rightarrow \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad \emptyset \quad \emptyset
\]

Obligatory if \( Y = \emptyset \), otherwise optional.

U DELETION RULE. Originally formulated as Agent Deletion (6.48), which is the most usual application of the rule, further discussion is offered early in Chapter VII and also Chapter XI.

\[
Y \quad X: [U] \quad Z \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \Rightarrow \text{OBL} \\
1 \quad \emptyset \quad 3
\]

A,K COPYING RULE. This rule accounts for features of P-relative sentences discussed in Chapter VI. Independent motivation for this rule has not appeared. It operates in much the same manner as the REFLECTION rule, but no means has been found to satisfactorily combine the two rules.

\[
[\text{NP} \quad K]_A \quad Y \quad V \quad \text{tns} \quad K \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \Rightarrow \text{OBL} \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 2 \\
\]

6 must be \( \emptyset \)

REFLEXIVE/RECIPROCAL RULE. The two syntactic types are regarded as products of the one rule, despite the lack of an adequate formulation of this rule. Discussion of this is found under Reciprocal
and Reflexive in Chapter VIII, and under erbe-

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{NP} & \text{Y} & \text{NP} & \text{Z} & \text{V} \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & => & \text{OBL}
\end{array}
\]

(I) 1 2 3: [+reflex] 4 5 + 5: [+reflex]
or (II) 1 2 \emptyset 4 5 + 5: [+reflex]

where \( l = 3 \)

CLASSIFIER PRO-COPY RULE. The introduction of the classifier by

rule (7.5) may possibly be effected by the PRONOMINALIZATION rule

(8.27) in a more sophisticated grammar, with the ordering accounted

for by a separate rule.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Y} & \text{N: [+CL]} & \text{Z} \\
1 & 2 & 3 & => & \text{OBL}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2: [+pro] & +2 & 3
\end{array}
\]

PHRASAL CONJUNCTION is presented as (4.16), but is discussed beyond

Chapter IV under Reciprocal and Reflexive in Chapter VIII.

\[
(X) - Y - (Z), (X) - Y^1 - (Z) \ldots (X) - Y^n (Z) \Rightarrow
\]

\[
(X) - Y \# Y^1 \# \ldots \# Y^n - (Z)
\]

THE PRONOMINAL SUB-CYCLE. The PRONOMINALIZATION rule (8.27) accounts

for gapping, the introduction of classifiers, \texttt{amb} and the personal

pronouns. Personal pronouns so introduced are transported to a posi-

tion following the verb by rule (8.29), and the original NP optionally

deleted by rule (8.21).
PRONOMINALIZATION

Z    NP    W
SD: 1 2 3 =>

(1) GAPPING

Conditions: Z contains NP = 2 (i.e. coreferential NP)
in a conjoined S
SC: 1 Ø 3

(2) CLASSIFIER/amb

Conditions: W or Z contains NP = 2
classifier: NP contains [+CL]
amb: One or more primacy relations is held by the
coreferential NP over 2. The conditions for gapping
are not met.
SC: 1 2 + 2: [+pro] 3

(3) PERSONAL PRONOUN

Condition:
SC: 1 2 + 2: [+pro +pers] 3

PERSONAL PRONOUN COPYING

NP:[+pers +pro] Y V Z
1 2 3 4 => OBL

(I) Ø 2 3 4 1

or, optionally, if 1 is NP, X, S, and Z = Ø

(II) 1 2 3 4 1
### CO-NP DELETION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP</th>
<th>NP:[+pro]</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 =&gt; OBL if 1 is [+CL] and 2 if a classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>∅ OPT otherwise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRONOUN DELETION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>NP:[+pro +pers]</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(It is entirely possible, by the rules of CO-NP DELETION and PRONOUN DELETION, to delete fully specified NPs without being able to 'recover' them—a possibility not permitted within the fabric of transformational theory. That some NPs are completely deleted is clear from some examples of Chapters VIII [8.12] and IX [9.52], [9.14], where the hearer is expected to 'understand' what has been deleted.

Another theoretical problem revolves around the place of the K ADJUNCTION/X COPYING rule mentioned earlier. The appearance of this rule prior to the subject choice rules is necessary again here, where

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP</th>
<th>NP:[+pro]</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

may appear, and be realized by

1ala al ambiy

uncle-AG PR-AG
where the K constituent appears on both NPs. It may be necessary
to recognize K ADJUNCTION as an 'anywhere' rule. In the derivation
of [4.18] from [4.17] there appears evidence that X COPYING is also
an 'anywhere' rule.)

REDUNDANT K DELETION. This appears to be one process, applicable
in several circumstances. Discussion of the deletion of a redun-
dant K is found in Chapters V (5.10), VI (6.31) and X (following
[10.31]). The three SDs accepted as input are rather awkward.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{NP} & \text{K} & A & Y & V & \text{NP: [+pro +pers]} & Z \\
3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & \text{OPT}
\end{array}
\]
where \(3 \neq 7\)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
V \text{ (tns)} & K & Y & \text{OPT} \\
2 & 3 & 4 & 5
\end{array}
\]
where \(K \neq \emptyset\)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{NP} & R & S & K \text{,}_X \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & \text{OBL}
\end{array}
\]

\(4 \Rightarrow \emptyset\)

NEGATIVE FLIP. This rule is justified in Chapter X (10.7) under
the discussion of auxiliaries.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V: [-\text{Adj} -\text{NEG}] & (\text{NP: [+pers]}) & V: [+\text{NEG}] \\
1 & 2 & 3 & \Rightarrow & \text{OBL}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
3 & 1 & 2
\end{array}
\]

