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Introduction

• Traditional descriptions of Huave, such as the grammar of Stairs & Hollenbach (1982), posit a somewhat complex verb word which encodes subject agreement and a variety of tense/aspect properties.

Future tense verbs:

(1) a. sa-n-a-rang
   1EXCL.FUT-1EXCL-있-do ‘I will make/do’

b. ap-m-e-rang
   FUT-있-2-do ‘you will make/do’

c. ap-m-a-rang
   FUT-있-있-do ‘s/he will make/do’

d. ap-m-a-rang-ar
   FUT-있-있-do-1INCL.DU ‘we — you sg. and I — will make/do’

e. ap-m-a-rang-aats
   FUT-있-있-do-1INCL.PL ‘we — all of us — will make/do’

f. sa-n-a-rang-an
   1EXCL.FUT-1EXCL-있-do-PL ‘we (excl.) will make/do’

g. ap-m-e-rang-an
   FUT-있-2-do-PL ‘you pl. will make/do’

h. ap-m-a-rang-üw
   FUT-있-있-do-3PL ‘they will make/do’

In a very early paper in Word-Paradigm Morphology P.H. Matthews (1968) argued that the Huave agreement pattern, in particular in the future tense as shown above, was strong evidence against a morpheme-based approach.
Matthews’ arguments against a morpheme-based approach are the standard ones:

(2) There are affixes which don’t appear to express any properties (glossed ☹). What are they there for, if they don’t contribute meaning?

(3) Some properties are expressed twice: 1st person both sa- and n-. How could this be if there is just one agreement morpheme?

(4) Some properties are not expressed at all:

\[ ap- \text{ fut} \] does not express person in a direct way: its distribution is heterogeneous (it expresses fut everywhere that sa- (1excl) does not occur.

\[-a- \] has a fronted form -e- which seems to be the only ‘exponent’ of 2nd person; elsewhere in the same position we find -a-, which doesn’t seem to express anything and has a heterogeneous distribution

Similarly, -m- seems to mean ‘2nd or 3rd person or 1st person inclusive’ (whatever -n- 1excl does not express)

Matthews’ ideas had a significant influence on Stephen Anderson’s later work (‘Extended Word-Paradigm Morphology’, ‘A-Morphous Morphology’); they emerge in Stump’s lexicalist approach morphology; Carstairs-McCarthy revisited Matthews argument in his 1986 book.

- The objections in (4) are good ones inasmuch as they suggest that morphology is realizational:

☞ phonological pieces of words do not ‘contribute’ morphosyntactic features to the syntax

☞ phonological pieces are instantions/images/signals — whatever you wish to call it— of an abstract structure

- Objections (2) and (3) are, however, completely specious, since they rely on the incorrect presumption that the verb word is not a complex syntactic object.

- I will argue, on the contrary, that there is plenty of evidence that the verb word is a syntactic object — there are no ‘empty’ pieces in it.

- Where agreement appears to be expressed multiply in the “verb” we are dealing with a **syntactically independent auxiliary verb** which joins with its verbal into a single phonological word.
Outline of the argument

A. Argument from clausal complementation structures

Huave has no infinitive verbs — i.e. no verbs which lack both tense and agreement. Subordinate clauses with infinitive with control subjects in English, for example, have “dependent” verbs which exhibit agreement, but no tense/aspect:

(5) a. s-a-ndiüm n-arang najiüt ‘I want to work’
   1-TH-want  1DEP-TH-do work  lit. ‘I want I work’

   b. andiüm m-arang najiüt ‘S/he wants to work’
   TH-want DEP-TH-do work lit. ‘s/he wants she work’

- The dependent form of the verb is a subpart of the future verb word. This is an accident for Matthews, since they have nothing in common.

- Substituting s-a-Ø (1-TH-FUT) for s-a-ndiüm (1-TH-want) and a-p (TH-FUT) for a-ndiüm (TH-want), we obtain the future tense verbs:

(6) a. s-a-Ø n-a-rang najiüt ‘I will work’
   1-TH-FUT 1DEP-TH-do work

   b. a-p m-a-rang najiüt ‘s/he will work’
   TH-FUT DEP-TH-do work

- For Matthews this parallelism can have no (synchronic) explanation.

