

SEMAIAN 11

TOPICS IN DESCRIPTIVE  
AUSTRONESIAN LINGUISTICS

edited by

Ger .P. Reesink

Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië  
Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden  
1993

SEMAIAN is een serie publikaties van de Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië van de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden.

Met deze serie wil de Vakgroep een extra kanaal creëren waardoor ook minder gangbare teksten, die op enigerlei wijze betrekking hebben op Zuidoost-Azië, kunnen worden gepubliceerd.

Deze serie publikaties is totstandgekomen met financiële steun van het Indonesian Linguistics Development Project (ILDEP).

Redactieraad: B. Arps, M.J. Kok, W. van der Molen, W.A.L. Stokhof.

Alle correspondentie betreffende SEMAIAN, inclusief bestellingen en abonnementen, is te richten aan: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden.

CIP-GEGEVENS KONINKLIJKE BIBLIOTHEEK, DEN HAAG

Ger P. Reesink

Topics in descriptive Austronesian linguistics – Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden. – (Semaian, ISSN 0924-4840 ; 11)

Met lit.opg.

ISBN 90-73084-12-1

Trefw.: Austronesische talen / Linguïstiek.

© copyright Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië. Leiden, 1994.

Behoudens uitzondering door de wet gesteld mag zonder schriftelijke toestemming van de rechthebbende(n) op het auteursrecht niets uit deze uitgave worden verveelvoudigd en/of openbaar gemaakt door middel van druk, fotocopie, microfilm of anderszins, hetgeen ook van toepassing is op de gehele of gedeeltelijke bewerking. De uitgever is met uitsluiting van ieder ander gerechtigd de door derden verschuldigde vergoedingen van kopiëren, als bedoeld in artikel 17 lid 2, Auteurswet 1912 en in het K.B. van 20 juni 1974 (Stb. 351) ex-artikel 16b Auteurswet 1912, te innen en/of daartoe in en buiten rechte op te treden.

Save exceptions stated by the law no part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or other means, included a complete or partial transcription, without the prior written permission of the publisher. Only the publisher is qualified to collect the dues indebted by others for copying.

## CONTENTS

Introduction <i>Ger P. Reesink</i>	vii
1. The semantics of irrealis in Austronesian languages of Papua New Guinea. Across-linguistic study <i>Robert D. Bugenhagen</i>	1
2. Describing interclausal relations in Takia <i>Malcolm D. Ross</i>	40
3. These 'Procrustean feelings... Some of my problems in describing Kilivila <i>Gunter Senft</i>	86
4. On determiners in the Leti of Tutukei (Leti, Maluku Tenggara, <i>Aone van Engelenhoven</i>	106
5. Notes on verbs in Dawanese <i>H. Steinhauer</i>	130
6. Verbal inflection in Indonesian <i>Jan E. Voskuil</i>	159
7. Distinguishing homonymic word forms in Indonesian <i>Waruno Mahdi</i>	181
8. Why roots add the affixes with which they occur. A study of Tagalog and Indonesian adjective formations <i>John U. Wolff</i>	217
9. Factors influencing comparison of Sundanese, Javanese, Madurese, and Balinese <i>Bambang Kaswanti Purwo</i>	245

## DESCRIBING INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS IN TAKIA

Malcolm D. Ross\*

*1. Introduction*

Takia is an Oceanic Austronesian language<sup>1</sup> spoken on Karkar and Bagabag, volcanic islands about twenty kilometres off the north coast of mainland Papua New Guinea. Karkar lies about fifty kilometres due north of the town of Madang, Bagabag about fifty-five kilometres northeast of that town. Takia is also spoken in two mainland coastal villages. However, most of the fifteen thousand or so Takia speakers live on the southern half of Karkar on the narrow coastal strip and the lower slopes of the volcano. Karkar forms an ellipse about twenty kilometres from east to west and twenty-five from north to south.

Takia is heavily papuanized in its grammatical structure (Ross 1987). This may be due in part to the fact that the northern half of Karkar is occupied by speakers of Waskia, a Papuan language.<sup>2</sup> Although Takia speak-

\*I am very grateful to Bob Bugenhagen, Andrew Pawley, Bruce Waters and Arnfinn Vonen for their careful comments on earlier drafts of this article. Institutional support for the research reported here was provided by the Department of Linguistics in the Research School of Pacific Studies at the Australian National University.

<sup>1</sup>More precisely, Takia belongs to the Bel family of the North New Guinea cluster of Western Oceanic languages. See Ross (1988) for explanation of these terms and justification of the subgrouping.

<sup>2</sup>The immediate genetic relationships of Waskia are unclear. Z'graggen (1975) places it with several nearby mainland coastal languages in the Isumrud Stock, but, as Foley has pointed out, the bases of many putative Papuan groupings are rather shaky, and Foley does not list the Isumrud Stock among his "major Papuan language families" (Foley 1986:206-214, 229-245). Inspection of Z'graggen's word lists for the area suggests an obviously close relationship only with Korak, on the mainland coast directly to the west

ers claim to have had little contact with their northern neighbours for a period of indefinite length prior to European contact, the fact that the Takia and Waskia seem to form an ethnographic unit (McSwain 1977) suggests that there must have been significant contact and probable bilingualism at some time in the past, intense enough to papuanize the structure of an Austronesian ancestor of Takia.<sup>1</sup>

This article is not directly concerned with the history of Takia, however, although the part of the language to be discussed here – its interclausal relations – probably owes much to papuanization. Instead I am concerned with the fact that when I set out to gain some knowledge of the Takia language, I found that recording its lexicon and analyzing its morphosyntax left me a very long way from being able to use the language. Of course, this is to some degree the situation for any language learner, but it seems to me that what I need to know in order to speak Takia in a way which starts to approach natively use goes far beyond what a linguist would traditionally record in describing a language – and this 'margin of ignorance' is greater for Takia than for European languages (including non-Indo-European Hungarian) or for numerous other Oceanic Austronesian languages. I will limit myself here to some aspects of what I would need to know (and to control) in order to produce a piece of monologue discourse – a narrative or a description of a procedure – in Takia.<sup>2</sup> At present, if I were to tell a story in Takia, it is possible (although very unlikely) that it would be perfectly grammatical – but it would certainly not be natively like because, as we shall see, Takia speakers construe relations between events rather differently from English speakers. Before turning to Takia discourse, however, I would like to relate the matter of construing reality to the theoretical construct of 'content substance'.

of Waskia (a relationship recognised by Z'graggen as the "Kowan family"; Z'graggen 1980).

<sup>1</sup>The only descriptive work on Takia is Ross [forthcoming], which sketches the phonology and a few aspects of morphosyntax. A more extensive but unpublished sketch of the latter is Rehburg and Tuominen [n.d.], which, however, leaves many questions unanswered. A published Waskia grammar sketch is provided by Ross with Paol (1978), and this is supplemented by unpublished papers by Barker and Lee (1980a, 1980b, 1987). There is a published Waskia dictionary compiled by Barker and Lee (1985).

<sup>2</sup>The data for this work consists of texts which I recorded and transcribed during visits to Karkar in 1987 and 1988.

## 2. Content substance

The 'content substance' of a language is the sum of the conventional ways in which its speakers 'construe reality'. The term 'content substance' is taken from Grace (1981:24) and Hjelmslev (1961:52), whilst the phrase 'construe reality' is implicit in the title of Grace's book *The linguistic construction of reality* (1987). Pawley writes that

[...] even the most descriptive things we say, the 'just-the-bare-facts' reports of events and situations, are of necessity caricatures, extremely simplified sketches or interpretations. When people utter a sentence that purports to describe an event they have witnessed, they do not (and cannot) describe everything that happened in an objective and exhaustive manner. They must *put a construction* on what they observed. [Pawley's emphasis] (Pawley 1991:342)

For example, in a paper entitled 'Encoding events in Kalam and English', Pawley (1987) shows how speakers of Kalam (a Papuan language of the Papua New Guinea Highlands) construe events with much greater explicitness than speakers of English. Where an English speaker might talk about 'hunting game', a Kalam speaker construes the 'same' event sequence as a conventionalized content substance which more or less obligatorily includes going to the scene of action, killing game, bringing it to camp/home, cooking it and eating it.

It follows from this that if speakers of different languages observe the same continuum of activity through time, they may construe those events differently, and that these differences are not simply differences between individual speakers, but differences between the conventions of the two languages with regard to the ways they construe particular kinds of events. A blatant example occurs in one of my Takia texts, where S., an old man approaching ninety, tells his life story from the day he went off to German mission school (presumably just before the first World War) down to the present. His narrative is almost completely devoid of reference to dates and places – to a degree which is quite disquieting for a western listener – and his western-educated grandson M. interrupts him several times: 'When was that, grandpa?' 'Where was that plantation, grandpa?' M.'s concern is that when S.'s story is written down for pos-

terity, it will be done 'properly', that is, construed with the dates and places required by western readers. But S. construes his life story as a series instalments, each consisting of experiences which have further prepared him for life and of relationships with people from whom he has learned. Placing these in history and geography is of little interest to him, although his answers to M.'s questions show that he *can* place them if he wants to.

Similarly, when my village sister explains how to make *furoŋ*, a pudding made from canarium nuts, her account contains no ordinal indicators like 'first', 'second', 'finally' and none of the impersonality of a recipe book. Instead, she introduces references to people to illustrate the cultural significance of *furoŋ* (see [2] for an example).

The content substance of a language bears no direct relationship to that language's lexical forms or morphosyntax. Languages which are genetically unrelated and which have unrelated lexical forms and quite different morphosyntactic systems may (as the result of contact between their speakers) have similar content substance, as Thurston (1987) has reported from north-western New Britain. Here a Papuan language, Anêm,<sup>1</sup> and several Oceanic Austronesian languages show convergence in content substance, but considerable differences in morphosyntax. This is illustrated in this example from Anêm and Austronesian Lusi (Thurston 1987:69):<sup>2</sup>

- (1) Anêm: *Uas gox o-mên da-t*  
 Tobacco some IMP:S:3s-come IMP:S:1s-O:3s<sup>3</sup>
- Lusi: *Uasi eta i-nama ŋ-ani*  
 Tobacco some S:3s-come S:1s-eat

'Hand me some tobacco to smoke.'

In both languages the content substance is roughly that which might be encoded in an English rendering like 'let some tobacco come (and) I will eat it'. This is quite unlike the construction of reality encoded in the free English gloss.

<sup>1</sup>The term 'Papuan' covers a number of genetically unrelated language families in Melanesia, and Anêm is not related to Waskia.

<sup>2</sup>See for abbreviations p. 82

<sup>3</sup>The verb 'eat' in Anêm has no segmentable stem (Thurston 1987:57).

