KONJO'S PERIPATETIC PERSON MARKERS

BARBARA FRIBERG

1. INTRODUCTION

Konjo designates the language of some 200,000 people living in South Sulawesi. It lies between the dominant Bugis and Makasar languages, and has frequently been called a dialect of Makasar. Konjo shares a number of features with both Bugis and Makasar, but as a member of the Makasar family of languages, it is more closely related to Makasar (and family member Selayar). Konjo reflects many features of the Makasar language, yet there are numerous distinctions, many of which are a result of Bugis influence on the language.

Within Konjo there are two major dialects, termed mountain and coastal Konjo. These notes reflect the coastal Konjo language situation. Coastal Konjo consists of four sub-districts located along the eastern coast of Bulukumba district. This paper is based on intermittent fieldwork done in the twin villages of Jannaya and Kalimporo in Kajang sub-district from 1985 to 1991.

2. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

In order to adequately describe the function of person markers in Konjo a number of related issues are dealt with in this paper. The subjects of ergativity and transitivity are discussed first as they are relevant to Konjo and its relation to other languages in the area. Throughout the paper an attempt is made to comment on related languages and to some degree on their analyses as they differ from Konjo.

Focus, topic and prominence are also discussed as basic factors determining the placement of Konjo person markers. Konjo word order is presented as a basis for discussing variant orderings arising from considerations of focus and topic.

The major part of the paper deals with verbal modifiers and how they affect person markers. Verbal juxtaposition is touched on in contrast to verbal modifiers. Negatives, temporal adverbials and complex clauses all result in a divergence from the normal pattern of affix placement in Konjo and are discussed thoroughly.

Passives, imperatives and completive -*mo* will be discussed to show how they function in relation to person marking.

2.1 ERGATIVITY

The issue of ergativity has been much debated, and depending on the latest article read, one vacillates between viewing Konjo (and other related languages in the area) as an ergative-type language and viewing it as an accusative-type language. Anderson's (1976:23)[1] notion of subject in languages where ergativity is evident is helpful, as is Dixon's (1979) general treatise on ergativity.

There is no doubt that Konjo is *morphologically ergative* in that the cross-referencing clitics affixed to the verb clearly divide into ergative and absolutive forms. The person-marker clitics referring to the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive verb have one set of morphemes and are suffixed to the verb, while the person-marker clitics referring to the subject of a transitive verb have a different set of morphemes, which are prefixed to the verb. Chart 1 gives the person markers, free pronouns and possessives found in Konjo.

CHART 1: CLITIC PERSON MARKERS, FREE PRONOUNS AND POSSESSIVES

	Proclitics (/Ergative)	Enclitics (/Absolutive)	Free Pronouns	Possessives
1SG/1PL.EXC[2]	*ku-*	*-a*	*nakke*	*-ku*
1PL.INC[2]/2H	*ki-*	*-ki*	*gitte*	*-ta*
2F	*nu-*	*-ko*	*kau*	*-nu*
3	*na-*	*-i*	*ia*	*-na*

Syntactically, however, free-form nominals have no case-marking distinctions and function nominative/accusatively. The subject of the clause is distinguished from the object either by word order or context. Free-form pronouns occur mainly for emphasis in Konjo or as the subject of an equative clause. The person-marker clitics serve to clarify what the semantic subject (and object) of the verb are. In many cases even the third-person nominal subject (and object) are clear from discourse and need not be overtly stated. Since the person markers carry such a heavy load in designating the participants of a clause, it is easy to want to classify Konjo as an 'ergative language'.

