

# The Evolution of the Huavean Verbal Complex

Rolf Noyer, University of Pennsylvania

Workshop on Suspended Affixation, Cornell-Syracuse 26 October 2012

## 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-☺-do      ‘I will make/do’
- b. *ap-m-e-rang*  
FUT-☺-2-do      ‘you will make/do’
- c. *ap-m-a-rang*  
FUT-☺-☺-do      ‘s/he will make/do’
- d. *ap-m-a-rang-ar*  
FUT-☺-☺-do-1INCL.DU      ‘we — you sg. and I — will make/do’
- e. *ap-m-a-rang-aats*  
FUT-☺-☺-do-1INCL.PL      ‘we — all of us — will make/do’
- f. *sa-n-a-rang-an*  
1EXCL.FUT-1EXCL-☺-do-PL      ‘we (excl.) will make/do’
- g. *ap-m-e-rang-an*  
FUT-☺-2-do-PL      ‘you pl. will make/do’
- h. *ap-m-a-rang-üw*  
FUT-☺-☺-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-* 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 instantiations/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.



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 najiüt*  
 Juan FUT EVID DEP-TH-do work

‘They say Juan will work’

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

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

d. \**Fwan ap-m-a-rang najiüt 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-jiüng* ‘dance’ vi.

b. *-a-tsants* ‘warm (something) a bit’ vt.

*-a-tsants-üy* ‘warm (self) a bit’

☞ ‘reflexive’ *-ay/-üy*, 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.
- $\hat{\ }$  marks the clitic-host juncture

|      |  |   |   |
|------|--|---|---|
| (11) | <i>-rang</i> ‘make, do’  | 1sg                                       | 3sg   |
|      | independent  | <i>s-arang</i>                            | $\emptyset$ - <i>arang</i>                      |
|      | independent ‘preterite’  | <i>t-arang-as</i>                         | <i>t-arang</i>                                  |
|      | dependent  | <i>n-arang</i>                            | <i>m-arang</i>                                  |
| (12) | clitic + dependent   | 1sg                                       | 3sg   |
|      | future   | <i>sa<math>\hat{\ } </math>n-arang</i>    | <i>ap<math>\hat{\ } </math>m-arang</i>          |
|      | continuous   | <i>al<math>\hat{\ } </math>n-arang</i>    | <i>al<math>\hat{\ } </math>m-arang</i>          |
| (13) | clitic + dependent or independent — as determined by transitivity (mostly !) |   |   |
|      | progressive transitives  | <i>tea<math>\hat{\ } </math>n-acheed</i>  | <i>tea<math>\hat{\ } </math>m-acheed</i> DEP    |
|      | recent past transitives  | <i>la<math>\hat{\ } </math>n-acheed</i>   | <i>la<math>\hat{\ } </math>m-acheed</i> DEP     |
|      | progressive intransitives  | <i>tea<math>\hat{\ } </math>(a)jiünts</i> | <i>tea<math>\hat{\ } </math>(a)jiünts</i> INDEP |
|      | recent past intransitives  | <i>la<math>\hat{\ } </math>(a)rang</i>    | <i>la<math>\hat{\ } </math>(a)jiünts</i> 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 | <i>tea<math>\hat{\ } </math></i> or <i>tengial</i>                           | (SMa <i>dye<math>\hat{\ } </math></i> or <i>dye-m-üj-ch</i> ‘giving’) |
|      | b. Recent past | <i>la<math>\hat{\ } </math></i>  |   |
|      | c. Continuous  | <i>al<math>\hat{\ } </math></i> or <i>aliün</i>                              | ( <i>iün</i> = ‘go’, <i>al-Ø</i> stative copula)                      |
|      | d. Future      | <i>sa<math>\hat{\ } </math></i> (1st), <i>ap<math>\hat{\ } </math></i> (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:** *aliün ~ al<sup>ˆ</sup>*  
 ‘it is still the case that (X does V)’ → ‘X keeps V-ing, X remains V’