### 3. *Takia* monologue discourse

If *Takia* speakers construe events differently from English speakers, then it is possible that they will construe the relations between those events differently too. The usual vehicle for expressing a conceptual event is a clause, and the relations between events are expressed by means of various interclausal devices. It is to these interclausal devices and the content substance they express that I now turn. Data are mostly from monologue discourse. Most of the material in my *Takia* texts is narrative or procedural, and so the majority of the events construed in them are in various kinds of sequential relation.<sup>1</sup>

#### 3.1 *Takia* clauses

Formally, *Takia* clauses fall into the three categories described by Foley (1986:175-205) for Papuan languages:

1. independent clauses, fully marked for aspect and mood and capable of occurring alone;
2. coordinate-dependent clauses, incompletely marked for aspect and mood and participating in clause chains consisting of one or more coordinate-dependent clauses and a final independent clause whose marking has the whole chain in its scope;
3. subordinate-dependent clauses, which in form are independent clauses with an added morpheme and which either occupy a noun phrase slot or serve as a relative clause.

I will follow Foley in referring to 1, 2 and 3 respectively as independent, dependent and subordinate clauses. A notable feature of this division is that it includes nothing structurally equivalent to English 'adverbial clauses' (time, place, condition, reason etc.); their functions are covered by dependent and subordinate (noun) clauses in *Takia*.

<sup>1</sup>One text in the corpus is a reanalysis of one transcribed by Rehburg and Tuominen ([n.d.]). The remainder I recorded, transcribed and analyzed myself.

### 3.2 Clause-chaining

Example (2) provides a nice illustration of a chain of six dependent clauses and an independent clause. The speaker is explaining how canarium nuts are dried.<sup>1</sup>

(2) FU 23

a. *Ago =p parapar =na midiri =p yen =do=p*  
*Ago=pe parapar =na mi -diri =pe i -en =do=pe*  
 PRO=ID platform =PP:at S:1EP -put -ID S:3s-sleep =CT=ID

*teik wao =p Ø-ma =na =p umul =do=p*  
*tei -k u -ao=pe Ø-mado -na =pe u -mul =do=pe*  
 brother-P:1s S:2s-go=ID S:2s-stay -DUR -ID S:2s-return =CT=ID

*man aŋar parapar =na yen =do=p ule =wa.*  
*man aŋar parapar =na i -en =do=pe u -le =wa*  
 THM canarium platform =PP:at S:3s -sleep =CT=ID S:2s -see =IRR

'Then we will put it on the smoke bed, and it will stay, and, my brother, you will go and stay [away] for a while, and when you return, you will see canarium here on the platform.'

b. *Ago=p parapar =na midiri=p*  
 Then we will put it on the smoke bed

*yen=do=p*  
 it will stay

*teik wao=p*  
 my brother, you will go

*Ø-ma=na =p*  
 stay [away] for a while

<sup>1</sup>In text examples, the first line is a phonemic transcription, the second a morpheme-by-morpheme analysis (i.e. an 'undoing' of morphophonemic processes), the third a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss, the fourth in some cases a clause by clause gloss (where <...> signifies embedding), whilst a free English translation is given below. The symbol /ŋ/ is used for the velar nasal, /Ø/ for a zero morpheme, an equals sign (=) indicates that an enclitic follows, and hyphens (-) indicate other morpheme breaks. A backslash (\) indicates a hesitation. The code at the top of an example refers to its source in the text corpus. If there is no code, the example is drawn from my fieldnotes.

*umul=do=p man*  
when you return

*agar parapar=na yen=do=p*  
the canarium will lie on the platform

*ule=wa*  
you will see it

The six dependent clauses describe a sequence of actions. Each clause has the potential structure Subject–Object–Verb or Object–Subject–Verb, but many clauses contain no noun phrases, as every verb has a prefix indicating the person and number of the subject, and transitives often have a suffix indicating the same for the object. Each clause ends with the irrealis dependent (ID) enclitic =*pe*, which gives an incomplete specification of mood. The full specification is provided by the enclitic =*wa* ‘irrealis independent’ (IRR) on the final clause, which clarifies that all the clauses in the chain are to be interpreted as future. This is not quite such an academic consideration as it might seem. In (3), which happens to have as its dependent clause the same clause as the first in (2), the final enclitic =*da* ‘imperfective’ (IMPF) shows that the whole chain is to be interpreted as the generalized habitual, typical of procedures.

(3) FU 4

*Ago =p, parapar =na midiri =p kalam sikis igos =da.*  
*Ago =pe parapar =na mi -diri =pe kalam sikis i -gos =da*  
PRO =ID platform =PP:at S:1EP-put =ID moon six S:3s-dry =IMPF  
we put it on the platform it dries for six months

‘Then we put them on the smoke bed and they dry for six months.’

Takia clause chaining is essentially the same as that described for Papuan languages by Foley (1986:175-198) and by Longacre (1972), who calls dependent and independent clauses and their verbs ‘medial’ and ‘final’ respectively. Foley and Van Valin (1984:256-263) use the term ‘co-subordination’ to describe the relationship between dependent clauses and an independent clause. Whilst a subordinate clause is both dependent on an independent clause *and* embedded in it, a co-subordinate (our ‘dependent’) clause is dependent on an independent clause for its full aspect and mood

specification, but not embedded within it. The term ‘co-subordinate’ attempts to catch the fact that these chained clauses are both dependent on and, in a sense, coordinate with the chain-final independent clause.

In the literature it is often assumed that clause-chaining entails the marking of switch-reference on dependent clauses. However, although this is a widespread feature of clause-chaining languages, it is not an essential one. Two members of the Papuan Chimbu family, Golin and Sinasina, have clause-chaining but no switch-reference (John Roberts, personal communication), and Takia has had no need to develop switch-reference devices, since it has inherited the Oceanic practice of marking the person and number of the subject by a prefix on every verb, e.g. in (2) *mi-* S:1EP, *i-* S:3s, *u-* and zero S:2s.

### 3.3 Aspect and mood enclitics

Every Takia clause ends in a predicate, which may be a verb phrase, an adjective phrase, a noun phrase, a locative phrase, or a temporal phrase. Every predicate is followed by one or more enclitics marking various features of aspect and mood, except for imperative predicates and, in some idiolects, realis independent predicates. These enclitics are listed in table 1, which should be read as follows: a predicate is followed by one or no enclitic in the slot ASPECT<sub>1</sub> and, if the predicate is dependent, in the slots ASPECT<sub>2</sub>, and ASPECT<sub>3</sub>, and must also be followed by one of the MOOD enclitics (apart from the imperative and realis independent exceptions just mentioned).

The ASPECT<sub>1</sub> paradigm occurs on both dependent and independent predicates.<sup>1</sup> In general, the ASPECT<sub>1</sub> enclitics occur insufficiently often to make clear statements about their co-occurrence with the other enclitic paradigms. All combinations of dependent ASPECT<sub>2</sub>, ASPECT<sub>3</sub> and MOOD enclitics in table 1 have been found except =*gu=de*, =*do=gu=de*, =*do=ta=de*. The non-occurrence of combinations which include =*gu=de* is

<sup>1</sup>The tabulation of ASPECT<sub>1</sub> enclitics is probably an oversimplification, as in the idiolect of one of my informants the sequence =*se=na* =FREQ=DUR is possible, i.e. this slot should probably be divided into two. One more ASPECT<sub>1</sub> enclitic has been found, namely =*og*= ‘incomplete’, which has so far been found only on dependent predicates.

Table 1: Aspect and mood enclitics in Takia.

ASPECT <sub>1</sub>	ASPECT <sub>2</sub>	ASPECT <sub>3</sub>	MOOD
DEPENDENT			
	=“=	=“=	=go realis dependent RD
=“=	=do= continuative CT	=gu= completive CP	=pe irrealis dependent ID
=na= durative DUR		=ta= reason REAS	=de loose dependent LD
=se= frequentative FREQ			
INDEPENDENT			
=la= terminative TERM			=“= imperative
=o= intentive INT	=“=	=“=	=ya= (realis) perfective independent PF
			=wa irrealis (perfective) independent IRR
			=da imperfective independent IMPF

not surprising, as the two enclitics are functionally quite similar. The combination =do=de has been found only attached to the pro-clausal *ago*, i.e. *ago=do=de*. The following combinations do occur, and some of them play an important role in Takia discourse: =go, =pe, =de, =gu=go, =gu=pe, =do=go, =do=pe, =do=gu=go, =do=gu=pe, =ta=go, =ta=pe, =ta=de, =do=ta=go, =do=ta=pe.

As the labels of the enclitics in the MOOD paradigms indicate, some of these also have aspectual meanings. Whereas =go ‘realis dependent’ and =pe ‘irrealis dependent’ express only mood, their most obvious sentence-final equivalents, =ya and =wa, also have apparent overtones of aspect,

whilst =da ‘imperfective’ is exclusively aspectual. These features are roughly summarized in (4):

	INDEPENDENT		DEPENDENT
	PERFECTIVE	IMPERFECTIVE	
REALIS	=ya	=da	=go
IRREALIS	=wa	=da	=pe

An irrealis clause chain always has =pe sentence-medially, but may have either =wa or =da sentence-finally, as we saw in (2) and (3). The enclitic =da (which also occurs in realis chains) marks the events in an irrealis chain as habitual and commonly occurs in the description of processes. Its characterization as ‘imperfective’ here is therefore justified.

The tabulation in (4) is a somewhat unsatisfactory approximation, however. It implies that, in contrast with =da, the enclitic =wa is characterized as ‘perfective’. This is not true. The enclitic =wa usually marks the events of the chain as occurring in the future or hypothetically, and usually on a single occasion. However, as the discussion in connection with (18) indicates, =wa is sometimes also used for non-future, habitual events. That is, whilst we can appropriately characterize it as ‘irrealis’, the label ‘perfective’ does not fit. We can capture this by borrowing from phonology the device of underspecification. Thus in (5), =da is specified as ‘imperfective’, where =wa has no specification; and =wa is specified as ‘irrealis’, where =da has no specification.

	=ya	=wa	=da	=go	=pe
DEPENDENT				+	+
IRREALIS		+			+
IMPERFECTIVE			+		

The implication of underspecification here is that, other things being equal, a morpheme is interpreted as expressing the negative pole of a feature for which it is unspecified. For example, =wa is normally [–IMPERFECTIVE], i.e. expresses perfectivity. However, its lack of specification in (5) indicates that this is not an essential component of its meaning but rather the result of implied contrast with imperfective =da: there are contexts in which =wa is used to express imperfectivity.

The reader will note that (5) entails certain other decisions. The dependent enclitics are specified as such, whilst the independent enclitics are left unspecified. As we see in section 3.3.3, the independent enclitics are sometimes used in an environment where we would expect a dependent enclitic, but the reverse is never true.