It is quite clear that Konjo does not meet the requirements of Marantz's Ergativity Hypothesis (1984) which states that in an ergative language the agent has the deep-structure role of object and the patient has the deep-structure role of subject. (It is questionable whether even the oft-cited ergative language Dyirbal meets the requirements.) Konjo does not

---

[1] "The notion of subject in ergative languages is, despite the morphological indications which appear to indicate otherwise, essentially the same as that in accusative languages...there is in fact no reason to expect the notion of subject to be related in a maximally simple way to morphological category." Dyirbal is an exception, where a distinctively 'ergative' notion of subject "is analogous to the usual 'accusative' notion, but which is inapplicable to the vast majority of morphologically ergative languages".

[2] The Konjo pronominal system differentiates only person, not number or gender. The charted distinction between first person plural inclusive and exclusive arises from context; it is not an inherent part of the pronominal system. The use of first person reflects the fact that the speaker excludes the hearer, while the use of second person honorific reflects his inclusion. For purposes of glossing, only the person will be indicated as 1, 2F, 2H, 3 unless there is a clear case of first person plural (which is extremely rare in the examples – (1PL.INC, 1PL.EXC).

even have the evidence as in Dyirbal that complement or relative clauses require an ergative or antipassive pattern (Dixon 1979: 127-130).[3]

Martens (1988) shows how ergativity in Uma relates to a focus system found in Philippine languages. He treats person markers as pronouns and thus leans towards viewing Uma as an ergative language. He uses goal and actor focus and calls the set of neutral, unmarked pronouns in Uma the absolutive pronouns. He succeeds in showing that Uma is morphologically ergative, very similar to Konjo.

Himmelmann (this volume) presents an interesting viewpoint asserting that to try to class Sulawesian languages in terms of either a focus system or an ergative system leaves a number of important issues unaccounted for from a typological perspective. Instead of dealing with grammatical relations in terms of overall systems, he finds it more useful to treat them in more local and surface-oriented terms such as the grammatical formatives involved. Based on this premise, he goes on to show that the person markers normally referred to as 'ergative' are in fact simply prefixes marking the ACTOR.[4] He claims that person markers on the verb stem are an 'intrusion' into the 'focus'/mood paradigm, a relatively recent innovation within the Austronesian family.

I choose neither to abandon ergativity nor to consider it a syntactic factor which would typify Konjo as an ergative language. An ergative/absolutive system functions at the morphological level. Thus I will talk about ergativity as a major morphological process in Konjo, yet use the terms 'subject' and 'object' (on a syntactic level) as would normally be used of a nominative/accusative language.[5]

2.2 TRANSITIVITY

The primary concern in an ergative system is the *transitivity* of the verb. As Givón (1984:151) expresses it, such a system "abides neither by the pragmatics of 'subject' nor by the semantics of agent/non-agent. Rather, it abides roughly...by the **transitivity** of the clause". Konjo refers to the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive verb by the same morpheme, but the subject of a transitive verb by a different morpheme, however transitivity may be defined pragmatically on the basis of degree of affectedness of the patient. From a Konjo perspective a clause is considered 'transitive' only if the object is something specifically referred to, regardless of any assumption of prior familiarity. In Konjo transitivity (i.e. that which requires a proclitic person marker) is distinguished on the basis of a parameter of object definiteness (Hopper & Thompson 1980:259, 288). The fact that the verb implies two participants yet only focuses on one is signalled by the verbaliser prefix *ang-*: *a'-* is used for semantically intransitive active verbs; *a-* is used with statives.

---

[3]   Larsen (1987) shows that Quiché is syntactically ergative, but in a way that has not been previously recognised: NPs in S-function in Quiché are syntactically like NPs in O-function for the simple reason that they are both direct objects, i.e. they are both dominated by VP in S-structure. If we compare similar structures in Konjo to those cited by Larsen for Quiché, we see that a nominative/accusative system functions in all cases for Konjo.

[4]   In fact this view is not satisfactory for Konjo, since the same prefixed person markers sometimes designate the patient of the verb, as will be discussed later in this paper.

[5]   Subject and object are used here in the most traditional sense, i.e. the subject is the participant in a clause that performs the action (or is in a given state) of the verb while the object is that which receives the action of the verb.