NOSE RAZING. This rule deletes the now 'empty' M constituent, and
produces from sentential datives a structure comparable to adnominal
ones for the operation of the GENITIVE rule.
GENITIVE RULE. This is not regarded by Fillmore as a rule at all, but as surface phenomenon associated with the Dative. Inasmuch as the grammar permits a speaker to realize certain Datives as either surface datives or as genitives, a rule giving this choice is incorporated in the grammar.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
[S] & M & \{[P & D] & P & S]\} \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \Rightarrow \text{OBL}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\emptyset & \emptyset & \emptyset & 4 & \emptyset & \emptyset
\end{array}
\]

CASE SUPPORT. This introduces \textit{undam}- as discussed in Chapter V under the Agentive and Dative.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NP:}[+\text{pro} \ +\text{pers}] & \longrightarrow \text{L} \\
\text{NP:}[+\text{pro} \ +\text{pers}] & \longrightarrow \text{D} \\
\text{NP } & \text{G } \longrightarrow \text{X} & \text{OBL except when } X = 0
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{NP } (\}_G \text{ undam- } \}_X
\]

SCRAMBLING RULES. These produce permutations of sentence elements for stylistic measures, such that the 'neutral' SOV order, or other orders established by the rules, are disturbed. Case constituents are not disrupted, of course, nor the sequences of morphemes which make up a word in Oykangand. The rule schema which effects SCRAMBLING has not been explored.
Introduction

This chapter presents the text of a personal narrative about hunting together with the lexicon on which the text is based.

For convenience, the text is segmented into morphemes which are provided with either English glosses or mnemonics. The mnemonics refer to the tables of tenses (Table 9.1) or NP case postpositions (Tables 5.1 to 5.4) which should be consulted for details of morphophonemic change, meaning, etc.

The lexicon is a minimal sketch of the entries necessary to the text, and of the feature assignment rules required. The phonological shape of the entries is specified according to the conventions outlined in Chapter III rather than in a feature matrix. The entries are alphabetically ordered.

Oykangand Text

(1) ERGE-1   ay, oRaŋar ađen undam-ay, "abm aliy eŋ
    say-RPAST I husband my E-DAT person we-2-in try
    kotakot aŋga-nay, elke-nay uwa-nd ey, erk abmb uŋgul
    axe    look for-RFUT return-RFUT west IDIOM there
            = old campsite
abm ogog udna-1 a'y ambul." (2) "ehhe onger
person before camp-RPAST once we-pl-in tomorrow
aliy, Sunday elke-ŋaŋ." (3) aRti-r aliŋ artar, eŋ
we-2-in return-RFUT rise-RPAST we-2-ex morning food
iŋa-r, ilimb erge-1 ay, Barbara-n, elaŋar iŋin undam-ay,
eat-RPAST then say-RPAST I -DAT y.sister his E-DAT
"inaŋ arŋ ogog ąina-ŋamba-1, aliŋ kotakot afa-n
you child here sit-E cause-IIMP we-2-ex axe fetch-E
elke-ŋaŋ uwa-nd." (4) igu-r aliŋ uwa-nd ey, Joe's Lagoon-∅.
return-RFUT west go-RPAST we-2-in west
(5) paddock-iy elka-r aliŋ. (6) uwa-nd igu-r, igu-r,
- at enter-RPAST we-2-ex west go-RPAST
igu-r, uda-1 urmu-r uwa-nd. (7) urmu-r, urmu-r, urmu-r,
dog-AG bark-RPAST west bark-RPAST
ilimb ay erge-1, "abm uŋgul anen urmu-n ey? et uwaŋ
then I say-RPAST person there what bark-RPRES try go
= let's go now
aliy, iŋ ewa-ŋ-ag." (8) iŋŋi-ŋ ay iba-R, ogog-
we-2-in meat see-E-PRP run-RPAST I south r-first
= well ahead
(9) iŋŋi-ŋ ay, iŋŋi-ŋ ay, ilimb ay ewa-1 iŋ udnud
run-RPAST I then I see-RPAST meat male wallaby
amay uyam aŋa-n aRti-nm. (10) ay erge-; "ŋiŋ oyboy
big hand spread-E rise-RCUST I say-RPAST meat wallaby

uda-l aŋ-aŋa-n aliŋan! away! agagwin ari-nay!" (11) il
dog-AG INT-bite-RPRES us-2-in hither quickly hit-RFUT he

uda-l ito-m onelmbman aŋa-r iŋun, oŋdoRay. (12) alŋ adni-y
dog-AG that neck bite-RPAST him for-dead belly up

ambi y unb-unba-nm il ŋ oyboy ito-m iy. (13) eŋ ubaŋŋ
PR INT-roll-RCUST he meat wallaby that again food honey

ewa-l aliŋ, uk aybama-ŋd, (14) "eŋ ubaŋŋ ‘ŋ ow! iyand
see-RPAST we-2-ex tree -on food honey here later

orŋa-nay aliŋ uwa-m elke-ŋ-ŋiy-ar." (15) uwa-nd
chop-RFUT we-2-in west-from return-E-PNP-subj-subj west

igu-r aliŋ ey, og arfaŋ ilg ar alŋa-r. (16) iŋ elkoy
go-RPAST we-2-ex water with at descend-RPAST meat turtle

afa-r ay, uŋIR. (17) uwa-nd igu-r aliŋ ey, erk abmba-ŋ,
fetch-RPAST I two west go-RPAST we-2-ex IDiom-DAT = old campsite

erk ukal "Kapeŋanŋu". (18) oŋgo-m uwa-nd, aŋga-n amba-r
place name this west look-E cause-RPAST

aliŋ, aŋga-n amba-r aliŋ, aŋga-n amba-r aliŋ, ebnandew ilgay
we-2-ex

= meat roasting pit
edndelay. (19) "kotakot ang îndog eŋ ugo gi-ŋ? arŋ completely axe here where indeed leave-RPAST child aŋgunaŋ-d iyame-ŋ amba-ŋm aliŋ, arŋ uym elgoR-iy!"
young-AG play-E cause-RCUST we-2-ex child IDIOM-AG = light-fingered