The enclitic =*ya* remains completely unspecified in (5), i.e. it is the unmarked choice. A realis clause chain usually has =*go* sentence-medially (occasionally =*de*), but may have either =*ya* or =*da* sentence-finally. If the predicate is active (as opposed to stative), =*ya* marks the event as completed before the time of speech (*ɲani=ya* 'I ate/have eaten') and =*da* 'imperfective' marks it as ongoing at the time of speech (*ɲani=da* 'I am eating'). But if the predicate is stative, =*ya* marks the state as prevailing at (or before) the time of speech (*oŋ uya=ya* 'you are well'), whereas =*da* marks the state as coming into being (*oŋ uya=da* 'you are getting well'). This implies that =*ya* usually expresses perfectivity. However, =*ya* may also co-occur with =*pe*, expressing *habitual* action in the past, and this habitual usage suggests that (like =*wa*) perfectivity is not an essential component of the meaning of =*ya*. At the same time, its co-occurrence with irrealis =*pe* suggests that =*ya* is not inevitably used to express realis, i.e. that it is also unspecified with regard to the realis/irrealis divide.

Because the independent (sentence-final) MOOD forms do not correspond exactly in distribution with =*go* realis dependent and =*pe* irrealis dependent, it is simpler – if imprecise – to mark each with the most salient feature of its meaning: hence =*wa* irrealis and =*da* imperfective. I label =*ya* as perfective even though (5) indicates that this is not a proper specification, since perfectivity is implicit in most of the predicates to which =*ya* is attached.

### 3.3.1 =*go* 'realis dependent' and =*pe* 'irrealis dependent'

Usage of the MOOD enclitics is not difficult for a European learner to master (provided that s/he can cope with the concept of clause-chaining). The dependent enclitics =*go* realis dependent and =*pe* irrealis dependent occur far more frequently than =*de* loose dependent, and when they occur without ASPECT enclitics they are the unmarked choice for forming

clause chains. Normally the relation between events joined by =*go* or =*pe* is one of temporal sequence, as in (2). But this sequence is not implicit in the enclitics themselves, which simply have the function of joining events which are conceived as closely related. There is a rule in Takia that sequential events within a clause chain must be expressed in the sequence in which they occur, and sequence is therefore inferred by the hearer on the basis of this rule. There are occasions when some of the events in a chain are not temporally sequential. In (6), where E. describes how he came to be a paraplegic, there are just two chains. The first has one dependent clause and one independent clause, the second has eleven dependent clauses and one independent clause. The independent clause of the first chain, 'I broke the bones of my body', provides the introduction for the first three dependent clauses of the second chain, which enumerate the damage to E.'s body. It is clear by inference that the damage was simultaneous, not sequential, but the instances of =*go* which join these clauses imply only a close relation between them. The rest of the events in the chain, again by inference, are sequential.

- (6) KE 7
- |               |     |                              |                           |
|---------------|-----|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>ɲadu</i>   | =g, | <i>tinig</i>                 | <i>tatu ɲulusuni</i> .    |
| <i>ɲa -du</i> | =go | <i>ini-g</i>                 | <i>tatu ɲu -lusuni =∅</i> |
| S:1s -descend | =RD | skin-P:1s                    | bone S:1s-break =PF       |
| I fell        |     | I broke the bones of my body |                           |
- 
- |                 |                   |     |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----|
| <i>ɲeg</i>      | <i>ɲulusuni</i>   | =g, |
| <i>ɲe -g</i>    | <i>ɲu -lusuni</i> | =go |
| leg-P:1s        | S:1s-break        | =RD |
| I broke my legs |                   |     |
- 
- |                     |                        |     |
|---------------------|------------------------|-----|
| <i>patug</i>        | <i>tatu ɲulusuni</i>   | =g, |
| <i>patu-g</i>       | <i>tatu ɲu -lusuni</i> | =go |
| back-P:1s           | bone S:1s-break        | =RD |
| I broke my backbone |                        |     |
- 
- |                 |               |        |                 |                  |
|-----------------|---------------|--------|-----------------|------------------|
| <i>tijaeg</i>   | <i>ilon</i>   | =lo    | <i>melmel</i>   | <i>aenta =da</i> |
| <i>tijaeg-g</i> | <i>ilo -n</i> | =lo    | <i>mel -mel</i> | <i>aenta da</i>  |
| guts -P:1s      | inside-P:3s   | =PP:in | thing -thing    | some PP:COM      |



*dam ipit injini =g*

*dam i-pitijini =go*

also S:3s-spoil =RD

some of the things inside my body were also spoiled

*dago=g dijiliag [=g] aossik =lo dupou =g,*

*dago=go di -ijili-ag=go aossik =lo du -pou =go*

PRO =RD S:3p-get -O:1s hospital =PP:in S:3p -come =RD

they took me to the hospital

*dokta Gaobin san ijai disalim =go,*

*dokta Gaobin sa -n ijai di -salim =go*

doctor Gaobin POSS-P:3s D:1s S:3p-send -RD

the Gaubin doctor sent me

*Madag aossik =lo ijao =g,*

*Madag aossik lo ij -ao =go*

Madang hospital PP:in S:1s-go =RD

I went to the Madang hospital

*ago aossik an =lo dokta ijai sag tinig*

*ago aossik an =lo dokta ijai sa -g tini-g*

PRO hospital DM2 =PP in doctor D:1s POSS-P:1s skin-P:1s

*en ikubune =g,*

*en i -kubune =go*

DM1 S:3s -fix =RD

at that hospital the doctors patched up this body of mine

*fon Nowemba seken wik, 83 Nowemba seken wik*

*fo -n Nowemba seken wik 83 Nowemba seken wik*

base-P:3s November second week 83 November second week

*an ijai ijumul =go*

*an ijai ij -mul =go*

DM2 D:1s S:1s -return-RD

in the second week of November 1983 I came back

*Gaobin =na ijupalu =g, wod 2=lo ijuma =g,*

*Gaobin na ij -palu =go wod 2=lo ij -mado =go*

Gaubin PP:at S:1s-come =RD ward 2=PP:in S:1s -stay =RD

I came to Gaubin

I stayed in Ward 2

*dokta ijai isalim =go wod 8 ijadu.*

*dokta ijai i -salim =go wod 8 ij -du =Ø*

doctor D:1s S:3s-send =RD ward 8 S:1s-descend =PF

the doctor sent me

I went down to Ward 8

'I fell, and I broke the bones of my body. I broke my legs, I broke my backbone, and some of the things inside my body were also spoiled, so they took me to the hospital, and the Gaubin doctor sent me to the Madang hospital, and at that hospital the doctors patched up this body of mine, and in the second week of November 1983 I came back and arrived at Gaubin, and stayed in Ward 2, then the doctor sent me down to Ward 8.'

Both (2) and (3) begin with the word *ago=pe*, which provides linkage to the events of the preceding chain. The morpheme *ago* is a member of the set of manner deictics *igo* 'in this way', *ago* 'thus', 'in that way', and *ugo* 'in yonder way'. However, as the least marked member of the set, *ago* serves as a pro-clausal, i.e. a pro-form standing in place of a clause. A brief excursus will help to clarify this. Takia, like many Papua New Guinea languages, uses recapitulation (often called tail-head linkage). Foley writes:

When a sentence is terminated by an independent verb, the next sentence often begins with a subordinate clause recapitulating the information of the last clause of the previous sentence. This information was of course asserted in the previous clause, and is now backgrounded, but the recapitulating subordinate clause provides a linkage between the previously asserted information and the new information to be asserted in its own sentence. (Foley 1986:200)

Recapitulation in Takia works in the way Foley describes, except that the recapitulating clause is dependent, not subordinate. In (7), drawn from an account of marriage preparations, *di-gi-ai=go* is a classic case of Takia recapitulation.

(7) MA 10-11

... *tamol inantaman an dumul =go*

... *tamol ina -n -tama -n an du -mul -go*

... man mother -P:3s-father -P:3s DM2 S:3p-return -RD

the boy's parents returned

*gai adi digiai.*  
*gai a -di di -gi -ai*  
 uncle D2-P:3p S:3p-call-O:3p  
 they called his uncles together

*Digiai =go dadi dikibiai.*  
*Di -gi -ai =go da -di di -kibi -ai =Ø*  
 P:3p-call-O:3p =RD PP:COM-P:3p S:3p-speak -O:3p =PF  
 They called them they talked with them

'... the boy's parents returned and called his uncles together. Having called them together they talked with them.'

Recapitulation, however, is not very common in my texts. Far more common, and starting perhaps 40% of sentences, is the pro-clausal *ago* with the appropriate dependent enclitics attached. This *ago* is a pro-form for recapitulation, and serves as a dummy to carry the dependent enclitics. Thus *di-gi-ai=go* could equally well be replaced by *ago=go*, just as in (2) and (3) recapitulation at the beginning of an irrealis chain is replaced by *ago=pe*. Sometimes even *ago* is deleted and the enclitic sequence stands alone sentence-initially. It is tempting to translate *ago=go* and *ago=pe* as 'and then' or 'and so', but this would be to infer a relationship which is not expressed. Plain 'and' is a more faithful translation!

Note that Takia speakers sometimes construe as a chain of events something which in English would be a single event. At the end of (6), for example, we find *dokta ŋai i salim=go wod 8 ŋa-du=Ø* 'the doctor sent me and I went down to Ward 8', which in a normal English construal would be 'the doctor sent me down to Ward 8'.<sup>1</sup> Temporal expressions are also construed as events, so that

- (8) *Gabulo =p ŋilio =wa.*  
*Gabulo =pe ŋi-le-o =wa*  
 Tomorrow =ID S:1s-see-O:2s =IRR  
 'I'll see you tomorrow.'

<sup>1</sup>In many Oceanic languages this event would be expressed by a verb serializing constructions. Takia also has such constructions, but their use is less widespread than in many Oceanic languages.

is roughly translatable as two events: 'it will be tomorrow and I'll see you'.

### 3.3.2 =de 'loose dependent'

The enclitic =*de* loose dependent occurs much less often than =*go* or =*pe*. The label loose dependent is intended to capture the fact that =*de* denotes a relationship between two events which is not as close as that denoted by =*go* or =*pe*. All cases of =*de* in my texts occur in realis chains. Although most are sequential, a few are not, and it is likely that, as with =*go* and =*pe*, sequence is inferred from the events and is not part of the basic meaning of =*de*. This looseness of relationship is especially clear in (21), where the use of =*go* would imply a contingency relationship ('the mission took me to school'), whereas =*de* here indicates that "the two events are sequential, but not closely related – or in this particular instance, the 'taking' event was not the immediate precursor of the event of 'go to school'" (Bruce Waters, personal communication).

- (9) SI 4  
*ŋai misin diŋiliag =de skul =lo ŋao.*  
*ŋai misin di -ŋili-ag =de skul =lo ŋ -ao =Ø*  
 D:1s mission S:3p-get -O:1s =LD school =PP:in S:1s -go =PF  
 The mission took me I went to school  
 'The mission took me and I went to school.'