B. Argument from variation and diachronic development

- It’s clear that the complex verb words which express tense/aspect properties developed from reduction of free-standing auxiliaries plus verbal complements.

- Future verbs such as sa~n-a-rang ‘I will make/do’ have clearly developed historically from bi-clausal structures (approximately ‘I go (that) I do’):

(7) a. \[TP s-ü-p \[TP n-arang \] ] > \[TP sa \[VP n-arang \] ]
   ‘I go I do’ > ‘I will do’

   b. \[TP ü-p \[TP m-arang \] ] > \[TP ap \[VP m-arang \] ]
   ‘s/he goes (that) s/he do’ > ‘s/he will do’

☞ In SMo üp can still mean ‘go’ but has a very limited range of possible uses.
☞ In SMA the historically anterior forms above are still grammatical, but most speakers use various types of reduced forms — there is a lot of variation.
☞ In SD the 1913 text collection of Paul Radin shows some examples of the analogous anterior forms in that dialect.
C. Huave has two second-position clitics with similar distributions:
   a. Evidential *chük* ‘they say’ / ‘so the story goes’ / ‘allegedly’ etc.
   b. Dubitative *koen* ‘maybe’ / ‘it’s not certain that’ / ‘I’m not sure that’ etc.

   - When these clitics attach to a verb, they always appear between the auxiliary and its verbal complement.

(8) a. *Fwan ap chük m-a-rang naijüt*
   Juan  FUT  EVID  DEP-TH-do work
   ‘They say Juan will work’

   b. *Fwan chük ap m-a-rang naijüt*
   Juan  EVID  FUT DEP-TH-do work

   c. *Fwan ap-m-a-rang chük naijüt*
   Juan  FUT-DEP-TH-do EVID work

   d. *Fwan ap-m-a-rang naijüt chük*
   Juan  FUT-DEP-TH-do work EVID

   - This pattern is difficult to explain if the verb word is syntactically atomic.

**Overview of the verbal system**

1. **Pre-thematic vs. post-thematic verb stems**
   - Simple verb stems consist of a Root plus a Theme Vowel.
   - The theme vowel is harmonic but has the default value [a].

(9) Prethematic: verb stem = -Theme+Root  Transitives and intransitives.

   a. -a-peed  ‘cut, pick (a fruit)’ vt.
      -a-ndiüm  ‘like, want’ vt.
      -a-jüng  ‘dance’ vi.

   b. -a-tsants  ‘warm (something) a bit’ vt.
      -a-tsants-üy  ‘warm (self) a bit’
      \[\text{☞ reflexive’}-ay/-üy, \text{much like Romance se}\]
      -a-xot  ‘hide (something)’ vt.
      -a-xot-üy  ‘hide (self)’ vr.

(10) Post-thematic: verb stem = Root+Theme-  All are intransitive.

   - chet-e-  ‘sit’ (person) vi.
   - lop-o-  ‘soak, get wet’ vi.
   - mbay-a-  ‘be afraid’ vi.
2. Tense/Aspect Categories

- In the standard grammar (Stairs & Hollenbach 1982), Huave is said to have six tense/aspect categories in its verbs.
- There is also a ‘subordinate’ mood, which, for reasons should become clear, I will be calling the dependent form.
- Taking a look at the distribution of negation and evidential clitics, we will see that in fact verbs in four of these categories are formed by means of phonologically clitic auxiliary verbs.
- ~ marks the clitic-host juncture

(11) -rang ‘make, do’
    independent s-arang Ø-arang
    independent ‘preterite’ t-arang-as t-arang
    dependent n-arang m-arang

(12) clitic + dependent
    future sa~n-arang ap~m-arang
    continuous al~n-arang al~m-arang

(13) clitic + dependent or independent — as determined by transitivity (mostly !)

progressive transitives tea~n-acheed tea~m-acheed DEP
recent past transitives la~n-acheed la~m-acheed DEP
progressive intransitives tea~(a)jiünts tea~(a)jiünts INDEP
recent past intransitives la~(a)rang la~(a)jiünts INDEP

3. Free-standing Auxiliaries

- Isolate the part of the verb once the auxiliary is removed: in some (but in fact not all) of these contexts, this part is identical to the dependent verb.
- In two of the categories — progressive and continuous — a free-standing inflected auxiliary may be used instead of a the proclitic.