(20) ina-1 ay, bottle agọga-n amba-r ay, og afa-n-ay,
sit-RPAST I look-E cause-RPAST I water fetch-E-PRP og iđa-r ay. (21) ilimb onder uw agọga-r aliŋ,
water eat-RPAST I then more again look-RPAST we-2-in agọga-r "aŋg ow! araRaŋ adni-m oŋge-n!" (22) afa-r
look-RPAST here cabbage-tree over cover-RPRES fetch-RPAST aliŋ, "uwa-m elke-ŋ aliŋ ow, egŋ ubanŋ-ay ito-ly
we-2-ex west-from return-RINT we-2-in food honey-to there-to
amb." (23) "karey, ay eŋkoR-iy in-ŋ, iŋaŋ egŋ ubanŋ oyta-ny." PR o.k. I shade-in sit-RPAST you food honey cut-RFUT

(24) il igo-ŋr aŋndiy ey, uk ub ayke-ŋ amba-r
he INT-go-RPAST o-man tree trunk turn-around-E cause-RPAST il iŋun, ilimb in almbm ewa-l atub in-ina-ŋ-am.
he it then meat opossum see-RPAST back R-sit-E-PAST

(25) erge-l il aŋun, "inaŋ ey! ŋ almbm in-ina-ŋ aliŋ."
speak-RPAST he me you meat opossum INT-sit-RINT ours-2-in
(26) ay erge-1, "oŋd erk uk-uki-n erb-∅ inaŋ aŋun!"
I say-RPAST INT-IDIOM -RPRES you me = lie

(27) "ιŋan! inaŋ away ol-∅ ip ewa-ŋ-ay!"
true you hither travel-RPRES meat see-E-PRP

(28) olo-1 ay, "ehhe, ip et ayin igøgi-1 uRūŋd-am."
travel-RPAST I meat try if pull-IIMP down-from

(29) igøgi-r alin inun. (30) atub arfi-r ey, ayke-1-ayke-ŋ
pull-RPAST we-2-ex him back hold-RPAST r-turn-around-E
amba-r inun, aŋaŋj il uRūŋd uw elke-ŋ, erk ewa-ŋ
cause-RPAST him NEG he down again return-RCUST place hole-to
ilimb ubman arfi-r inun, ubman arfi-n-∅-iy igøgi-r il, eŋ
then thigh hold-RPAST him thigh hold-E-PNP-subj pull-RPAST he head
urŋa-r inun uk ubu-ŋ, ip albmb it-∅ iy. (31) ip
bump-RPAST him tree trunk-to meat opossum there again meat
ant il umay udna-ŋ, uk ewa-maaŋ udna-ŋ il ip ant.
small he inside lie-RCUST tree hole-in lie-RCUST he meat small

(32) erge-1 ay inun, "ip et ayin ew-∅ it-∅, uk ew it-∅
say-RPAST I him meat try if see-IIMP there tree hole there
et ayin aŋaŋum-i-1 uRūŋd. (33) ip ant iɡo-m em ʊŋgo-1.
try if peep-IIMP down meat small that might there
(34) uk ubmbaR-ŋə oŋgo- m ep aRti-r uk arkaR- iy aŋg tree limb-on this might climb-RPAST tree w.gum-on here adni-y." (35) il erge-l aŋun, "aŋaŋdə, oŋgo- m uRum Ɂ udna-ŋ il." up he say-RPAST me NEG this down lie-RINT he

(36) eloʃ amb ewa-l iŋun, eloʃ ik-iki-n-am, ay erge-1, eyeball PR see-RPAST him eyeball INT-throw-E-PPAST I say-RPAST "iyokerey! arŋ ambotj aŋen undam-aŋ, ak amb! (37) arŋ aŋen owąŋ hooray child small my E-to let PR child my IDIOM = ask for erg-erge-ŋ iŋ abma-ŋ undam-aŋ uŋəjinaŋ." (38) afa-r INT-speak-RCUST meat someone-'s E-DAT yesterday fetch-RPAST aliŋ iŋun iŋ ant iɔ-ᵲ iy. (39) egŋ ubaŋdə oRũa-r, we-2-ex him meat small there again food honey chop-RPAST oʃon-ŋ oriki-r aliŋ egŋ ubaŋd-i�. (40) oʃon-ŋ elke-ŋ grass-to secure-RPAST we-2-ex food honey-INST grass-in return-E amba-r, elke-1 aliŋ ey, il arŋ ambotj iɖiŋdi-r aŋun cause-RPAST return-RPAST we-2-ex he child small run-RPAST me uŋəgeway. (41) "iɔ-ᵲ-m anen algə-a-n inaŋ, mamaŋ? iŋ oʃok, ey?" forward that what carry-RPRES you mother meat cat

(42) "aŋaŋdə, iŋ albmb oŋgo- m onoŋ." (43) "iŋ albmb!" NEG meat opossum this another meat opossum
(44) alɔŋ-alɔŋ adniy amb-a-r il iŋун, "mamaŋ, igenous ant ingday r-belly up cause-RPAST he him mother meat small where

(45) oŋo-m ing onol, əŋtungal ilg afa-r his this meat what-you-call-it pocket with fetch-RPAST

(46) oŋo-m in onol, antjuŋ gal ilg afa-r his this meat what-you-call-it pocket with fetch-RPAST

(47) oŋo-m in onol, antjuŋ gal ilg afa-r his this meat what-you-call-it pocket with fetch-RPAST

Translation. (1) I said to my husband, "We must try to find that axe, we must go back down to where we camped once before."

(2) "O.k., tomorrow—Sunday—we'll go back."

(3) We got up in the morning, cooked food, and then I said to his sister, Barbara, "You keep the children here, we must go back down to fetch our axe."