The following examples are typical: sequence is inferable but not immediate.

- (10) FU 2  
*Maror busumak dimat peis =de ŋai abed ŋiŋa =ya=k*  
*Maror busuma -k di -mat pasi =de ŋai abe -di ŋi -ŋane =ya=ak*  
 Maror senior -AL S:3p -die release=LD D:1s place-P:3p S:1s-take =PF=B  
 Senior people of Maror died I took their place

*ŋima* =*da*.  
*ŋi -mado* =*da*  
 S:1s -stay =IMPF  
 I am here

'The senior people of Maror have all died and I have taken their place and am here.'

## (11) SI 20

*Ago=d gavman Ostrelya san an ŋai iliag =de*  
*Ago=de gavman Ostrelya sa -n an ŋai i -le -ag =de*  
 PRO=LD government Australia POSS-P:3s DM2 D:1s S:3s-see-O:1s =LD  
 the Australian government man saw me

*tinig =na biouŋ ipasi =d ago =d*  
*tini-g =na biouŋ i -pasi =de ago =de*  
 skin-P:1s =PP:at clothes S:3s-release=LD PRO =LD  
 he removed the clothes from me

*yamel luag =te du =gane.*  
*yamel lua -g =te du =gane*  
 cloth belly-P:1s=PP:LOC S:3p =do  
 they put a *laplap* round me

'Then that Australian government man saw me and removed the clothes from me, then they put a *laplap* round me.'

In (11) S. describes the events when German administration was replaced by Australian and his full set of western clothes was replaced by a simple *laplap* (sarong).

## (12) WA 20

*Ago=d ŋao =d ŋumado =d ŋupalu =d*  
*Ago=de ŋ -ao=de ŋu -mado =de ŋu -palu =de*  
 PRO=LD S:1s-go=LD S:1s-stay =LD S:1s-come =LD  
 I went I stayed I came

*Mutag san bulamat andam ipag.*  
*Mutag sa -n buramat andam i -pan -ag*  
 Mutang POSS-P:3s pig:tusks DM2 also S:3s -give-O:1s  
 Mutang gave me a pair of pig's tusks

'And then I went away for a time then I came back and Mutang gave me a pair of pig's tusks.'

In (12) the function of =*de* is to express the fact that the events are spread over a long period of time. Note, incidentally, that the Takia speaker again construes as two events, *agoŋdŋ aonŋdŋ umadonŋ* 'then I went away and I stayed', something which an English speaker would probably construe as one: 'then I went away for a time'. The same is true of the last two clauses of (13).

An extension of the loose relationship sense of =*de* occurs in (13), where it is very clear from the context that the relation is not only sequential but also adversative. The storyteller and his friends have been warned not to put to sea, as they will be attacked by the Japanese.

## (13) WA 17

*Ago=do maŋ malon =de milasa =g mao.*  
*Ago=do maŋ ma -lon =de mi -lasa =go m -ao*  
 PRO=CT D:1EP S:1EP-hear =LD S:1EP-come:out =RD S:1EP-go  
 we heard him we came out we went

'So we heard him but (still) we went on our way.'

In (14) the temporal relationship between 'I lived at my own place' and 'he lived here' is simultaneous, implying strongly that looseness of relationship between the events – rather than sequence – is the prototypical meaning of =*de*.

## (14) WA 11

*Ago =g, sensen, ŋai ŋai sigag =na ŋuma =de*  
*Ago=go se -n =se -n ŋai ŋai siga -g =na ŋu -mado =de*  
 PRO=RD self-P:3s=self-P:3s D:1s D:1s POSS-P:1s =PP:at S:1s-stay =LD  
 each to himself I lived at my own place

*ij et =na ima =ya.*  
*ij e -te =na i -mado =ya*  
 D:3s D1-PP:LOC =PP:at S:3s-stay =PF  
 he lived here

'And so, each to himself, I lived at my own place and he lived here.'

3.3.3 Coordination of independent clauses with =*ak*

## 3.3.3 Coordination of independent clauses with =ak

Although coordination of independent clauses has, strictly speaking, no place in an examination of dependent clause enclitics, it is discussed here because it stands in contrast to co-subordination with =go and =pe.

In (10) the clause sequence *ŋai abe-di ŋi-ŋanenyanak ŋi-madonda* 'I have taken their place and I am living here' occurs. The morpheme =ak is a boundary marker with a number of uses, some of which correspond to Tok Pisin *ya*. It marks noun phrases as contrastively emphatic; it occasionally occurs on a chain-final independent verb to give emphasis; it marks some clauses as subordinate; it marks the end of direct or indirect speech; and in the present case it marks the boundary between two independent clauses in a coordinate relation. Why does the speaker not use =go or =de here? The reason seems to be that =go, =pe, and =de are all used to connect events which the speaker conceives as having some connection in the 'real world'. When the connection is one which she conceives as imposed by herself, then she uses two independent clauses, closing the first with =ak. In this example, 'I have taken their place' and 'I am living here' are apparently construed not as two separate real world events but as two statements of the same real world event, the fact that all her senior relatives have died and she is left as the senior member of the hamlet community. The same construction occurs in (15):

(15) SI 88

*ŋai pein ŋule =la =i =k e, oŋ pein ta ule =o*  
*ŋai pein ŋu -le =la =ya =ak e oŋ pein ta u -le =o*  
 D:1s woman S:1s-see =TERM =PF =B D1 D:2s woman INDEF S:2s-see =INT  
 I met a girl you should meet a girl

'Since I have already met a girl, you should meet a girl too.'

Again, the relation is clearly speaker-imposed, not 'real world'.

In (16) the speaker-imposed nature of the relation is very clear, since =ak connects a background aside back to the events of the narrative.

(16) WAK 19

*Ago =g yao =g anig ŋai tidom ŋabol =a =k*  
*Ago=go i -ao =go anig ŋai tidomi ŋa -bol =a =ak*  
 PRO=RD S:3s-go =RD thus D:1s morning S:1s-speak =PF =B  
 it went as I told you earlier

*ago ŋai pein ŋuyane =g, ara ...*  
*ago ŋai pein ŋu -ŋane =go aria*  
 PRO D:1s woman S:1s-take =RD O.K.  
 I had taken a wife

'And so it went on, and as I told you earlier, I had taken a wife, well, ...'

One form of speaker-imposed relation which is quite often expressed with =ak is parallelism between two or more events. In (17), the first clause introduces the second and third, which are parallel examples of 'various work'.

(17) GA 3

*ŋai panu ilon =lo ulat aenta ŋuga =da =k*  
*ŋai panu ilo -n =lo urat aenta ŋu -gane =da =ak*  
 D:1s village inside-P:3s =PP in work some S:1s-do =IMPF =B  
 I do various work in the village

*matu ulat ŋuga =da =k a kris tamol pein ŋaŋal =da*  
*matu urat ŋu -gane =da =ak a kris tamol pein ŋa -ŋale =da*  
 senior work S:1s-do =IMPF=B D2 Christian man woman S:1s-get =IMPF  
 I do the work of an elder I lead the Christians

'I do various work in the village: I do the work of an elder, and I lead the Christians.'

Sometimes parallelism alone seems to motivate the use of dependent clauses with =ak as a stylistic device. In (18) M. is describing the games on the early German mission station and the prizes which competitors collected from the top of the greasy pole. The sequence starts with an irrealis =pe marking the events as habitual or repetitive, and there does not seem to be any reason other than style for the use of independent =wa rather than dependent =pe. This example also provides a rare case of =wa irrealis being used for habitual or repetitive events in the past, indicating

that in the speaker's mind it is prototypically an irrealis independent marker rather than a future or a perfective marker.

(18) MI 39

*Masa* =p *galas mupasi* =wa=k *a dubdub mupasi* =wa=k  
*Ma -sa* =pe *galas mu -pasi* =wa=ak *a dubdub mu -pasi* =wa=ak  
 S:1EP-rise=ID mirror S:1EP-release=IRR=B D2 jew's:harp S:1EP-release=IRR=B  
 We went up we removed mirrors we removed jew's harps

*o yamel mupasi* =wa=k *tiraosis mupasi* =wa=k  
*o yamel mu -pasi* =wa=ak *tiraosis mu -pasi* =wa=ak  
 cloth S:1EP-release =IRR=B trousers S:1EP-release =IRR=B  
 or we removed cloths we removed trousers

*klos mupasi* =wa=k *ago=do ago makok* =na =ya.  
*klos mu -pasi* =wa=ak *ago=do ago ma -kok* =na =ya  
 clothes S:1EP-release =IRR=B PRO=CT PRO S:1EP-play =DUR =PF  
 we removed clothes we kept on playing like this

'We went up and we removed mirrors and jew's harps and cloth lengths and trousers and clothes and so we kept on playing like this.'

Although a linguistic description distinguishes a dependent and an independent clause, this is not a significant difference in Takia usage: independent clauses with =ak are used in (18) in a chain which is functionally very similar to a chain of dependent clauses. The extract in (19) takes this a step further: here M. is talking about the three Samoan evangelists who accompanied the German missionaries to Karkar before the first World War. The chain begins with =go, switches to =ak to express parallelism in exactly the same way as =go has just been used, then back to =go for sequence. There is no obvious difference in functional or syntactic status between the two kinds of clause.

(19) MI 65

*Buson* =na *ima* =g, *ago* =du =go  
*Buson* =na *i -mado* =go *ago* =do =go  
 Buson =PP:at S:3s-stay =RD PRO =CT =RD  
 He stayed at Buson

*Tayao o Bangmei* =na *ima* =ya =k  
*Tayao o Bangmei* =na *i -mado* =ya =ak  
 Tayao D3 Bangmei =PP:at S:3s-stay =PF =B  
 Tayao settled over at Bangmei

*Asafo Mapor* =na *ima* =ya=k *an fudian ij dupalu* =g,  
*Asafo Mapor* =na *i -mado* =ya=ak *an fudian ij du -palu* =go  
 Asafo Mapor =PP:at S:3s-stay =PF=B DM2 all D:3p S:3p-come =RD  
 Asafo settled at Mapor they all came

*sinad* =na *dumul diao*.  
*sina -di* =na *du -mul di -ao*  
 POSS -P:3p =PP:at S:3p-return S:3p-go  
 they went back to their (homes)

'He stayed at Buson and meanwhile Tayao settled over at Bangmei and Asafo at Mapor; all of them came and they went back to their (homes).'

### 3.3.4 =na 'durative', =se 'frequentative', =la 'terminative', =o 'intensive'

The ASPECT<sub>1</sub> enclitics are fairly straightforward for the European learner, because – unlike the other dependent enclitics – they refer only the event of their own clause and say nothing about its relationship with the following event. This is why they occur on both dependent and independent clauses. The most common of these enclitics are =na 'durative', =se 'frequentative', =la 'terminative', and =o 'intensive'. The durative is used for events whose duration, as in (20), or habitual nature, as in (21), is stressed. Note that durative =na in (20) expresses duration pure and simple: it does not express the span/punctiliar relationship of the English progressive in 'While my white master was travelling, he met me' (this is reserved, if at all, for =do='continuative'). In (21) durative =na tells us that what used to happen at the German mission at Christmas happened every Christmas.