*niüng al<sup>ˆ</sup>m-akül kiaj*  
 where CONT DEP-live there ‘there where he lives’

- (16) **Future:** proclitic ‘will’: *sa<sup>ˆ</sup>* (1st person) / *ap<sup>ˆ</sup>* (elsewhere) → ‘X will V’

a. *wüx sa<sup>ˆ</sup>n-apeay t e-nden*  
 when 1FUT 1DEP-arrive in-home  
 ‘when I arrive home’

b. *Naleaing ap<sup>ˆ</sup>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<sup>ˆ</sup>* → ‘X is V-ing’

a. *Te(a)<sup>ˆ</sup>akwiki-aw, te(a)<sup>ˆ</sup>andeak-üw ...*  
 PROG laugh-PL PROG-talk-PL  
 ‘They are laughing, they are talking’

b. *Tea<sup>ˆ</sup>m-apiüng-üw [kwane ap<sup>ˆ</sup>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<sup>ˆ</sup>*

a. *la<sup>ˆ</sup>me-ngiay [tea<sup>ˆ</sup>m-arang mi-ntaj]?*  
 REC 2DEP-hear PROG 2DEP-do your-wife  
 ‘Have you heard (what) your wife is doing?’

b. *la<sup>ˆ</sup>ü-mb apix*  
 REC-be.finished clothes  
 ‘(His) clothes have gotten worn out’

- (19) **Negation and Progressive**

a. *ngo me<sup>ˆ</sup>tea-s-andeak aweaag nijingin*  
 not DEP PROG 1-talk with anyone  
 ‘I am not talking with anyone’

(20) **Negation and Future**

a. *kos ngo<sup>h</sup>me<sup>h</sup>ap<sup>h</sup>m-aw, ngo<sup>h</sup>me<sup>h</sup>ap<sup>h</sup>m-axom m-ajaw a pajchiün,*  
 because NEG-DEP FUT DEP-leave NEG-DEP-FUT DEP-find DEP-know the countryside,

‘for he will not get out, he will not recognize the countryside,

b. *ngo<sup>h</sup>me<sup>h</sup>ap<sup>h</sup>m-axom m-ajaw nikawjind*  
 NEG DEP FUT DEP-find DEP-know 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 *ngo* ~ *ngome* and tense/aspect clitics.**

(21) NEG *ngo* precedes a simplex verb (in the dependent form):

a. *s-andiüm pet* ‘I like dogs’  
 1-like dog

b. *ngo n-andiüm pet* ‘I don’t like dogs’  
 NEG 1-like dog

(22) With progressive, continuous and future auxiliaries Neg has the form *ngo-me* and precedes the auxiliary.

NEG<sup>h</sup>ASP<sup>h</sup>v

a. Progressive *ngome<sup>h</sup>tea<sup>h</sup>Verb*

b. Continuous *ngome<sup>h</sup>al<sup>h</sup>Verb*

c. Future *ngome<sup>h</sup>sa<sup>h</sup>Verb* or *ngome<sup>h</sup>ap<sup>h</sup>Verb*

- The *me* part of *ngo-me* reflects (historically at least) a dependent prefix on the verb which became (or is) ASP — verbs are in the dependent form after NEG.

- (23) In the recent past, however, NEG *follows* the clitic:

Recent past      *la^ngo^Verb*      (fairly common)  
                                  REC^NEG^V

This is usually translated as *todavía no ...*, i.e. *no longer*.

Semantically: (recently (not (Verb)))

- (24) *Juan la^ngo^m-andiüm pet.*

Juan 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.

- (25) a. Evidential enclitic:    *^chük*    ‘they say that ...’, ‘supposedly’, ‘so it goes ...’  
       b. Dubitative enclitic:    *^koen*    ‘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.