(4) We went down (5) and into the paddock at Joe's Lagoon. (5) Down we went, down, down, and the dog barked. (7) It barked and barked, and I said, "Who's there for it to bark at? Let's go now; it must see some animal."

(8) So I ran well ahead, south. (9) I ran and
ran, then I saw it—a big male wallaby rising up with his claws outspread. (10) I said, "The dog has bitten a wallaby for us! Come here! Kill it, quick!" (11) The dog bit its neck and killed it. (12) The wallaby rolled about, belly up. (13) Then we saw some wild honey, too, in a tree (variety unknown). (14) "Wild honey! Later we'll chop it out, when we come back." (15) We went down further, and crossed the water at the wild mangroves. (16) I got a turtle, then another. (17) Down we went to the old campsite called "Kapengandhu". (18) Down there we looked about, looked about everywhere—all through the meat roasting pit. (19) "Where did those children leave the axe? Those light-fingered kids of ours were playing with it!" (20) I sat down, found a bottle to fetch water in, and had a drink. (21) Then went back to looking, looking, "Here! The cabbage-tree palm had covered it!" (22) We fetched it, "We should go back now, to there where the wild honey is." (23) "O.k., I will sit in the shade, and you can cut the honey down." (24) The old man went, circled around the tree trunk, then saw the back of an opossum sitting there. (25) He said, "Hey you! There's an opossum here for us!" (26) I said, "You're pulling my leg!" (27) "True! Come and see it." (28) I went—"Hmm, see if you can pull it down." (29) He pulled it, (30) held his back, kept twisting it, but it wouldn't come back down. Then he got hold of its thigh from the hole, and pulled it off, holding its thigh, and bashed the opossum's head on the tree trunk. (31) Its young lay inside a hole in the tree. (32) I said to him, "Can you try and see there, try
and peep down into the hole—there might be some young ones.
(34) Or they might have climbed up into this white gum tree.
(35) He said, "No, it's lying here." (36) He saw its eyeballs
as it blinked. I said, "Hooray! Let's take it back for my kids!
(37) My children pleaded with me for someone else's opossum yes-
terday." (38) He got it, that opossum. (39) We chopped out the
wild honey and put it into grass. (40) In the grass we carried it
home, we returned, and my girl ran forward to me. (41) "What's
that you are carrying, Mum? Cat, eh?" (42) "No, another opossum."
(43) "Opossum!!" (44) She turned it over, belly-up, "Mum, where's
its baby? (45) This one's a—what-do-you-call-it?—it has a
pocket!" my girl said. (46) I in my dress had hidden the little
opossum from her again. (47) Later, the dogs bit it. (48) Yester-
day, when Bobina's children were playing with it.

Lexicon

The view of the lexical subcomponent adopted for this study
is based on work by G. Lakoff 1965 as more recently modified by
Fillmore 1968b and others. Some of the redundancy rules have
already been mentioned in the text, for example

\ [+pro] \Rightarrow \ [+CL] \ (Chapter VII)

and

L may occur optionally in the case
frame of any V (Chapter V).

Others have not yet been discussed. The feature \[-SPEC\] (Chapters
VIII and XI) is relatable to the feature [+pro] on nouns.

\[ [+\text{pro}] \Rightarrow [-\text{SPEC}] \]

In the sample that follows, \([IN], [E\text{G}N], [ABM]\) and other semantically derived features are included—sometimes, as in the case of \(e\text{ga} \ 'head'\) \([IN, ABM]\), as alternate possibilities. Any of these features of course selects \([+CL]\) by a redundancy rule.

Feature assignment rules also include those which determine the value of \([EMPH]\) and \([INTENS]\) and give the features of person \([I, II, III]\) and number \([\text{singular, dual, plural}]\) to nouns. Nouns can be assumed \([-\text{pro}]\) unless otherwise marked.

The empty morph inserted after the first verb stem in instances of complete reduplication \((rE)\) is specified, and the \([+INTENS]\) partial reduplicative process also defined. Verbs are assumed to be obligatorily subject to the Subject Choice Rule II unless otherwise marked. Some verbs of Class 2 are specified with respect to loss of the final syllable with \(-y\).

A few forms, as \(ehhe\) and the vocative \(mamaQ\) are entered as S categories, for want of a more sophisticated analysis. One productive process of the lexicon operates on kin terms \([+\text{kin}]\) such as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{amaQar} & \quad \text{'mother'} \\
(a)\text{mamaQ} & \quad \text{'mother! (vocative)'} \\
\text{amaRñQar} & \quad \text{'my mother'}. 
\end{align*}
\]
Personal pronouns, tense forms, case postpositions and sentence final phonological phenomena such as ow! have been omitted from this lexicon for the sake of simplicity.

Lexical Entries

abma  'person, aborigine'
[+N, [____(S)(D)], [+pro], [+ABM]]

abmba  'swamp'
[+N, [____(S)], [+OG]]

adn abmi- 1  'hide, conceal'
[+V, [A 0 (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)____], [-Adj]] for [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable of
abmi- 1; rE = r

adni-  'upward'
[+N, [____], [+spatial]]

afa- 1  'fetch, get'
[+V, [A 0 (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)____], [-Adj], [-reflex]]¹ for [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = l

agagwin  'quickly'
[+SA, [____V]]

agogga- 1  'find, look for'
[+V, [A 0 (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)____], [-Adj]] for [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = l

adʒiдиy  'old man, elder'
[+N, [____(S)(D)], [ABM, IN], [+animate]]
ak  'let'

[+SA, [___V]]

almbma  'opossum'

[+N, [__(S)], [+IN], [+animate]]

alngα- 1  'carry, bring'

[+V, [A O (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)__], [-Adj]] for

[+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1;

SCII optional

alngα  'belly'

[+N, [__(S)(D)], [ABM, IN]]

alngα- 1  'carry, bring'