CHART 2: VERBALISERS IN KONJO

ang-	transitive verbaliser
ang-	definite verbaliser[6]
ni-	passive verbaliser
a'-	intransitive active verbaliser
a-	stative verbaliser

If Konjo were to be viewed as having a syntactically ergative system, then we would have to class as *antipassive* those clauses which have an inherently transitive verb but which require an absolutive person-marker referent to the subject (as discussed in §3.1.1). This fits the criterion that the antipassive construction is used in situations where the object is indefinite; however, the criterion that the patient is marked by an oblique is never met in Konjo. If transitivity is defined for Konjo in terms of object definiteness, then there are no syntactic antipassive forms. Rather object focus versus subject focus as defined below differentiates transitivity for all situations.

2.3 KONJO WORD ORDER

Before discussing issues of focus and topicalisation, it will be helpful to look at Konjo word order. One could say (as has been said of several Sulawesian languages) that Konjo has relatively free word order. We will, however, posit that Konjo basic word order is VSO, with many alternate orders depending on which element of the clause is prominent or which is being topicalised. (In Konjo the topicalised item is that element under discussion, and it occurs in clause-initial position.)

Consider first clauses with only one participant. The unmarked order is verb followed by subject (example 1). If the subject is topicalised it occurs before the verb (example 2).

(1)   A'lampai   (Amir).
        VRi.go.3ABS Amir
        He (Amir) goes.

(2)   Amir a'lampa.
        Amir VRi.go
        Amir goes.

In clauses where there are two (or more) participants the order is VSO. This fact is not based on statistics; in fact a clause with VSO word order is rarely found in texts or conversations. In examples such as (3) and (4) there is nothing in the clause which would clarify which of the two items is the subject (or object), nor is either participant prominent or the topic of the discourse. Konjo speakers will choose the meaning given (i.e. the first noun is subject) based on the fact that they perceive the subject to be the item which occurs first following the verb.

---

6   Although the definite verbaliser *ang-* is the same phonetic shape as the transitive verbaliser *ang-*, the former does not phonologically affect the verb root, while the latter does. Compare examples (11) and (19b). See Friberg and Friberg (1991) for details.

(3)   *Napeppe'i*   *Amir asungku.*
       3ERG.hit.3ABS   Amir dog.1POSS
       Amir hit my dog.

(4)   *Naittei*   *asua*   *meonga.*
       3ERG.see.3ABS   dog.DEF   cat.DEF
       The dog saw the cat.

It is quite common for the subject to follow the object, in which case the context clarifies the participants.

(5)   *Naallei*   *tasi'ku*   *meonga.*
       3ERG.take.3ABS   bag.1POSS cat.DEF
       The cat took my bag.

(6)   *Naondangi*   *meonga asua.*
       3ERG.chase.3ABS   cat.DEF dog.DEF
       The dog chased the cat.

Technically in (6) 'the cat' is in subject position, yet everyone knows that dogs chase cats, not vice versa. Without recourse to higher-level discourse distinctions, one would have to conclude from examples such as (7a) and (7b) that the order of the subject and object vary freely. (These sentences occurred in the same paragraph with similar contexts.)

(7)   a.   *...iamintu*   *punna nasambangi*   *tulu' bangkenga.*
             3PRO.3CMP.that if   3ERG.trip.3ABS   rope leg.DEF
             ...it's if the rope trips the foot.

       b.   *...iamintu nasambangi bangkenga tulu'.*
             ...it's the rope tripping the foot.

Usually context or the meaning of the verb will suffice to indicate which participant is which, but in the case of names or pronouns a device of adding an *i*-prefix to the subject[7] is used.

(8)   *Nabetai*   *Ali iAmir.*
       3ERG.beat.3ABS   Ali   PI.Amir
       Amir beat Ali.