(20) SI 57

*Ago=gu=p \ ayo \ \ai sag malkouk an yao* =na =g  
*Ago=gu=pe \ ayo \ \ai sa -g malkouk an i -ao* =na =go  
 PRO=CP=ID \ II \ D:1s POSS-P:1s white DM2 S:3s-go =DUR =RD  
 My white master was travelling

iliag.

*i -le -ag*  
S:3s-see -O:1s  
he met me

'And then, oh, my white master was travelling and he met me.'

(21) MI 35

*Grismas nal =lo lou an muŋa =na =ya,*  
*Grismas nal =lo lou an mu -ŋane =na =ya*  
Christmas time PP:in gift DM2 S:1EP-take -DUR =PF  
At Christmas time we received gifts

*Jemeni san lou muŋa =na =ya.*  
*Jemeni sa -n lou mu -ŋane =na =ya*  
Germany POSS-P:3s gift S:1EP-take =DUR =PF  
we received gifts from Germany

'At Christmas time we received gifts, gifts from Germany.'

We may note in passing that (21) illustrates a pervasive feature of Takia syntax, namely that it is a strictly predicate-final language. If the speaker has an afterthought, like *Jemeni san*, he does not simply add it after the (clause-final) verb, but repeats the verb.

The sense of frequentative =*se* overlaps with that of durative =*na* in the expression of habitual actions, as in (22). It is also used where the speaker wants to stress the repetitive nature of the action, as in (23), where an elderly evangelist describes how he interacted with his parents after, as a young man, he had completed mission school.

(22) MA 22

*Kalam =mi ij an ij sad nal diabi =se =i.*  
*Kalam =mi ij an ij sa -di nal di -abi =se =ya*  
Moon =PP:MAN D:3s DM2 D:3p POSS-P:3p time S:3p-hold =FREQ =PF

'They always kept time by the moon.'

(23) MI 25

*Naod =na uru misiti =se =g, bar mabisei =g,*  
*Nao-di =na uru mi -siti =se -go bar ma -bisei -go*  
Face-P:3p =PP:at speech S:1EP-read -FREQ-RD song S:1EP-sing -RD  
We used to read them the good news we used to sing songs

*ago ago muga =se =ya.*  
*ago ago mu -gane =se -ya*  
PRO PRO S:1EP-do -FREQ =PF  
we kept doing this

'We used to read them the good news, sing songs, we kept doing this.'

Terminative =*la* corresponds roughly to English 'already', as in (24) where S. recalls how he acquired his first wife. His 'white master' met a girl and married her, and then deemed it appropriate for S. to do the same:

(24) SI 88

*ŋai pein ŋule =la =i =k e, oŋ pein ŋi ule =o'*  
*ŋai pein ŋu -le =la =ya =ak e oŋ pein ŋi u -le =o*  
D:1s woman S:1s-see =TERM=PF =B D1 D:2s woman INDEF S:2s-see =INT

'Since I have already met a girl, you should meet a girl too.'

In (24) we also see one of the uses of intentive =*o*. This is the most difficult of the ASPECT<sub>1</sub> enclitics, as it covers an area of meaning rather different from that of any English morpheme. The basic meaning of =*o* is that the subject of the verb has the intention to perform the action of the verb. S.'s master uses =*o* with the imperative to express deontic modality, more exactly to tell S. what to intend! This is a common usage. A more prototypical usage expresses the subject's intention or desire:

(25) *ŋai fud ŋi ŋ-ani ŋwo*  
*ŋai fud ŋi ŋ-ani ŋo*  
D:3s banana NEG S:1s-eat =INT

'I want to eat a banana.'

At the beginning of an expected story, the storyteller opens with:

- (26) WA 3  
*Adia ŋabol =o =da.*  
*Aria ŋa -bol =o =da*  
 O.K. S:1s-speak =INT =IMPF  
 'O.K., I am about to tell (it).'

One extension from the prototype of intention is its use with a non-animate subject to express what is about to be. In (27) E., a paraplegic, sums up his story with a sentence in which *ŋai -sa-g girismas* is the subject and *faiv yias* is the (noun phrase) predicate, denoting extent which the subject is about to reach.

- (27) KE 9  
*ŋisag girismas gamu faiv yias oda*  
*ŋai -sa -g girismas gamu faiv yias o -da*  
 D:1s-POSS-P:1s year now five years INT-IMPF  
 My time will soon be five years  
*wod =lo ŋuma =da.*  
*wod lo ŋu -mado =da*  
 ward PP:in S:1s-stay =IMPF  
 I am staying in the ward  
 'My time is now approaching five years in the ward.'

Another extension of the use of *=o* is that it functions as a complementizer with several predicates expressing desires and requests. In (28) *=o* marks the preceding clause as the (subordinate clause) complement of *ilo-g i-en=da* 'it was my desire'.

- (28) SI 66  
*ŋai gavman =lo urat ŋuga =o ilog yen =da.*  
*ŋai gavman =lo urat ŋu -gane =o ilo -g i -en =da*  
 D:1s government =PP:in work S:1s-do =INT inside-P:1s S:3s-sleep =IMPF  
 'I wanted to do government work.'

A final extension of the intention sense of *=o* is its use to express purpose in (29). The narrator of a Second World War tale is explaining how the *Mutor*, a Japanese boat, kept changing direction 'in order to ram our boat' (*maŋ sa -ma bot i -fini=o*), a subordinate clause of purpose.

- (29) WA 20  
*Ago=do=pe mile =do=p fon bot naon miŋane =p*  
*Ago=do=pe mi -le =do=pe foun bot nao-n mi -ŋane =pe*  
 PRO=CT=ID S:1EP-see =CT=ID again boat face-P:3s S:1EP-take =ID  
 We would see we would change the boat's direction again  
  
*sen miga =ta =p Mutor an dam*  
*se -n mi -gane =ta =pe Mutor an dam*  
 self-P:3s S:1EP-do =REAS =ID Mutor DM2 also  
 we changed it Mutor the same  
  
*maŋ sama bot ifini =wo igane.*  
*maŋ sa -ma bot i -fini =o i -gane*  
 D:1EP POSS-P:1EP boat S:3s-hit =INT S:3s-do  
 <he wanted to hit our boat> did  
 'And so we would see and we would change the boat's direction again and as we changed Mutor did the same in order to hit our boat.'

### 3.3.5 *=do* 'continuative', *=gu* 'completive' and *=ta* 'reason'

It will help us here if we give the label E1 to the event of the clause to which the enclitic is attached, and the label E2 to the event of the following clause (understanding 'event' here to include states as well); 'following clause' in this instance means the next clause in the chain, i.e. a dependent or independent clause, but not a subordinate clause. The enclitics *=gu* 'completive' and *=ta* 'reason' each say something about the *relation* of E1 to E2, but say nothing about the events themselves. They play a major role in interclausal relations in Takia, and are troublesome to the European learner because Takia speakers construe the relations between conceptual events in terms of a content substance rather different from that of European languages.

These enclitics are closest in function to the English adverbial clause subordinators *after*, *before*, *until*, *while*, *as*, *because*, and *if*. However, the clauses which they join form a chain (i.e., the first is not subordinate to the second), and the Takia equivalents of such subordination are conceptually rather different from their English counterparts.

The meanings of these three enclitics and their combinations may be summarized as follows: =*do* 'continuative', E1 is continued for an indefinite time span; =*gu* 'completive', E1 is completed before or at the occurrence or onset of E2; =*ta* 'reason', E1 is a reason for the occurrence of E2; =*do=gu*, E1 is continued for an indefinite time span, but is completed before or at the occurrence or onset of E2.

The continuative =*do* is the most common of the three enclitics. When it occurs without an ASPECT<sub>3</sub> enclitic it marks E1 as incomplete and continuing for an indefinite time. It is tempting to view it as indicating that E1 is at least partly coterminous with E2, but Bruce Waters (personal communication) points out that this interpretation does not do justice to its range of use. In typical uses like those in (30) =*do* does not in itself mark temporal overlap; it is simply that E2 typically begins during the indefinite time-span of E1. In (30) the storyteller is explaining how the man who has warned him not to put to sea for fear of the Japanese interrupts the embarkation to manhandle his own relatives back off the boat. There are two instances of =*do*: 'as we were putting our things into the boat ...', and 'as this man's brothers and sisters and his children and grandchildren were getting into the boat ...'.

(30) WA 13

Ago =*du=go* bot ilo =lo abaj mi -dili =*du=go* tamol o  
 Ago =*do=go* bot ilo =lo abaj mi -diri =*do=go* tamol o  
 PRO =CT =RD boat inside =PP:in thing S:1EP-put =CT=RD man D2  
 Were putting our things into the boat the man

maj mi -yawai o mite =p ot =na  
 maj mi -yawai o mite =pe o -te =na  
 D:1EP S:1EP-sail D2 later =ID D3-PP:LOC =PP:at  
 <<we would sail later>>

Diapan bot amama da dufunama anen  
 Diapan bot a -mama da du -fun -ama anen  
 Japan boat POSS-P:1EP EXIST S:3p-hit -O:1EP DM2  
 the Japanese boat out there would hit us that>

ilonj an tamol ane ij an tein,  
 i -lonj an tamol ane ij a -n tei -n  
 S:3s-hear DM2 man DM2 D:3s POSS-P:3s s.s.sibling-P:3s  
 <he knew that> this man's brothers and sisters

ij an nanun tubun bot =lo disida =*du=go*  
 ij an nanu -n tubu -n bot =lo di -sida =*do=go*  
 D:3s DM2 child -P:3s grandparent-P:3s boat =PP:in S:3p-go:up =CT=RD  
 his children and grandchildren were getting into the boat

isida =g banin =nam ibiai =g  
 i -sida =go bani-n =nam i -abi -ai =go  
 S:3s-go:up =RD arm -P:3s =PP=INS S:3s-hold-O:3p =RD  
 he got in took hold of them with his hands

ilupupasai lonj =na dudu.  
 i -lupupas-ai lonj =na du -du  
 S:3s-shove -O:3p beach =PP:at S:3p-descend  
 pushed them they got out onto the beach

'As we were putting our things into the boat, the man who knew that if we sailed then the Japanese would out there attack the boat we had, as this man's brothers and sisters and his children and grandchildren were getting into the boat, and he got in and took hold of them with his hands and pushed them down onto the beach.'