[+V, [A O (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)__], [-Adj],

[-reflex]] for [+INTENS] reduplicate first

syllable; rE = 1 or lw

amay  'big, great'

[+V, [O (D)__], [+Adj]]

amba- 1  'cause, happen'2

[+V, [(A) O (D)(S)__(L)]__, [-Adj]] for [+INTENS]

reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1

amboũ  'small'

[+V, [O (D)__], [+Adj]]

anaqumi- 1  'peep, see with difficulty into something'

[+V, [A O (D)(CSL)/(PRP)__], [-Adj]] for

[+INTENS] reduplicate third syllable; r does

not cooccur
anen  'what'
     [+SA, [N__]]
anta  'child, young one'
     [+N, [__(S)(D)], [ABM, IN], [+animate]
anāñj  [NEGATIVE] 'not'
     [+V, [O (D)(S)____]]
ang  'here'
     [+N, [____], [+spatial], [+locative]]
anguñan  'young'
     [+V, [O (D)____(S)], [+Adj]]
ańtangoal  'pocket, corner'
     [+N, [__(S)(D)], [+IN]]
ańda- 1 'spread wide, as of fingers, legs, or nippers of crab'
     [+V, [A 0 (D)(CSL)/(PRP)____], [-Adj]] for [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; r does not cooccur
arāñj  'cabbage tree palm'
     [+N, [__(S)], [+UK]]
arţar  'morning'
     [+N, [__(S)], [-CL]]
arfañ  'tree sp., mangrove'
     [+N, [__(S)], [+UK]]
arfi-1 'hold, grasp'
   [+V, [A O (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)_], [-Adj]] for
   [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = ñ

ari-1 'hit, strike, kill'
   [+V, [A O (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)_], [-Adj]] for
   [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1

arkaR 'tree sp., white gum'
   [+N, [__(S)], [+UK]]

arngu 'child, offspring'
   [+N, [__(S)(D)], [+ABM], [+animate]]

arcli-1 'rise, wake up, climb up'
   [+V, [O (CSL)/(PRP)(S)_], [-Adj]] for [+INTENS]
   reduplicate first syllable; rE = 10

agya-1 'bite' also 'tie up'
   [+V, [A O (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)_], [-Adj]] for
   [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1v

atubu 'back'
   [+N, [__(S)(D)], [ABM, IN]]

away 'hither, this way'
   [+L, [+spatial], [-locative]]

aybama 'tree sp. (variety unknown)'
   [+N, [__(S)], [+UK]]

ayin [QUESTION MARKER]
   [+SA, [__(V)]]
ayke-2 'go around, turn'

[+V, [0 (CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj]] for [+INTENS]
reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1

ebmanđew '(IDIOM) meat roasting pit'

[+N, [___(S)], [-CL]]

eŋ 'try out'

[+SA, [___(ak) V]]

edndelay 'completely, altogether'

[+SA, [___V]]

eга 'head'

[+N, [___(S)(D)], [IN, ABM]]

eгана 'food, vegetables, fruit'

[+N, [___(S)], [+EGN]]

ehhe 'hmm'

[+S]

elaŋar 'younger sister'

[+N, [___(S)(D)], [ABM]]

elgoŋ 'many'

[+V, [0___], [+Adj]]

elka-1 'enter, go into'

[+V, [0 (CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj], [-reflex]] for
[+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1

elke-2 'return, come back'

[+V, [0 (I)(PRP)(S)___], [-Adj], [-reflex]] for
[+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1;
loses final syllable with -v
elkoy 'freshwater turtle, tortoise'
[+N, [\(S\)], [+IN]]

elef 'eyeball'
[+N, [\(S)(D)\)], [ABM, IN]

en\(\text{kor}\) 'shade'
[+N, [\(S\)], [-CL]]

en 'might, indeed'
[+SA, \(\begin{array}{c}
X \\
As
\end{array}\)]

erge\(\text{-2}\) 'speak, talk'
[+V, [O D (I)(PRP)\(\_\)], [-Adj]]\(\text{3}\) for [+INTENS]
reduplicate first syllable; r does not cooccur;
loses final syllable with -y

erk\(\text{ambba}\) '(IDIOM) previous campsite'
[+N, [\(S\)], [-CL]]

erki 'place, time, occasion'
[+N, [\(S\)], [-CL]]

ewa 'mouth, hole'
[+N, [\(S)(D)\)], [ABM, UK, ERK, IN]]

ewa\(\text{-2}\) 'look, see'
[+V, [A O D (I)(CSL)/(PRP)\(\_\)], [-Adj]] for
[+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1;
SCRII optional; loses final syllable with -y

ey [QUESTION MARKER]
[+AS, [S\(\_\)]]
iba-  'south'
    [+L, [___], [+spatial]]

idpan  'truly'
    [+AS, [{X} V] \sim [[[X] V]]]

igogi-1  'pull'
    [+V, [A 0 (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj]] for
    [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = \bar{n}
    or \underline{1}

igu-1  'go, walk, travel'
    [+V, [0 (I)(CSL)/(PRP) S___], [-Adj], [-reflex]]
    for [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = \underline{1}

idja-1  'eat, drink'
    [+V, [A 0 (D)(CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj], [-reflex]]
    for [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = \underline{1}

idndji-1  'run (of vehicle, animal, person water)' also
    'ride in a vehicle'
    [+V, [0 (I)(CSL)/(PRP)(S)___], [-Adj], [-reflex]]
    for [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = \underline{1}

iki-1  'throw' also 'blink'
    [+V, [A 0 (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj]] for
    [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = \underline{1}

ilgay  'together'
    [+V, [0 (D)___], [+Adj]]

ilimb  'then'
    [+sp]
ina- 2  'sit, be sitting'
+V, [0 (CSL)/(PRP)_], [-Adj] for [+INTENS]
reduplicate first syllable; r does not cooccur;
loses final syllable with -v