- (26) Ordinary Evidential Clitic Position: suffix to an independent (tensed) verb:

- a. *T-amb-üw^chük tiül rüñch m-apejt-iw sambüm.*

PRET-go-PL EVID to fields DEP-pick-PL calabash

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

- b. *T-ajaraw^chük mi-ntaj xeech*

PRET-be.seen EVID 3-wife gentleman

‘The gentleman’s wife was — I’m told — seen (speaking with another man)’

(27) Evidentials can also encliticize to fronted wh-expressions or adverbs:

a. *Kwan<sup>ˆ</sup>chük 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. *Kwan<sup>ˆ</sup>chük ta-rang nganüy ?*

what EVID PRET-do now

‘What (allegedly) did he do now?’

☞ Wife asking husband what he heard about the alleged ‘other man’

c. *Kiaj<sup>ˆ</sup>chük 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’

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

*Kwane t-e-jaraw<sup>ˆ</sup>chük ningiün te<sup>ˆ</sup>andeak aweaag pälwüx 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.

(29) a. ASP+EVID V

b. \* EVID ASP+V

c. \* ASP+V+EVID

- (30) a.  $\hat{chük}$  with future  $ap\hat{}$

*Ap $\hat{chük}$  ma-mb nej.*

FUT EVID DEP-go he

‘They say he is going to go’

- b.  $\hat{chük}$  with recent past  $la\hat{}$

*Ngananganaj la $\hat{chük}$  ajküy omeaats ngana naxey.*

immediately REC EVID got.angry heart this man

‘They say this man immediately got angry’

- c. *La $\hat{chük}$  atang mi-kwal nej.*

REC EVID grow 3-son him

‘They say his son has (just) grown up’

- d.  $\hat{chük}$  with progressive  $tea\hat{}$

*Tea $\hat{chük}$  andeak aweaag xeech ne-nüüb onij.*

PROG EVID speak with gentleman AGNT-sell meat

‘They say she was speaking with the gentleman who sells meat’

- e.  $\hat{koen}$  with progressive  $tea\hat{}$

*Tea $\hat{koen}$  ajoy yow.*

PROG DUB bring water

‘Maybe he is bringing water’

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

NEG  $ngo\hat{}$  must precede EVID  $\hat{chük}$

- a. *Juan ngo $\hat{chük}$  m-ajoy yow*

Juan NEG EVID DEP-bring water

‘Juan is evidently not bringing water.’

- b. *\*Juan $\hat{chük}$  ngo $\hat{m}$ -ajoy yow*

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<sup>h</sup>chük ngo<sup>h</sup>m-andiüm pet*                      or  
 Juan REC EVID NEG DEP-want dog
- a.' *Juan la<sup>h</sup>ngo<sup>h</sup>chük ma-ndiüm pet*  
 Juan REC NEG EVID DEP-want dog  
 '(They say) Juan no longer wants a dog ( ... instead he wants a cat)'
- b. *Juan la<sup>h</sup>koen ngo<sup>h</sup>m-andiüm pet*  
 Juan REC DUB NEG DEP-want dog  
 'Maybe Juan no longer wants a dog ( ... instead maybe he wants a cat)'
- b.' *Juan la<sup>h</sup>ngo<sup>h</sup>koen ma-ndiüm pet*  
 Juan REC NEG DUB DEP-want dog  
 'Maybe Juan no longer wants a dog ( ... instead maybe he wants a cat)'
- b.'' \**Juan<sup>h</sup>chük la<sup>h</sup>ngo m-andiüm pet.*  
 Juan EVID REC NEG DEP-want dog.

(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.

## (34) A sample of additional verbs/auxiliaries which select a complement with dependent verb form

|                    |                                |                                |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| a. Completion:     | <i>ambich</i> (agrees w/subj.) | ‘is finished/done’             |
|                    | <i>ümb</i> (impersonal)        |                                |
| b. Neg Imperative: | <i>nde</i> (impersonal)        | ‘don’t (V)!’                   |
| c. Possibility:    | <i>ndom</i> (impersonal)       | ‘is possible’ (= ‘can’)        |
| d. Necessity:      | <i>netam</i> (impersonal)      | ‘is necessary’ (= ‘must’)      |
| e. Wish:           | <i>malüy</i> (impersonal)      | ‘if only ...’ ( <i>ojalá</i> ) |
| f. Desire:         | <i>andiüm</i> (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.