(14) a. Progressive tea~ or tengial (SMa dye~ or dye-m-ûj-ch ‘giving’)
    b. Recent past la~
    c. Continuous al~ or aliün (iün = ‘go’, al-Ø stative copula)
    d. Future sa~ (1st), ap~ (2/3)

Note: I have been told that men use the proclitics more commonly than women.
This is consistent with my observations in two dialect communities.
4. Examples

(15) **Continuous:** $\text{aliün} \sim al^\sim$

‘it is still the case that (X does V)’ $\rightarrow$ ‘X keeps V-ing, X remains V’

$niüng \, al^\sim m\-akül \, kiaj$

where CONT DEP-live there ‘there where he lives’

(16) **Future:** proclitic ‘will’: $sa^\sim$ (1st person) / $ap^\sim$ (elsewhere) $\rightarrow$ ‘X will V’

a. $wüx \, sa^\sim n\-apeay \, t\, e\-nden$

when 1FUT 1DEP-arrive in-home

‘when I arrive home’

b. $Naleaing \, ap^\sim m\-apak \, o\-meajts\-üw \, nej-iw \, ?$

true  FUT DEP-strong 3-heart-PL 3pron-PL

‘Is it true (that) they will be happy?’

(17) **Progressive:** tengial or its proclitic variant $tea^\sim$ $\rightarrow$ ‘X is V-ing’

a. $Te(a)^\sim akwiki\-aw, \, te(a)^\sim andeak\-üw \ldots$

PROG laugh-PL PROG-talk-PL

‘They are laughing, they are talking’

b. $Tea^\sim m\-apiüng\-üw \, [kwane \, ap^\sim m\-arang\-üw]$.  

PROG DEP-say-PL what  FUT DEP-do-PL

‘They are saying [what they are going to do ]’

(18) **Recent past:** proclitic $la^\sim$

a. $la^\sim me\-ngiay \, [tea^\sim m\-arang \, mi\-ntaj] \, ?$

REC 2DEP-hear PROG 2DEP-do your-wife

‘Have you heard (what) your wife is doing?’

b. $la^\sim ü\-mb \, apix$

REC-be.finished clothes

‘(His) clothes have gotten worn out’

(19) **Negation and Progressive**

a. $ngo \, me^\sim tea\-s\-andeak \, aweaag \, nijingin$

not  DEP PROG 1-talk with anyone

‘I am not talking with anyone’
Negation and Future

a. \( ko^n me^a p^m a w, \)  
   \( n g o^m e^a p^m a x o m m a j a w a p a j i u n, \)  
   because \( n e g^d e p \)  
   \( f u t^d e p \)  
   \( l e a v e^d e p \)  
   \( n e g^d e p \)  
   \( f u t^d e p \)  
   \( f i n d^d e p \)  
   \( k n o w^d e p \)  
   the countryside,  
   ‘for he will not get out, he will not recognize the countryside,

b. \( n g o^m e^a p^m a x o m m a j a w n i k a w j i n d \)  
   \( n e g^d e p \)  
   \( f u t^d e p \)  
   \( f i n d^d e p \)  
   \( k n o w^d e p \)  
   nobody  
   ‘he will not recognize anyone’  
   i.e. he will not be able to get out of jail soon,  
   (but when he finally does) he will not recognize anything anymore

5. Auxiliaries are clitics on the verb

- Speakers sometimes write spaces between proclitics and their hosts; others write the whole sequence as one word or break it various places. Speakers disagree on the ‘right’ spelling.
- A more compelling argument for the clitic status of these elements is that they can be separated from their host by evidential clitics and the negation clitic.