It is irrelevant to the use of =*do* whether E2 covers a span of time or is conceived as punctiliar. In (31), from an account of marriage negotiations, E2 is apparently conceived as punctiliar: the parents went home. Similarly in the second of the three cases of =*do=go* in (32), the unexploded bomb was lying there, and 'we saw it and jumped over it'.

(31) MA 10

Imado =*du=go* aria, tamol tinantaman  
 I -mado =*do=go* aria tamol tina -n -tama -n  
 S:3s-stay =CT=RD O.K. man mother-P:3s -father-P:3s



*an dumul =go ...*

*an du -mul -go*

DM2 S:3p-return-RD

'While she stayed there, all right, the boy's parents went go back ...'

## (32) WA 83

*Bom tita ipuk =di =na =du =go yen =du=go*

*Bom tita i -puk =di =na =do =go i -en =do=go*

Bomb NEG S:3s-break =already =NEG =CT =RD S:3s-sleep =CT=RD

The bomb still hadn't exploded it was lying

*mile =g mupulali =g =ak nigen o*

*mi -le =go mu -pulali =go =ak niye -n o*

S:1EP-see =RD S:1EP-jump =RD =B REF -P:3s PP:REF

we saw it we jumped

so

*'amul, amul,' igo maŋ mabol =du=go*

*a -mul a -mul igo maŋ ma -bol =do=go*

S:2p-return S:2p-return PRO1 D:1EP S:1EP-speak =CT=RD

'go back go back' we spoke thus

*fidian dumul =go iŋ siganed gib =lo ago*

*fidian du mul =go ŋ sigane -di gib =lo ago*

all S:3p-return =RD D:3p POSS -P:3p hole =PP:in PRO

they all went back they to their own holes

*maŋ dam diŋiliana =g gib uyan =a =k =lo mao.*

*maŋ dam di -ŋili -ama =go gib uya -n =a =ak =lo m -ao*

D:1EP also S:3p-get -O:1EP =RD hole good-P:3s =PF =B =PP:in S:1EP-go

they also took us we went to a hole <which was good>

'The bomb still hadn't exploded and it was lying [there] and we saw it and jumped over it and so we said repeatedly "Go back! Go back!" and they all went back to their own holes and they also took us to a good hole.'

However, E2 may just as well cover a span of time and may be coterminous with E1, as in (33), drawn from S.'s account of how *furoŋ* is prepared: 'while he is eating it [the canarium pudding], I crush the residue [of the canarium nuts] separately for the children to eat'.

## (33) FU 28

*Mao mok sen misapal =g gamu ŋusue =g*

*mao mok se -n mi -sapal =go gamu ŋu -sue =go*

Taro true self-P:3s S:1EP-mix =RD now S:1s-pierce =RD

We mix it now with pure taro now we crush it

*teik naon =na ŋiga =g*

*tei -k nao -n =na ŋi -gane =go*

brother-P:1s face -P:3s =PP:at S:1s-do =RD

we put it in front of out brother

*yani ago ŋusue =g ŋipani =g yani =du=g*

*i -ani ago ŋu -sue =go ŋi -pani =go i -ani =do=go*

S:3s-eat PRO S:1s-pierce =RD S:1s-give =RD S:3s-eat =CT=RD

he eats I crush it I give it he is eating

*kis an sen ŋusue =g nanuk diani.*

*kis an se -n ŋu -sue =go nanu-k di -ani*

residue DM2 self-P:3s S:1s-pierce =RD child-AL S:3p-eat

I crush the residue separately the children eat it

'We mix it with pure taro and now we crush it, then we put it in front of out brother for him to eat, I make it and I give it to him and while he is eating it, I crush the residue separately for the children to eat.'

The foregoing examples entail what Longacre (1985:243-244) calls 'temporal overlap'. However, as Waters (personal communication) points out, =do also codes event relations which are not covered by Longacre's classification. In (34) the encoding of indefinite duration is particularly clear in *bos ŋu-madondongo* 'I stayed there as boss' and *you du-dadndongo* 'they used to buy drink'.

## (34) KA 7

*An bos ŋuma =du=go you an ŋai sag =na you*

*An bos ŋu -mado =do=go you an ŋai sa -g na you*

DM2 boss S:1s-stay =CT=RD water DM2 D:1s POSS-P:1s PP:at water

I stayed there as boss they bought the beer from me

*dudad* =*du=go* *duluk*.  
*du -dad* =*do=go* *du -luk*  
 S:3p-buy =CT=RD S:3p-drink  
 they drank

'I stayed there as boss, they bought the beer from me to drink.'

The uses of irrealis =*do=pe* are parallel to those of realis =*do=go*, except that it more commonly codes habitual actions; this results from the use of the irrealis for habitual and repeated action. A typical case comes from M.'s account of the games at the German mission station. They used to climb the greasy pole and compete in sack races, he says, and ...

(35) MI 42

*Ago muga* =*do=p* *maŋ win* =*do=p* *maŋ*  
*Ago mu -gane* =*do=pe* *maŋ win* =*do=pe* *maŋ*  
 PRO S:1EP-do =CT=ID D:1EP win =CT=ID D:1EP

*moni muŋa* =*se* =*ya*.  
*moni mu -gane* =*se* =*ya*  
 money S:1EP-take =FREQ =PF

'So we would do it, we would win, we would get money.'

A side effect of the use of =*do=pe* for habituals is that in generic contexts, e.g. in descriptions of procedures, =*do=pe* is most appropriately translated by 'if', as in (36). Note, however, that conditionality is not implicit in the meaning of =*do=pe*: It is simply inferred from the generic context by the European listener. The basic meaning of =*do*, marking E1 as incomplete, still applies here.

(36) FU 15

*An bor gamu=go ditalbisi* =*do=p* *furoŋ ago musue* =*da*.  
*An bor gamu-go di -talbisi* =*do=pe* *furoŋ ago mu -sue* =*da*  
 DM2 pig now -RD S:3p-grow =CT=ID pudding PRO S:1EP-pierce =IMPF  
 The pigs now they are growing we make pudding

'If the pigs are still growing [not ready to kill], then we make pudding [instead].'

Occasionally =*do=pe* is used for non-habituals, as in S.'s introduction to his life story, where he uses a speech formula of Takia storytellers, I SPEAK YOU HEAR.

(37) SI 1

*Man sen yen ka nu kawan ŋal* =*do=p* *uloŋa*.  
*Man se -n yen ka nu kawan ŋa -bol* =*do=pe* *u -loŋ -wa*  
 THM self-P:3s here PRMT speech nothing S:1s-speak =CT=ID S:2s-hear-IRR

'I can speak just simple speech here and you will hear it.'

Another case occurs in (38), which in context directly follows (27).

(38) KE 10

*Kalam Aogus imat* =*do=p* *ŋai sag faiv yias*.  
*Kalam Aogus i -mat* =*do=pe* *ŋai sa -g faiv yias*  
 Moon August S:3s-die =CT=ID D:1s POSS-P:1s five years  
 The month of August is dying my five years

'When August is coming to an end, it will be five years for me.'

The first instance of =*do* in (32) above is negative, and illustrates a natural extension of its basic meaning. Here it is the *non*-occurrence of E1 which is continuing:

*Bom ŋita ipuk* =*di* =*na* =*du=go* *yen* =*du=go* ...  
*Bom ŋita i -puk* =*di* =*na* =*do=go* *i -en* =*do=go*  
 Bomb NEG S:3s-break =already =NEG =CT=RD S:3s-sleep =CT=RD

'The bomb still hadn't exploded and it was lying [there] ...'

The enclitic =*gu* completive indicates that E1 is completed before or at the onset of E2. It is irrelevant whether E1 lasts for a period of time or is conceived as a punctiliar event. Its function is the same whether it is followed by realis =*go* or irrealis =*pe*. Thus in realis (39) and irrealis (40) E1 evidently lasts for a period of time.

(39) SI 9

... *maŋ skul mugane =gu=g ŋai ŋasol.*  
*maŋ skul mu -gane =gu=go ŋai ŋa -sol =∅*  
 D:1EP school S:1EP-do =CP=RD D:1s S:1s-flee =PF  
 we did school I ran away

'... we studied and then I ran away.'

The context of (40) is a conversation during marriage negotiations during which a relative of the (pubescent) girl undertakes to observe her physical development and to let the boy's relatives know when she is ready for marriage.

(40) MA 58

*Kalam nek wei tinan, tao =do=p*  
*Kalam nek wei tina-n t -ao =do=pe*  
 Moon thus many big -P:3s S:1IP-go =CT=ID  
 There are many months we will go

*ŋai seg ŋile =gu=p kalam ŋupano =wa*  
*ŋai se -g ŋ -ile =gu=pe kalam ŋu -pan-o =wa*  
 D:1s self-P:1s S:1s-see =CP=ID moon S:1s-give-O:2s =IRR  
 I myself will watch I will give you the month

'There are many months to go, so let us go and I myself will watch [when she is ready] and give you the month.'

In realis (41) and irrealis (42) E1 is conceived as punctiliar, but this makes no difference to the structure.

(41) SI 100

*An Willi nambawan an o =te=m mugasi =gu=g,*  
*An Willi nambawan an o =te=mi mu -ga-si =gu=go*  
 DM2 Willi first DM2 D3 =PP=LOC=only S:1EP-do-descend =CP=RD  
 Willi was the first We gave birth to him over there

*ye mupalu =ya*  
*e mu -palu =ya*  
 D1 S:1EP-come =PF  
 we came here

'Willi was the first one. We gave birth to him over there and then we came here.'

(42) SI 63

*Umul wao =gu =p umul.'*  
*U -mul u -ao =gu =pe u -mul*  
 S:2s-return S:2s-go =CP =ID S:2s-return

'Go back [there] then come back [here].'

I noted earlier in connection with (8) that temporal expressions can be construed as events. This seems to occur quite frequently with =gu. In (43) S. reminisces about his days as a ship's master and compares the ships he sailed with those of today. *Gamu=gu=go* means roughly 'Today has come and ...'

(43) SI 29

*ŋai sip ŋuŋa ŋula =se =i. Gu =go=g*  
*ŋai sip ŋu -ŋane ŋu -la =se =ya gamu =gu=go*  
 D:1s ship S:1s-take S:1s-depart =FREQ =PF now =CD=RD  
 I took the ship I departed It is already today

*sip a masin ad da =go wagam man a krosiŋ lai.*  
*sip a masin a -di da =go wagam man a krosiŋ lai*  
 ship D2 engine POSS-P:3p EXIST =RD before THM D2 crossbeam sail  
 ships have engines before [they had] cross sails

'I used to steer the ship around. Nowadays ships have engines but before there were ships with cross sails.'

In the context of (44), where because of a family feud the storyteller has for years not visited the village where he is now sitting talking, *gamu=gu=go* assumes a somewhat different force. From 'today has come' the hearer infers 'not until today'.