ipa  'meat, animal, flesh'
+N, [__(S)], [+pro]]

imday  'where (of persons),'
+SA, [N:[+unspec]_]

indo  'where at?'
+SA, [N:[+unspec]_]

ito-  'there'
+N, [___], [+spatial]]

iy  'each, again'
+SA, [X___]

iyalme- 2  'play'
+U, [0 (I)(CSL)/(PRP)_], [-Adj], [-reflex]]
for [+INTENS] reduplicate second syllable;
r + v = iyalmelame-

iyand  'later, soon'
+L, [-spatial]]

iyokerey  'Hooray!'
+S]

karey  'o.k.'
+SA, [__V]]
kawun  'dress (from English gown?)'
        [+N, [___(S)]]

kotakot  'axe (onomatopoeic)'
        [+N, [___(S)]]

mamaŋ  'mother'
        Vocative [+S] (formed from amâŋar)

okmd  erk  uki- 1  '(IDIOM) lie, deceive'
        [+V, [0 (D)(CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj], [+reflex]]
        for [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable of
        uki- 1; rE = \_ 1

okmdoRay  'for dead'
        [+SA, [___V]]

odnge- 1  'cover up, close up'
        [+V, [A 0 (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj]] for
        [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = n

ogo  'water'
        [+N, [___(S)], [+pro]]

ogog  'first, before'
        [+L, [+spatial]]

ola- 2  'travel, go along'
        [+V, [0 (I)(CSL)/(PRP)(S)___], [-Adj]] for
        [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; r does
        not cooccur; loses final syllable with -y

onderR  'tomorrow'
        [+N, [___(S)], [-CL]]
onelbmban  'neck'

[+N, [____(S)], [+IN]]

onder  'more'

[+SA, [____(V)]]

onol  'what-you-call-it?'

[+N, [____]]

onoŋg  'another'

[+V, [____(S)], [+Adj]]

onog-  'here'

[+N, [____], [+spatial], [+location]]

oRaqar  'husband, male cousin'

[+N, [____(S)(D)], [+ABM], [+kin]]

oRgata- 1  'chop, cut as with an axe'

[+V, [A 0 (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)____], [-Adj]] for

[+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1

oriki- 1  'insert, place inside'

[+V, [A 0 (D) I (CSL)/(PRP)____], [-Adj],

[-reflex]] for [+INTENS] reduplicate second

syllable; r does not cooccur

oŋok  'cat'

[+N, [____(S)], [+IN]]

oŋon  'grass sp. (with fine leaves)'

[+N, [____(S)], [+UKAN]]
owâ; ेर- 2  'ask for, plead for'

[+V, [O PRP____], [-Adj]] for [+INTENS]

reduplicate first syllable of ेर- 2;

r does not cooccur; ेर- 2 loses final syllable with -v

oyboy  'wallaby'

[+N, [__(S)], [IN]]

oyelm 'back again, in return, opposite'

[+SA, [(X)____]]

ubaññj 'wild honey'

[+N, [__(S)], [EGN]]

ubman 'thigh, lap'

[+N, [__(S)(D)], [ABM, IN]]

ubmbal 'arm, root of tree'

[+N, [__(S)(D)], [ABM, IN]]

ubu 'trunk (of tree)'

[+N, [__(S)], [UK]]

uda 'dog'

[+N, [__(S)], [-CL]]

udna- 2 'lie down, be lying down'

[+V, [O (CSL)/(PRP)____], [-Adj]] for [+INTENS]

reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1; loses final syllable with -v

udnîw 'large male wallaby'

[+N, [__(S)], [+IN]]
ugŋgay
'forward'
[+SA, [V] / [V]]

ugŋgi-1
'leave, part from, put'
[+V, [A 0 (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj]] for
[+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = ᵃ

udj-iR
'two'
[+V, [O(S)], [+Adj]]

ukal
'name'

[+N, [__(S)(D)], [-CL]]

umay
'inside'
[+L, [+spatial], [+location]]

umba-1
'roll over'
[+V, [0 (CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj], [-reflex]] for
[+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = ᵃ

or ᵐ

uŋgul
'there'
[+L, [+spatial], [+location]]

uŋḏinaŋ
'yesterday'
[+N, [__(S)], [-CL]]

uRumq
'downwards'
[+L, [+spatial], [-location]]

urmu-1
'bark at (Vᵦᵣ)'
[+V, [A 0 (I)(CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj], [-reflex]]
for [+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = ᵃ
urūŋa- 1 'bump, bash, smash'

[+V, [A O (D)(I)(CSL)/(PRP)___], [-Adj]] for

[+INTENS] reduplicate first syllable; rE = 1

uwa 'speech, talk'

[+N, [___(S)(D)], [-CL]]

uwa- 'west'

[+L, [___], [+spatial]]

uyam 'hand, fist, finger, paw'

[+N, [___(S)(D)], [ABM, IN]]

FOOTNOTES

1AfSen erbe- 2 does occur, but with the sense of 'fight, brawl'.

2The 'intransitive' amba- 1 most frequently commands transitive verbs in the embedded S; 'transitive' amba- 1 commands both transitive and intransitive verbs.

3Ergen amba- 1 has a second sense: 'interrogate, ask questions'.
Chapter XIV

OLGOL

Oykangand speakers regard the Olgol dialect as 'really rough'. Olgol speakers, in turn, defend their speech as being 'more deep' or 'more heavy'. In actual fact of course, the two dialects are closely related, sharing a large percentage of the lexical entries, but having slightly different phonological realization rules or exception features, and minor differences in morphology and syntax.

Olgol Syntax

The most obvious syntactic difference between the dialects is the appearance of an following the verb of Olgol. Frequent though this morpheme is, neither the author nor Mrs. Major could divine its function or meaning. It occurs in the accompanying text; in sentences (17), (19), (28) and (30), for example.