## (35) Transitivity/Ergativity Split

| selector                                  | transitive | unergative (?) | unaccusative<br>or reflexive (?)                  |
|---|------------|----------------|---|
| 1. a. Progressive: <i>te(a)ˆ/tenguial</i> | DEP        | INDEP          | INDEP   |
| b. ‘know how to’: <i>ndom -mbeas</i>      |            |                |   |
| c. Inceptive: <i>pots</i>                 |            |                |   |
| d. verb of motion + purposive             |            |                |   |
| 2. Recent past: <i>l(a)ˆ</i>              | DEP        | INDEP          | 1st/3rd pers = INDEP<br>2 pers has special prefix |
| 3. a. Future <i>saˆ/apˆ</i>               | DEP        | DEP            | DEP   |
| b. Continuous <i>alˆ/aliün</i>            |            |                |   |
| c. Other DEP selector                     |            |                |   |

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

## (36) Split under the progressive

- a. ‘cry’: unergative → INDEP

*Te<sup>ˆ</sup>ajiünts a nine nench*

PROG (IND).cry the little boy

‘The little boy is crying’

- b. ‘talk’: unergative → INDEP  
 ‘say (something)’: transitive → DEP  
 ‘can’ → DEP

*Te<sup>ˆ</sup>andeak-üw, tea<sup>ˆ</sup>m-a-piüng-üw [kwane al<sup>ˆ</sup>ndo-m m-arang-üw]*

PROG (IND).talk-PL PROG DEP-say-PL what CONT can-3 DEP-do-PL

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

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

*Tea<sup>ˆ</sup>m-angiy [leaw kwane tengial m-awaiich-eran wüx]*

PROG DEP-listen that what PROG DEP-lie-INDEF about

‘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

*Ngo ndo-m xi-mbas sa-jrok.*

NEG can-3 1-body 1IND-swim

‘I do not know how to swim.’

- b. ‘do’: transitive → DEP

*Ngo ndom xi-mbas n-arang nikwajind*

NEG can-3 1-body 1DEP-do nothing

‘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<sup>h</sup> m-apiüng-üw m-awün-iw<sup>h</sup> 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-üw 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<sup>h</sup> n-amb na-rang mandada*

1FUT-1DEP-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-ngalüy* ‘to buy (something) for oneself’ vt.; ‘to go shopping, to buy’ vi.

*a-ndeak* ‘to talk about (something) vt. / ‘to talk’ vi.

a. *Ajaj, x-iün te-mplas x-iün ne-ngalüy, tea<sup>ˆ</sup>s-a-ngalüy,*  
 yes 1-come to-square 1-come AGNT-buy PROG-1-buy,  
 ‘Yes, I come to the square, I come as a buyer, I am buying,

*ngome tea<sup>ˆ</sup>s-andeak aweaag nijingin*  
 DEP PROG 1-talk with no.one  
 ... I am not talking with anyone’

b. *Te<sup>ˆ</sup>andeak-üw ...*

PROG-talk-PL

‘They are talking’

“*Naleaing [leaw tea<sup>ˆ</sup>m-a-ndeak-üw a]?*” *ajow chük.*  
 true [what PROG DEP-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<sup>ˆ</sup>arang najiüt nganüy*

Juan PROG-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-amb-as [n-axaing ] [n-ayak kalüy ]* pick (it) up, take (it)  
 then PAST-go-1 1DEP-lift 1DEP-take north

‘Then I went to pick [it] up, to take [it] (to) the north side’

b. *Kiaj tambas [n-atsambiich kawak alinop ]* ‘release (it)  
 then PAST-go-1 1DEP-release south again

‘Then I went to release [it] on the south beach again’