A. Distribution of sentential negation \( n g o \sim n g o m e \) and tense/aspect clitics.

(21) \( n e g \ n g o \) precedes a simplex verb (in the dependent form):

a. \( s-a n d i \ddot{\text{i}} \ddot{\text{u}} m \ p e t \)  
   1-like dog  
   ‘I like dogs’

b. \( n g o n-a n d i \ddot{\text{i}} \ddot{\text{u}} m \ p e t \)  
   \( n e g 1\)-like dog  
   ‘I don’t like dogs’

(22) With progressive, continuous and future auxiliaries \( n e g \) has the form \( n g o-m e \) and precedes the auxiliary.

\[ n e g \sim a s p \sim v \]

a. Progressive \( n g o m e \sim t e a \sim v e r b \)

b. Continuous \( n g o m e \sim a l \sim v e r b \)

c. Future \( n g o m e \sim s a \sim v e r b \)  
   or \( n g o m e \sim a p \sim v e r b \)

- The \textit{me} part of \( n g o-m e \) reflects (historically at least) a dependent prefix on the verb which became (or is) \textit{ASP} — verbs are in the dependent form after \textit{NEG}.  

In the recent past, however, NEG follows the clitic:

Recent past $la^\text{ngo}^\text{Verb}$ (fairly common)
\[\text{REC}^\text{NEG}^\text{V}\]

This is usually translated as *todavía no* ..., i.e. *no longer.*
Semantically: (recently (not (Verb))

\[\text{Juan } la^\text{ngo}^\text{m-andiüm pet.}\]
\[\text{Juan } \text{REC NEG DEP-want dog}\]

‘It happened recently that Juan does not want a dog’
= ‘Juan no longer wants a dog’.

B. Distribution of evidential and dubitative enclitics and tense/aspect auxiliaries

Evidential and dubitative enclitics express the speaker’s attitude toward the reliability of the information or its likelihood of being true.

\[\text{(25) a. Evidential enclitic: } ^{\text{chük}} \text{ ‘they say that ...’, ‘supposedly’, ‘so it goes ...’}\]
\[\text{b. Dubitative enclitic: } ^{\text{koen}} \text{ ‘maybe ...’, ‘I’m not quite sure that ... ’}\]

Note: Most of the examples are taken from a spontaneous oral narrative in which a man is told a (false) rumor that his wife has been unfaithful to him. The couple argue about matters which are hearsay. Moreover, the narrative is itself hearsay, since it is a story. Evidentials appear in nearly every clause, sometimes twice.

The speaker was a 22 year old university student whose use of language is considered conservative. He also provided some grammaticality judgments in interview.

\[\text{(26) Ordinary Evidential Clitic Position: suffix to an independent (tensed) verb:}\]

\[\text{a. } T^\text{-amb-üw}^\text{chük } \text{tiül rünc } m^\text{-apejt-iw sambüm.}\]
\[\text{PRET-go-PL EVID to fields DEP-pick-PL calabash}\]

‘They went — so the story goes — to the fields to pick calabash’

\[\text{b. } T^\text{-ajaraw}^\text{chük } \text{mi-ntaj xeech}\]
\[\text{PRET-be.seen EVID 3-wife gentleman}\]

‘The gentleman’s wife was — I’m told — seen (speaking with another man)’
Evidentials can also encliticize to fronted wh-expressions or adverbs:

a. *Kwanʰ̑ch̑uk i-piüng ?*
   what EVID you-say
   ‘What am I hearing you say?’ lit. ‘What (evidently) are you saying?’
  ☞ The wife’s astonished reply to husband’s accusation.