As already pointed out, the Purposive Affix and Realis Future tense forms are different. In (14.1) Olgol and Oykangand equivalents are displayed for contrast.

(14.1) OLG: og ava-ng igu-mb aliy, al orğe-ng!
OYK: og afa-naɣ igu-naɣ aliy, al orğe-naɣ!
water get-PRP go-RFUT we-2-in fire wet-PRP
'We'll go and get water to put the fire out!'
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The morphological shape of the PRP case postposition differs in Olgol; presumably the juxtaposition of the n and y following loss of the vowel a has led to the assimilation of the y to g. With one other exception, the noun morphology of Olgol follows closely that of Oykangand. Even those Oykangand stems with exceptional postpositions for various cases show an equivalent form in Olgol, e.g., alkand 'with a spear (INST)', ugnamb 'in the sun' appear in Olgol as algand and ugnamb.

Oykangand ilg is the Comitative postposition, which has an unusual feature in that it does not accept further postpositions (Chapter VI). The Olgol equivalent is the suffix -id, for example, alg id 'with a spear (COM)' (see also text sentence [8]); -id does not share the irregularities of ilg.

The pronouns are identical in both dialects, except that in Olgol the Dative pronouns which become surface datives can optionally appear with an additional final -g.

The verb morphology is rather different in Olgol. There is no Realis Intitative -y in Olgol, and instead the Realis Present is used.

(14.2) OLG: in amaR aŋg udnudnaŋ!
  OYK: in amaR aŋg udnudnay!
    meat brown snake here lie
  'There's a brown snake lying here!'
The Realis Present forms are 1: -n, 2: -ŋ, and Realis Customary 1: -nm, 2: -nm. Comparison with the chart of Oykangand tense forms (Table 9.1) reveals that Ol gol speakers have engaged in a little regularizing by analogy. The Irrealis Potential of Ol gol is -muy; the Irrealis Past is -ōiŋ. The remaining tense morphemes are shared by both dialects.

The rules of Ol gol grammar appear to be identical to those proposed for Oykangand. One discrepancy was noted: Ol gol informants were much less willing to utilize or accept partial reduplication of the verb, although this process was observed to have affected adjectives in the text (sentences [23] and [28]), and also occurs with verbs (14.2). Unlike certain Oykangand verbs, all Ol gol verbs appear with an obligatory tense marker.

A brief account of Ol gol phonology can be found in Sommer 1969. A sample of Ol gol text with translation is included here for comparison with Oykangand.

Ol gol Text

(1) awaR 'aŋyi-r aliŋ, aŋ awa-R, pigipig-əy igu-r

   east hunt-RPAST we-2-ex here east -PRP go-RPAST

   aliŋ. (2) "aliy aŋ awa-R igu-mb ow!" (3) "iyan!"

we-2-ex we-2-in here east go-RFUT yes
(4) aŋyi-mb aliy. (5) aney?" (6) "pigipig-ay aŋŋa-mb hunt-RFUT we-2-in what for -PRP look-RFUT aliy." (7) awa-R igu-r aliŋ ey, New Mission-g. (8) awa-R we-2-in east go-RPAST we-2-ex -to east ilimb aliŋ igu-r ey, Tjelkorow, awa-R ungul og then we-2-ex go-RPAST (place name) east there water adulwaŋ dj-iŋ. (9) "ŋŋ oŋgo-ŋ aŋŋa!" (10) "ŋŋ oŋgo-ŋ Leichhardt tree-with meat here NEG meat here ebmal oŋgo-ŋ uŋdi-r." (11) "ilimb aliy arin elge-mb?" foot here dive-RPAST then we-2-in which way return-RFUT erge-1 il ağun. (12) "uwa-nd aliy elge-ŋ, ermbeR." speak-RPAST he me west we-2-in return-RPRES bank (13) uwa-nd aliŋ elge-1, ud enoŋ aliŋ aŋŋa-nm. west we-2-ex return-RPAST dog another we-2-ex take-RCUST (14) ud anol ungal il, "Boxer"! (15) uy-ŋ il iŋunj, dog what's-its-name? name he start up he him "woowoowoow!" (16) "pigipig ow! pigipig ow!" ayoŋ amba-r aliŋ follow-RPAST we-2-ex uŋŋa-Ra -- khaŋ h! idu-r il ağun. (17) "ayin?" (18) "an north spear-RPAST he me o.k. finish
idu-r aŋ ow!" (19) uŋga-R aŋa-mb il, amuR aryi-r, spear-RPAST (?) north follow-RFUT he creek follow-RPAST evun amb-ambudj adniy. (20) uŋga-R, uŋga-R, uŋga-R, uŋga-Ra -- creek INT-small up north ay iŋun oren iŋdi-nm aŋ, il adun ogōg-ōgōg iŋdi-r oroŋ I him behind run-RCUST (?) he me r-first run-RPAST past uw edne-1 evun aduwi-nm. (21) kat! il iŋun idu-nm. again stand-RPAST creek hold-RCUST he him spear-RCUST (22) "ayin?" uŋgul amb il iŋdi-n ow. (23) "iyaŋ!"
o.k. there PR he run-RPRES yes (24) uŋga-R ey -- og olbm amb-ambudj-iy il uŋdi-r, ḏuR, uy north water INT-small-at he run-RPAST tree aŋalŋaR-iy. (25) og uŋdi-r il udna-1 il og-ol, ud blackberry-at water dive-RPAST he lie-RPAST he water-in dog aŋaŋ il uŋdi-r odnoR amba-n, ardī-ly-ardi-r amb il ours-2-ex he dive-RPAST cool make-RPRES r-rise-RPAST PR he (26) adni-y il ardi-r uyān-g il eli-a-r, "ongo-m obmon il up he rise-RPAST grass-to he enter-RPAST this down he edne-ŋ ow! uyāŋ-ŋ ow!" (27) ay iŋun idu-ŋan. (28) aŋy stand-RPRES grass-in I him spear-IFUT spear
oyal iv-ivurŋ iŋun evaq-ay, iv-ivurŋ. (29) igu-r aŋ, il lancewood INT-sharp it sharp-PRP INT-sharp go-RPAST (?) he ağun ifa-ŋ edne-ŋ, lolaŋ ađen iy. (30) "inaŋ aŋ -- abm me south stand-RPRES o.brother my again you er person inun aša-my!" (31) "ay an idu-n aŋ." (32) igu-r aŋ you bite-IPOT I finish spear-RPRES (?) go-RPAST (?) inun ulgal ey -- idu-r iŋun. (33) amuR ongo-ŋ obmon. him close spear-RPAST him creek here down (34) kat! ayoŋ amba-r ağuna! doğ! doğ! doğ! doctrine! (35) "onder follow-RPAST me more időji-1! (36) onder időji-1! (37) onder időji-1 ow! (38) onder run-IIMP időji-1! (39) onder időji-1 ow! (40) onder időji-1 ow!" (41) adniy up taraŋ időji-r aŋ uy argaR-ay arvi-r iŋ. (42) "ha, abm run-RPAST once tree w.gum-to hold-RPAST (?) person ağun aR aša-r aŋ ow!" (43) il elge-1 obmon uyam-ŋ me no bite-RPAST (?) he return-RPAST down grass-in il ermbe-1, bub. (44) udna-nm uw il. (45) "uŋŋal ayin?" he fall-RPAST lie-RCUST again he now o.k.
(46) "in odendo idu-r aŋ." (47) in odendo idu-r aŋ.
meat dead spear-RPAST (?) meat dead spear-RPAST (?)

