

SESSION #6

2017-11-20

File: FM2-121

### Relativizing P:

- (1a) Aku gitaq kanak (no) padek acong (no)  
 'I saw a/(the) child hit a/(the) dog'  
 -Regular AV construction
- (1b) Aku gitaq **kanak** saq padek acong no  
 'I saw the **child** who hit the dog'  
 -Relativizing **A** in AV
- (1c) Aku gitaq **acong** [saq siq=ne padek siq kanak no]  
 'I saw the **dog** who the child hit'  
 -Relativized **P**, with embedded clause in PV → this is the expected case, according to Victoria
- (1d) Aku gitaq **acong** [saq padek=ne siq kanak no]  
 I saw the **dog** who the child hit  
 -Relativized **P**, with embedded clause in PV-same translation as (1c), just with the A cliticized on the verb instead of siq
- (1e) Aku gitaq **acong** [saq kanak no padek]  
 'I saw the **dog** who the child hit'  
 -Here we have relativized P, with the embedded clause in AV (Peter said this isn't possible in his class paper, but Nisa says this is OK)
- (2a) kamu kaken **buaq** [saq=ne bau siq Udin no]  
 'You ate **the fruit** that Udin picked'  
 -Here fruit is relativized from the embedded clause, which is in PV. Good example of DEM *no* marking the end of the RC
- (2b) Kamu kaken **buaq** saq Udin bau no  
 'You ate **the fruit** that Udin picked'  
 -same translation as (2a), showing here that P can be relativized from an AV embedded clause too  
 -at this point, we can confidently say that P can be relativized from both AV and PV

### Getting into passives in the RC

- (7a) Aku gitaq buku [saq siq=ne bèng murid no (siq guru no)]  
 I saw the book that was given to the student (by the teacher)  
 -The RC is in a PV DOC, and the T is extracted → seen this pattern before

- (7b) Aku gitaq buku no [saq=ne bèng tipaq murid no siq guru no]  
 I saw the book that was given to the student (by the teacher)  
 -The RC here is the IOC equivalent of the one in (7a). Here the T is extracted. Notice that the element tipaq-R comes right after the verb, because the siq-phrase is utterance final. The clitic =ne refers to the teacher
- (8a) Aku gitaq murid [saq te-bèng buku (siq guru no)]  
 -Here R is relativized from a passive RC DOC
- (8b) Aku gitaq murid [saq tipaq=ne te-bèng buku no (siq guru no)]  
 I saw the student to whom the book was given (by the teacher)  
 -This has an RC with an IOC equivalent of (8a). Again, the R is extracted from a passive RC. Here =ne refers to the book, which is interesting. Here's my confusion: the tipaq-phrase moves to the front of the RC when the R is extracted ... but I'm not sure why tipaq takes a clitic at all

Aku gitaq semamaq=bi saq tipaq=m te-bèng kamu

\*'I saw your husband to whom you were given'  
 -pragmatically weird, and grammatically wrong

### Looking closer at tipaq: Is it a preposition, verb, or what?

- (3a) Ne tipaq=ku  
 Here tipaq=1  
 'I stop here/ I stay here (for a while)'  
 -no predicate-like element in the clause other than tipaq
- (3b) Mbe tipaq=bi  
 Where tipaq=you.FEM  
 'Where did you stop/stay (for a while)?'
- (4a) Mbe laiq  
 Where go  
 'Where are you going?'
- (4b) Mbe laiq=ne te-tipaq-an  
 Where go=3 PASS-tipaq-  
 'Where is it addressed to?'  
 -Nisa says =ne is referring to 'it', so in this case the P that is promoted to the subject position by passivization. Not sure if -an in APPL, BEN, or what
- (4c) Mbe aning=ne te-tipaq-an  
 'Where is it addressed to?'  
 -ne is referring to 'it'

-Nisa says *aning* is more Ampenan way to say 'go'. This construction is syntactically identical to (4b)

(5) Mbe te-aning

'Where are we going'

-Here, Nisa says the interpretation is that the te- is the 1.PL clitic, not the PASS prefix

(6) buah ne te-tipaq-an jok kamu  
fruit DEM PASS-to-APPL to 2

'The fruit is addressed to you'

-Nisa says this construction is "not common, but it's really not bad at all" → so grammatical but dispreferred