b. *Kwanʰ̑ch̑uk ta-rang nganůy ?*
   what EVID PRET-do now
   ‘What (allegedly) did he do now?’
  ☞ Wife asking husband what he heard about the alleged ‘other man’

c. *Kiajʰ̑ch̑uk t-axom m-ajaw aliük mi-ntaj nej.*
   then EVID PRET-find DEP-see come 3-wife his
   ‘Then (they say), he recognized (lit. ‘found know’) his wife coming’

I have only one example where the evidential does not cliticize to fronted wh-expression:

   *Kwane t-e-jarawʰ̑ch̑uk ningiün teʰ̑andeak aweaag pálwux nipilan?’*
   how PRET-2-be.known EVID there PROG speak with other people
   ‘How did you “learn” that he is talking with other people there?’
  ☞ The wife is trying to find out how her husband learned about the behavior of the ‘other man’.
  ☞ She uses tejaraw ‘you learned’ with the evidential to reinforce that his knowledge is hearsay; otherwise, since ‘learn’ is factive, she would be admitting guilt.
   ☞ The evidential clitic needs to take narrow focus over the verb only here, and not some larger domain. This probably accounted for its unusual position.

**Evidential clitics and tense/aspect clitics**
- When attaching to a verb, evidential clitics MUST appear between proclitics and the verb.
- They **never precede** a tense/aspect proclitic.
- They **never follow** a verb which has a proclitic.
(30)  a.  `chük with future ap`

\[ Ap\text{`}chük ma-mb nej. \]
\[ \text{FUT EVID DEP-go he} \]
\[ \text{‘They say he is going to go’} \]

b.  `chük with recent past la`

\[ Ngananganaj la\text{`}chük ajkuy omeaats ngana naxey. \]
\[ \text{immediately REC EVID got.angry heart this man} \]
\[ \text{‘They say this man immediately got angry’} \]

c.  La\text{`}chük atang mi-kwal nej.
\[ \text{REC EVID grow 3-son him} \]
\[ \text{‘They say his son has (just) grown up’} \]

d.  `chük with progressive tea`

\[ Tea\text{`}chük andeak aweaag xeech ne-nüüb onij. \]
\[ \text{PROG EVID speak with gentleman AGNT-sell meat} \]
\[ \text{‘They say she was speaking with the gentleman who sells meat’} \]

e.  `koen with progressive tea`

\[ Tea\text{`}koen ajoy yow. \]
\[ \text{PROG DUB bring water} \]
\[ \text{‘Maybe he is bringing water’} \]

(31)  **Combining evidential enclitics with negation**

NEG ngo must precede EVID `chük

a.  Juan ngo\text{`}chük m-ajoy yow
\[ \text{Juan NEG EVID DEP-bring water} \]
\[ \text{‘Juan is evidently not bringing water.’} \]

b.  *Juan\text{`}chük ngo\text{`}m-ajoy yow
\[ \text{Juan EVID NEG DEP-bring water} \]
(32) **Combining evidential clitics and tense/aspect clitics and negation**

EVID can encliticize either to *la* or to *ngo*

a. *Juan la*\textsuperscript{\texttt{-chük ngo*}m-
\texttt{andiüm pet} or
\begin{tabular}{l}
Juan \texttt{REC EVID NEG DEP-want dog} \\
\end{tabular}

a’. *Juan la*\textsuperscript{\texttt{-ngo*}chük ma-
\texttt{andiüm pet} \\
\begin{tabular}{l}
Juan \texttt{REC NEG EVID DEP-want dog} \\
\end{tabular}

‘(They say) Juan no longer wants a dog ( ... instead he wants a cat)’

b. *Juan la*\textsuperscript{\texttt{-koen ngo*}m-
\texttt{andiüm pet} \\
\begin{tabular}{l}
Juan \texttt{REC DUB NEG DEP-want dog} \\
\end{tabular}

‘Maybe Juan no longer wants a dog ( ... instead maybe he wants a cat)’

b’. *Juan la*\textsuperscript{\texttt{-ngo*}koen ma-
\texttt{andiüm pet} \\
\begin{tabular}{l}
Juan \texttt{REC NEG DUB DEP-want dog} \\
\end{tabular}