(48) "ka! ka! ka! ka!" egọgara-ŋ amba-nm aŋun il.
laugh-E-cause-RCUST me he

(49) udnam a! (50) eya-r alin, udnam. (51) al iṣẹṣa-ṣa-
fat cut-RPAST we-2-ex fat fire heap-RPAST
alin alwun ibmbu-r aŋ. (52) il olvel-y ididi-r. (53) ay
we-2-ex ant-bed dig-RPAST (?) he bark-PRP run-RPAST I

ori aji-r aŋ, eya-r-eya-r aŋ, eliya ọgọgi-r aŋ, ọl
cold cook-RPAST (?) r-cut (?) bone pull-RPAST (?) he = singe hair off

olvel-iq ade-1 al aji-r alin, alwun-ŋ.
bark-with come-RPAST fire cook-RPAST we-2-ex meat-roasting-pit-in

(54) bobobobo odnge-r alin ọw, ina-nm alin. (55) ara-r
cover-RPAST we-2-ex sit-RCUST we-2-ex dig-RPAST
alin, arbm ọgọgi-r alin eya-r-eya-r alin, ilbidu-r,
we-2-ex rib pull-RPAST we-2-ex r-cut-RPAST we-2-ex stab-RPAST
araRaŋ orja-r alin pa të elge-1 alin ọga-man ọd
cabbage-tree cut-RPAST we-2-ex o.k. return-RPAST we-2-ex head-on
uda-nm, alin aryi-γ. (56) olon ọga-nm alin obmon
carry-RCUST we-2-ex home-to hither return-RCUST we-2-ex down
ogo-ly, mission-g.
here-to

Translation. (1) We two went up-river here, we went after pigs. (2) "We'll go up-river!" (3) "Very well, (4) we'll go hunting. (5) But what for?" (6) "We'll go and find a pig." (7) We went up-river to New Mission. (8) Then eastward to Telkorow, east there where the water lies among the Leichhardt trees. (9) "No meat here!" (10) "There are foot tracks here where the pigs went in." (11) "Which way will we go back?" I asked him. (12) "We'll go back westward along the bank." (13) Westward we returned, taking our dog--another one--with us. (14) The dog was called--what's his name?--"Boxer"! (15) He started one up, "Woof, woof, woof!" (16) "A pig! A pig!" we followed on to the north--wham! He speared it for me. (17) "O.k.?" (18) "Yes, I got him!" (19) On to the north he followed, up a small creek. (20) Northward, still northward--I brought up the rear, still running, he ran ahead of me past where we had stood where the creek was. (21) Wham! He speared him. (22) "O.k.?"--there he runs. (23) "Yes!" (24) North again, into a small water-hole he jumped, where the blackberry trees are. (25) Into the water jumped our dog, to lie in the water and cool off, then up again (26) and off into the grass he ran. "It's standing down here! In the grass!" (27) I'll spear it. (28) I made the lancewood spear really sharp. (29) My older brother stood on the south side of the creek from where I was. (30) "You er--it
might bite you!" (31) "I'll spear him alright." (32) I went close and speared it. (33) Down in the creek. (34) Wham! It chased me! Oy! Oy! (35) "Run! (36) Run faster! (37) Faster yet! (38) Still faster! (39) And faster again! (40) Run faster!" (41) I took a running jump at a white gum tree and held on. (42) "It won't bite me now!" (43) It went back down to the grass, and fell over. (44) It lay down. (45) "O.k. now?" (46) "I speared it--it's dead." (47) I had speared it, and it was dead. (48) "Ha! Ha! Ha!" he laughed at me. (49) It was fat! (50) We cut it, and it was fat. (51) We heaped up firewood, and dug up ant-bed, (52) and he ran off for bark, while (53) I singed the hair off, cut it up, and pulled the bones out. He came back with the bark, and we lit the fire in the pit. (54) We covered it over, and sat down. (55) Then we dug it up, pulled out the ribs, butchered them up, cut down some cabbage tree and came back home, carrying it on our heads. (56) We came back down here to the mission.
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