(44) WAK 24

*Ak man nek gom =gu=go nek e ŋupou =g e*  
*Ak man nek gamu =gu=go nek e ŋu -palu =go e*  
 B THM thus now =CP=RD thus D1 S:1s-come =RD D1  
 Thus it is already now I have come

*ɲulasa* =ya.  
*ɲu -lasa* =ya  
 S:1s-come.out =PF  
 I have appeared here

'However this is the first time I have appeared here.'

Similarly, although the sentence in (45) can mean 'they will dance tomorrow', 'they will not dance until tomorrow' would be inferred in an appropriate context:

(45) *Gabulo* =gu=p di -tari =wa  
 Tomorrow =CP=ID S:3s-dance =IRR

The combination =do=gu continuative + completive can be quite readily interpreted as a combination of the basic meanings of the two enclitics: E1 continues for an indefinite time-span, but is completed before or at the occurrence or onset of E2. It is quite rare in the text corpus, and only occurs with realis =go. The sentence in (46) seems to be a prototypical example. S. and his master have established several plantations and S. works there for his master until a cousin of his unexpectedly shoots himself. S. is devastated and finds himself a job on a ship.

(46) SI 40  
 A =te muma =du=gu=g aria ɲai dualig  
 A =te mu -mado =do=gu=go aria ɲai duali -g  
 D2 =PP:LOC S:1EP-stay =CT=CP=RD O.K. D:1s s.s.cr.cousin-P:1s  
 We stayed on there O.K. a cousin of mine shot  
  
 ɪa sen ipane.  
 ɪa se -n i -pane  
 INDEF self-P:3s S:3s-shoot  
 himself

'We stayed on there, O.K., and then a cousin of mine shot himself.'

We could legitimately translate this sentence 'we stayed on there ... until a cousin of mine shot himself'. However, *until* does not really capture the usage of =do=gu, as (47) shows. Here the trainee evangelists are ready to

work independently and their 'work' in the first clause seems to be viewed as overlapping into their work in the second.

(47) MI 69  
 Ago=du=g ij sed urat disini =du=gu=g, dibusaoi =g  
 Ago=do=go ij se -di urat di -sini =do=gu=go di -busaoi =go  
 PRO=CT=RD D:3p self-P:3p work S:3p-carry =CT=CP=RD S:3p-depart =RD  
 Soon they were doing their own work they departed  
  
 diao =g urat disini =ya  
 di -ao =go urat di -sini =ya  
 S:3p-go =RD work S:3p-carry =PF  
 they went they did their work

'Soon they were doing their own work, they departed and worked.'

Sometimes E1 is intrinsically punctiliar and therefore does not continue until the onset of E2. In this case the hearer infers that some state resulting from E1 continues until the onset of or until a time during the occurrence of E2. In (48) S.'s master has married his girl and wants S. to follow suit. E1 is the master's return with his new wife. E2 is his instruction to S. One may infer that what continues until the onset of E2 is the master's married state.

(48) SI 96  
 Malkouk an pein iɲa =g ipalu =du=gu=g  
 Malkouk an pein i -ɲane =go i -palu =do=gu=go  
 White DM2 woman S:3s-take =RD S:3s-come =CT=CP=RD  
 The white man took his girl he came  
  
 ɲai idinag 'Wao =p pein Ø -ɲa =wo,' ibo.  
 ɲai i -din -ag u -ao =pe pein Ø -ɲane =o i -bol  
 D:1s S:3s-send-O:1s S:2s-go =ID woman S:2s-take =INT S:3s-speak  
 he sent me out you go you get a woman he said

'The white man married his girl and after he had come back he sent me out: "You go and get a girl," he said.'

The sequence =do=gu=pe does not occur in my texts. However, I have elicited it, and Bruce Waters (personal communication) confirms that it

means something like 'after a while' or 'sometime later'. In other words, E1 continues for an indefinite time, then is completed, then E2 occurs.

The enclitic *=ta* reason is particularly interesting because it covers what English speakers would normally construe as two different relations: reason and condition. The realis combination *=ta=go* is roughly translatable as 'because', i.e. E1 is a reason for the occurrence of E2. In (49) a group of islanders are in Japanese captivity and have successfully talked their way out of being tied up. In (50), still in captivity, an allied aircraft spots the Japanese establishment where they are working and bombs it.

## (49) WA 39

Ago =do ibol =*ta* =g o *ŋiema banima ŋita dusubani.*  
 Ago=do i -bol =*ta* =go o *ŋie -ma bani-ma ŋita du -subani*  
 PRO=CT S:3s-speak =REAS =RD D2 foot-P:1EP arm -P:1EP NEG S:3p-tie:up  
 He spoke like that they didn't tie our feet

'Because he spoke like that they didn't tie up our feet and hands.'

## (50) WA 76

Iliama =*ta* =g gib =lo madu =du=go  
 I -le -ama =*ta* =go gib =lo ma -du =do=go  
 S:3s-see-O:1EP =REAS =RD hole =PP:in S:1EP-descend =CT=RD  
 It saw us we went down into the hole

bom ibal.  
 bom i -bal  
 bomb S:3s-throw  
 it dropped a bomb

'Because it saw us we went down into the hole and it dropped a bomb.'

The combination *=ta=de* has, predictably, both causal and sequential force. In (51) the propeller has separated from the bomb and has fallen independently. Maor sees this and shouts: the storyteller construes this relation as one of both reason and sequence.

## (51) WA 79

Koropla idu =de tamol ta *yaŋan Maor ane iŋ o*  
 Koropla i -du =de tamol ta *yaŋa-n Maor ane iŋ o*  
 Propeller S:3s-descend =LD man INDEF name-P:3s Maor DM D:3s D2  
 The propeller fell a man by the name of Maor saw

koropla =yan ile =*ta* =d iŋ o iwagiŋ:  
 koropla =an i -ile =*ta* =de iŋ o i -wagiŋ  
 propeller =DM2 S:3s-see =REAS =LD D:3s D2 S:3s-call  
 the propeller he shouted

'The propeller fell and a man by the name of Maor saw the propeller and then shouted.'

The combination *=ta=pe* occurs in (29). Again the relation is one of reason: as the islanders' boat changes direction, the *Mutor* does the same thing. Irrealis *=pe* here denotes repetitive action.

... miga =*ta* =p *Mutor an dam maŋ sama bot*  
 mi -gane =*ta* =pe *Mutor an dam maŋ sa -ma bot*  
 S:1EP-do =REAS =ID *Mutor DM2 also D:1EP POSS-P:1EP boat*  
 we did *Mutor the same <so that it would hit*

ifini =wo igane.  
 i -fini =o i -gane  
 S:3s-hit =INT S:3s-do  
 our boat> it did

'... as we did so Mutor did the same in order to hit our boat.'

When *=ta=pe* occurs in a generic habitual context as in (52), then the reason relation is still inferable ('because we mix the oil with fresh water ...') but the most normal English translation uses 'if'.

## (52) FU 31

You =nam gireŋ miga =*ta* =p man aŋar saen =da.  
 you =nam gireŋ mi -gane =*ta* =pe man aŋar saen =da  
 Water =PP:INS oil S:1EP-do -REAS =ID THM canarium bad =IMPF

'If we mix the oil with fresh water, the canarium goes bad.'

In (53) the relation is closer to a prototypical conditional where the occurrence of E2 is contingent on the occurrence of E1 (Longacre 1985: 244-245). It is clear, however, that in Takia this relation is expressed as an extension of the reason relation of (52): the relatives' search for the cause is not simply contingent on the wife's misbehaviour, but her misbehaviour is the reason for their search.

(53) MA 66

*Dima* =g *yao* =g *pein* *an* *foun* *ialis* =*ta*  
*Di* -*mado* -*go* *i* -*ao-go* *pein* *an* *fou* -*n* *i* -*alis* =*ta*  
 S:3p-stay -RD S:3s-go-RD woman DM2 new-P:3s S:3s-misbehave =REAS -ID  
 They stay it goes the woman misbehaves again  
  
 =*p* *an* *fun* *abay* *dile* =*wo*.  
 =*pe* *a* -*n* *fu* -*n* *abay* *d* -*ile* =*wo*  
 POSS-P:3s base-P:3s thing P:3p-see =INT  
 they will look for the cause

'When they have been married for a time, if the woman misbehaves again, they [relatives] will look for the cause.'

Analyzed in this way, the Takia construal of reason and condition as the same relation is no more surprising than their English construal as different relations.

#### 4. Pulling some threads together

The starting point for this article was a desire to understand something more of what one would need to know in order to approach a nativelike command of Takia. It was argued in the second section that understanding (1) the content substance of the language and (2) how this content substance is expressed in the language's morphosyntax are both essential parts of that knowledge. Understanding the content substance of a language entails understanding the ways in which speakers of that language construe reality as conceptual events and how they construe the relations between those events. In the third section I set out to describe the morphosyntax which Takia speakers use to express some of these relations and to examine what it may tell us about the ways they construe them. This of course is only a tiny part of that 'margin of ignorance' which needs to be bridged to achieve nativelike command.

In the course of section 3.3 and its subsections some of the parameters according to which Takia speakers construe and express the relations between events have come to light. Events are normally expressed in what the speaker conceives to be their temporal sequence (section 3.3.1). There

is a distinction between an unmarked (or close) inter-event relation, expressed by =*go*/=*pe*, and a more distant one expressed by =*de* (section 3.3.2). There is a distinction between both these relations, conceived as immanent in the event sequence, and a speaker-imposed relation for which an independent verb with the boundary marker =*ak* is used (section 3.3.3). In section 3.3.5 we saw that, where more refined construal is made, the important parameters in construing inter-event relations concern (1) the continuity or completeness of E1, (2) the temporal relation of E1 to the occurrence or onset of E2, and (3) the causal connection between them. If we give the label T to the time of the occurrence or onset of E2, then (1) and (2) tell the hearer whether E1 is continuing at T (=do) or has been completed before or at T (=gu), and, if E1 is continuing at T, it distinguishes the unmarked case where termination of E1 is irrelevant (=do) from the marked case where termination of E1 is at T or during E2 (=do=gu). Parameter (2) marks E1 as the conceived reason for E2 (=ta). More subtle relations are inferable from collocation and context, e.g., the different interpretations of =do=*pe* or the use of =do=gu with a punctiliar verb. This kind of inference occurs in all languages: Givón (1990:828) lists the temporal relations which can be inferred from the uses of English *when*.

These parameters entail a very different lexical organization from that implicit in the English subordinators *after*, *before*, *until*, *while*, *as*, *because*, and *if*. For example, the precedence relation of *Before John came, Elizabeth had left* represents a content substance which does not occur in Takia. Instead, the events would be construed and expressed in conceived sequential order and =gu would be used to express the completion parameter: *Elizabeth i-masa i-ao=gu=go John i-palu=ya* (Elizabeth S:3s-get:up S:3s-go=CP=RD John S:3s-come=PF). To complicate matters, *leave* in this sense is usually expressed as a serial construction consisting of -*masa* 'get up' and -*ao* 'go'.