‘Maybe Juan no longer wants a dog ( ... instead maybe he wants a cat)’

b’’. *Juan*\textsuperscript{\texttt{-chük la*}\textsuperscript{\texttt{-ngo m-andiüm pet}}. \\
\begin{tabular}{l}
Juan \texttt{EVID REC NEG DEP-want dog}. \\
\end{tabular}

(33) **Summary so far**

- Evidential clitics and negation can appear between tense/aspect ‘prefixes’ and the verb.
- Since the former are fairly uncontroversially syntactic objects, the complex verb word is presumably also syntactically complex, consisting of proclitic auxiliaries plus a “verb”

C. **What is ‘under’ the auxiliary?**

- Often, *but not always*, the auxiliary is proclitic on a ‘dependent’ form of the verb which has no tense/aspect distinction, but does show subject agreement.
- The dependent form also appears in a large variety of subordinate and complement clause types, as well as after negation, as well as various modals.
A sample of additional verbs/auxiliaries which select a complement with dependent verb form

a. Completion: *ambich* (agrees w/subj.) ‘is finished/done’  
   ümb (impersonal)

b. Neg Imperative: *nde* (impersonal) ‘don’t (V)!’
c. Possibility: *ndom* (impersonal) ‘is possible’ (= ‘can’)
d. Necessity: *netam* (impersonal) ‘is necessary’ (= ‘must’)
e. Wish: *malüy* (impersonal) ‘if only …,’ (ojalá)
f. Desire: *andiüm* (agrees w/subj.) ‘wants to/that’

- These are for the most part contexts where we might expect an infinitive complement or a clause with a subjunctive verb in familiar languages; so this is not entirely surprising.
- BUT, there are some vexing ‘splits’ in the inflection of the embedded verb which make the system far from tidy.

Transitivity/Ergativity Split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>selector</th>
<th>transitive</th>
<th>unergative (?)</th>
<th>unaccusative or reflexive (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a. Progressive: <em>te(a)</em>/tenguial</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  b. ‘know how to’: *ndom* -mbeas
  c. Inceptive: *pots*
  d. verb of motion + purposive

2. Recent past: *l(a)*
   1st/3rd pers = INDEP
   2 pers has special prefix

3. a. Future *sa*/ap
   b. Continuous *al*/aliün
   c. Other DEP selector

- Transitive verbs always have the same form in all DEP-selecting contexts.
- The intransitives show split inflectional patterning.
  a. After the progressive proclitic, the ordinary INDEP verb is use.
  b. After recent past *la*:
     i. a class of mostly unergative (?) verbs always appear with the INDEP form.
     ii. other intransitives, typically unaccusatives and reflexives, have a distinct inflection only in the 2nd person.
(36) Split under the progressive

a. ‘cry’: unergative → INDEP

\[ \text{Te} \overset{\text{PROG}}{\text{ajiünts}} \overset{\text{IND}}{\text{a nine nench}} \]

‘The little boy is crying’

b. ‘talk’: unergative → INDEP

‘say (something)’: transitive → DEP
‘can’ → DEP

\[ \text{Te} \overset{\text{PROG}}{\text{andeak-üw}}, \text{tea} \overset{\text{DEP}}{\text{m-a-piüng-üw}} [\text{kwane al} \overset{\text{CONT}}{\text{ndo-m}} \text{m-arang-üw}] \]

‘They are talking, they are saying [what they can do]’

c. ‘listen (to something)’: transitive → DEP

‘to lie about’: transitive → DEP

\[ \text{Tea} \overset{\text{PROG}}{\text{m-angiay}} [\text{leaw kwane tengial m-awaiich-eran wüx}] \]

‘He is listening to [whatever people are telling lies about]’

(37) Under ‘know how to’: ndo-m o-mbeas lit. ‘it is possible for my body to …’

a. ‘swim’: unergative → INDEP

\[ \text{Ngo ndo-m xi-mbas sa-jrok.} \]