We have just observed the Takia connection between what English speakers typically construe as *because* and *if*. However, there are three different ways in which Takia speakers may construe inter-event relations which are typically construed with English *if*. The first is the reason relation with =*ta* described above. The second is the irrealis generic habitual use of =do=*pe* discussed in connection with (36), where Takia replaces

English *if we do X then ...* with *we will do X and then ...*. The third entails the use of a subordinate clause marked with =ak, a construction not discussed above.

Subordinate clauses marked with =ak differ structurally from the independent clauses with =ak (see discussion associated with examples [16] to [19]) only in that a subordinate clause with =ak always occupies first position in a sentence, whereas independent clauses with =ak usually occur in mid-chain. Examples (54) and (55) contain subordinate clauses with =ak, both of which can be understood as conditionals. In (55) Mileng, the islanders' leader, has been lost at sea, and his relatives have been searching for him.

(54) FU 16

Go, bor dutur =a=k bor inug musue =do=p,  
 Go bor du -tur =a=ak bor inug mu -sue =do=pe  
 RD pig S:3p-stand =PF=B pig first S:1EP-pierce =CT=ID  
 The pigs stand we kill the pigs first

minei =do=p man ayar furoŋ daeg kaeskaok misapal =da.  
 mi -nei =do=pe man ayar furoŋ daeg kaeskaok mi -sapal =da  
 S:1EP-cook =CT=ID THM anarium pudding plate one S:1EP-mix =IMPF  
 when we cook them we only make one plate of pudding

'But if pigs are available, then we kill them first and cook them; if we do this, then we only make one plate of pudding.'

(55) WA 29-30

Yao =g dile =go diŋane dadi dupalu.  
 I -ao =go di -le =go di -ŋane da -di du -palu  
 S:3s-go =RD S:3p-see =RD S:3p-take PP:COM-P:3p S:3p-come  
 It went they saw him they took him they came together

Tia =ya=k man Mileŋ beig lom yaŋan itout =a  
 tia =ya=ak man Mileŋ beig lo -mi yaŋa-n i -tout =a  
 not:exist =PF=B THM Mileng sea PP:in-only name-P:3s S:3s-finish =PF  
 If not as for Mileng his name finished in the sea

ideg =a  
 i -deg =a  
 S:3s-drown =PF  
 he drowned

'They kept on and then they saw him and they brought him back with them. If they hadn't, then Mileng's name would have been finished and he would have been drowned in the sea.'

We observed earlier that the potential structure of the Takia clause is Subject-Object-Verb or Object-Subject-Verb. However, this is a simplification, as these constituents may be preceded by one or more 'theme' noun phrases each of which "sets a spatial, temporal, or individual domain within which the main predication holds" (Chafe 1976:50). These themes are not left-dislocated, i.e. they are not set apart intonationally from the rest of the clause, but they are also not in a grammatical relation with the predicate of the clause. It happens that such a theme occurs in (55): *Mileŋ* is theme of the clause *Mileŋ beig lo-mi yaŋa-n i-toutŋa*. Example (56) has three themes.

(56) GA 6

Ago =g ŋai pinein saen fudian ŋai skul uyan an  
 Ago =go ŋai pinein saen fudian ŋai skul uya -n an  
 PRO =RD D:1s youth time all D:1s school good-P:3s DM2

ŋupununai =da.  
 ŋu -punun -ai =da  
 S:1s-give -O:3p =IMPF

'And I always give good schooling to the young people.'

When a temporal phrase occurs as a theme (*saen fudian*) it usually has no post-position, since a simple noun phrase may serve as theme. In exactly the same way, a subordinate clause serves as a noun phrase in the theme slot in (24), (54) and (55).

By definition, the theme is presupposed, i.e. consists of information which the speaker assumes to be known to his hearers. When a subordinate clause theme occurs, it is identified as presupposed, but it is left to the hearer to infer from the context what sort of 'domain' it sets for the rest of the dependent or independent clause of which it is the theme constituent. Whereas the contexts of the subordinate clauses in (54) and (55) suggest conditionality, in (24) the context points to reason.

This third means of expressing a condition, the subordinate clause as theme, comes in an important way closer to an English conditional than either =*ta* or =*do=pe*. English adverbial clauses introduced by subordinators like *if*, *because*, *when*, *since*, *after* and so on provide a presupposed 'background' to the 'foreground' event of the main clause. A Takia subordinate clause theme works in much the same way. But Takia dependent clauses, whether with =*ta* or =*do=pe* or any of the other enclitics discussed in section 3.3.5, are not usually background clauses.<sup>1</sup> Except for recapitulations (or pro-clauses) a clause chain consists of foreground clauses, or perhaps more accurately of clauses each of which serves both as a foreground clause and as a background to the clause that follows.<sup>2</sup> It seems to me that it is this organization of information, so different from the structured dichotomy between background and foreground information in English, which causes the European learner of Takia (or this learner, anyway) more difficulty than the morphosyntax itself.

<sup>1</sup>Backgrounding in Takia is also marked by the 'theme marker' *man*. The label is somewhat ill-chosen, as not every theme is marked with *man*, and *man* can also be used to mark a dependent clause (which would otherwise not be backgrounded) as backgrounded/presupposed, i.e. as a theme to what follows. According to informants the subordinate clause theme *bor dutur=a=k* in (54) could be marked by *man*. Example (54) also contains a dependent clause marked by *man* as background, as do (14) and (52). In (55) the subordinate clause theme is marked by *man*, indicating its contrast with the content of the foregoing sentence.

<sup>2</sup>This is perhaps the reason why Myhill and Hibiya's (1988) statistical study of clause-chaining shows dependent clauses to have characteristics which place them mid-way between backgrounded and foregrounded clauses.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AL	alienable suffix	LOC	locative
B	boundary marker	MAN	manner
COM	comitative	MASC	masculine
CP	completive	NEG	negative
CT	continuative	O: <i>n</i>	object pronominal suffix, where <i>n</i> indicates person
DM <i>n</i>	demonstrative, <i>n</i> as for D <i>n</i>	p	plural
D <i>n</i>	deictic, where <i>n</i> is 1 (proximate), 2 (unmarked), 3 (distal)	PF	(realis) perfective independent
D: <i>n</i>	disjunctive pronoun, where <i>n</i> indicates person	P: <i>n</i>	possessive pronominal suffix, where <i>n</i> indicates person
DUR	durative	POSS	possessive classifier
EP	exclusive plural	PP	postposition
EXIST	existential deponent verb	PRMT	permissive modality
FREQ	frequentative	PRO	pro-clausal/unmarked manner proform
ID	irrealis dependent	PRO1	proximate manner proform
IJ	interjection	REAS	reason
IMP	imperative	RD	realis dependent
IMPF	imperfective independent	REF	reference
INDEF	indefinite verb	s	singular
INS	instrumental	S: <i>n</i>	subject pronominal prefix, where <i>n</i> indicates person
INT	intensive	T	time
IP	inclusive plural	TERM	terminative
IRR	irrealis (perfective) independent	THM	theme marker
LD	loose dependent		



## REFERENCES

- BARKER, FAY, AND JANET LEE, 1980a, Waskia sentences. [N.p.: n.n. Unpublished print-out].
- BARKER, FAY AND JANET LEE, 1980b, Waskia discourse. [N.p.: n.n. Unpublished print-out].
- BARKER, FAY AND JANET LEE, 1985, *Wasia dikesnari: Waskia – Tok Pisin – English*. Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- BARKER, FAY AND JANET LEE, 1987, Waskia grammar. Stem to clause. [N.p.: n.n. Unpublished print-out].
- CHAFE, WALLACE, 1976. 'Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view.' In: C.N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic* (New York: Academic Press), pp. 25-55.
- FOLEY, 1986, *The Papuan languages of New Guinea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FOLEY, WILLIAM A., AND ROBERT D. VAN VALIN JR., 1984, *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GIVÓN, TALMY, 1990, *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- GRACE, GEORGE W., 1981, *An essay on language*. Columbia, S.C.: Hornbeam.
- GRACE, GEORGE W., 1987, *The linguistic construction of reality*. London: Croom Helm.
- HJELMSLEV, LOUIS, 1961, *Prologomena to a theory of language*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 2nd ed. Trans. Francis J. Whitfield.
- LONGACRE, ROBERT E., 1972, *Hierarchy and universality of discourse constituents in New Guinea languages. Discussion*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- LONGACRE, ROBERT E., 1985, 'Sentences as combinations of clauses.' In: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Complex constructions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), vol. 2, pp. 235-286.
- MCSWAIN, ROMOLA, 1977, *The past and future people*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- MYHILL, JOHN AND JUNKO HIBIYA, 1988, 'The discourse function of clause-chaining.' In: John Haiman and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), pp. 361-398.
- PAWLEY, ANDREW, 1987, 'Encoding events in Kalam and English: different logics for reporting experience.' In: Russell S. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and grounding in discourse* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), pp. 329-360.
- PAWLEY, ANDREW, 1991, 'How to talk cricket. On linguistic competence in a subject matter.' In: Robert Blust (ed.), *Currents in Pacific linguistics. Papers on Austronesian languages and ethnolinguistics in honour of George W. Grace*. Canberra: Australian National University. Pacific Linguistics C117:339-368.
- REHBURG, JUDY, AND SALME TUOMINEN, [n.d.], 'Takia grammar essentials.' [N.p.: n.n. Unpublished typescript 1978].
- ROSS, MALCOLM D., 1987, 'A contact-induced morphosyntactic change in the Bel languages of Papua New Guinea.' In: Donald C. Laycock and Werner Winter (eds.), *A world of language. Papers presented to Professor S.A. Wurm on his 65th birthday*. Canberra: Australian National University. Pacific Linguistics C100:583-601.
- ROSS, MALCOLM D., 1988, *Proto Oceanic and the Austronesian languages of western Melanesia*. Canberra: Australian National University. Pacific Linguistics C98.
- ROSS, MALCOLM D., [forthcoming], 'Takia.' In: D. Tryon (ed.), *Comparative Austronesian dictionary*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- ROSS, MALCOLM, WITH JOHN NATU PAOL, 1978, *A Waskia grammar sketch and vocabulary*. Canberra: Australian National University. Pacific Linguistics B56.
- THURSTON, WILLIAM R., 1987, *Processes of change in the languages of north-western New Britain*. Canberra: Australian National University. Pacific Linguistics B99.
- Z'GRAGGEN, JOHN A., 1975, *The languages of the Madang District, Papua New Guinea*. Canberra: Australian National University. Pacific Linguistics B41.
- Z'GRAGGEN, JOHN A., 1980, *A comparative word list of the northern Adelbert Range languages, Madang Province, Papua New Guinea*. Canberra: Australian National University. Pacific Linguistics D31.