‘I do not know how to swim.’

b. ‘do’: transitive → DEP

\[ \text{Ngo ndom xi-mbas n-arang nikwajind} \]

‘I don’t know how to do anything.’
(38) Under *pots* (inceptive): ‘it starts that’ (impersonal)

a. ‘to be drinking, to get drunk’: intransitive → INDEP
   ‘to drink (something)’: transitive → DEP

   *Tea* m-apiüng-űw m-awün-iw~chük akas nangaag yow [pots [angün-iw]],
   PROG DEP-say-PL DEP-get.out-PL EVID some bitter liquid start (IND).get.drunk-PL
   ‘They are saying to get out some liquor to start to get drunk (hearsay),

   *pots* m-anganeow-űw nganüy.
   start DEP-drink-PL now

   (and now) they start to drink (some)’

b. ‘to lie (about or to)’: transitive → DEP

   *Kwane neol ta-pots m-e-waiich xik?*
   What reason PRET-begin DEP-2-lie.to me
   ‘Why did you begin to lie to me?’
   lit. ‘(For) what reason did it start that you lie to me?’

(39) Verbs of motion followed by purpose clauses

a. *T-amb-as s-andok*
   PRET-go-1 1IND-fish
   ‘I went to fish.’

b. *T-amb-as n-andok tixem.*
   PRET-go-1 1DEP-fish shrimp
   ‘I went to fish for shrimp.’

c. *Sa n-amb na-rang mandada*
   1FUT-1 DEP-go 1DEP-do errand
   ‘I will go to do an errand.’
What counts as ‘transitive’?

- A verb which normally appears in a transitive context inflects intransitively when having no direct object (in the ‘dogs bite’ context).

(40)  

\[ a\text{-ngalüy ‘to buy (something) for oneself’ vt.; ‘to go shopping, to buy’ vi. } \]
\[ a\text{-ndeak ‘to talk about (something) vt. / ‘to talk’ vi. } \]

a.  
\[ Ajaj, x\text{-iün te-mplas x\text{-iün ne-ngalüy}, tea\text{-s-a-ngalüy,} \]
\[ yes 1\text{-come to-square 1\text{-come AGNT-buy PROG-1-buy,} } \]
\[ ‘Yes, I come to the square, I come as a buyer, I am buying, } \]
\[ ngome tea\text{-s-andeak aweaag nijingin } \]
\[ DEP PROG 1\text{-talk with no.one } \]
\[ ... I am not talking with anyone’ \]

b.  
\[ Te\text{-andeak-üw ... } \]
\[ PROG\text{-talk-PL } \]
\[ ‘They are talking’ \]
\[ “Naleaing [leaw tea\text{-m-a-ndeak-üw a]?” ajow chük. } \]
\[ true [what PROG DEP\text{-talk-PL} yes/no say EVID } \]
\[ “Is it true what they are talking about?” he says (so the story goes).’ \]

(41)  

Light Verb Constructions are ‘intransitive’

\[ -rang ‘to make X’ (trans.) / ‘to do X’ light verb construction (intransitive) \]

a.  
\[ Juan te\text{-arang najiüt nganüy } \]
\[ Juan PROG\text{-do work now } \]
\[ ‘John is working now’ \]

(42)  

Object pro-drop

- Object pronouns as well as subject pronouns can be pro-dropped.
- Verbs with pro-dropped objects are still transitive for the split.

a.  
\[ Kiaj t\text{-amb-as } [n\text{-axaing }] [n\text{-ayak kalüy ] pick (it) up, take (it) \]
\[ then PAST\text{-go-1 1DEP\text{-lift 1DEP-take north } } \]
\[ ‘Then I went to pick [it] up, to take [it] (to) the north side’ \]

b.  
\[ Kiaj tambas [n\text{-atsambiich kawak alinop] ‘release (it) \]
\[ then PAST\text{-go-1 1DEP\text{-release south again } } \]
\[ ‘Then I went to release [it] on the south beach again’ \]