(9)   *Nakanrei*   *lokaku*   *iAmir.*
       3ERG.eat.3ABS   banana.1POSS PI.Amir
       Amir ate my banana.

Either the subject or object can be fronted as topic. Example (10) is the unmarked word order; the subject is topic in (11); the object is topic in (12).

(10)   *Nakanrei*   *Amir lokaku.*
       3ERG.eat.3ABS   Amir banana.1POSS
       Amir ate/is eating my banana.

(11)   *Amir angkanrei*   *lokaku.*
       Amir VRd.eat.3ABS   banana.1POSS
       (It is) Amir (who) ate my banana.

---

7   It marks other than subject in certain constructions, but its full use is beyond the scope of this paper.

(12)   *Lokaku   nakanre   (Amir).*
banana.1POSS 3ERG.eat Amir
(It was) my banana he (/Amir) ate.

3. KONJO PERSON MARKERS AS USED IN VARIOUS TYPES OF CLAUSES

Before getting into a detailed discussion of focus, topic and prominence and how they factor into the placement of Konjo person markers, it will be helpful to clarify the interaction between the person markers and the subjects and objects they refer to. Konjo requires the presence of the person markers under normal conditions even if both the subject and object are fully specified in the clause. Note the correspondence between the person markers and the subjects (and objects) in examples (1) and (3)-(11) where the ergative form refers to the subject in a transitive clause and the absolutive form refers to the object in a transitive clause and the subject in an intransitive clause. (The person marker referring to the subject in (2) and (11) and the object in (12) is missing because of topicalisation as discussed in §3.2.)

A few more examples will serve to show that free pronouns function syntactically the same as the free nominals. However, since the person markers clearly specify the participants for first and second person, the pronoun is used to add emphasis to the subject or object involved.

(13)   *Lamminroma   nakke.*
FUT.VRi[8].return.1CMP[9] 1PRO
I (emphatic) am returning home.

(14)   *Igitte   a'lampa.*
PI.2(H)PRO VRi.go
You (emphatic) go.

(15)   *Inakke   ansareko   doi'.*
PI.1PRO VRd.give.2(F)ABS money
I (emphatic) give you money.

(16)   *Angngura na   inakke   kisare   doi'   lohe   kamua?*
why   CMPL PI.1PRO 2(H)ERG.give money much very
Why is it to me (emphatic) you are giving so much money?

(17)   *Injo nisessaanga   nakke, nasuroa*
that PASS.hard.BEN.1ABS 1PRO 3ERG.order.1ABS

a'bela'   karaenga borong tuju   hetto.
VRi.slash king.DEF forest   seven hectare
I (emphatic) was given a hard time: the king ordered me to slash seven hectares of forest.

Example (13) illustrates the free pronoun being added for emphasis. In (14) the free pronoun is also emphasised, and it is topicalised. In (15) the pronoun is the subject of the

---

[8]   *a'-* plus vowel-inital roots usually becomes *amm-*; therefore, *a'+inro = amminro.*

[9]   We are considering the enclitic person markers in combination with the aspect markers (*-ja, -pa, -mo*) as a single unit. Thus *-ma* is glossed 1CMP rather than CMP-1ABS. These behave as simple enclitics and function as a unit in most situations.

transitive clause and is topicalised, while in (16) the topicalised pronoun is the indirect object. Example (17) illustrates the free pronoun used in a passive construction.

3.1 FOCUS

A basic distinguishing factor for Konjo clause types is *focus*. Focus in the sense used in this paper distinguishes between subject and object at the syntactic level. *Subject focus* implies that there is no object or that the object is not relevant to the action at hand. *Object focus* implies that there is a specifically referred-to object. Subject focus requires an 'absolutive' enclitic referent to the subject. Object focus requires an 'ergative' proclitic referent to the subject while the object is referred to by an 'absolutive' enclitic. Although this seems somewhat awkward, it could be viewed as a system where the unmarked form (i.e. the subject in subject focus and the object in object focus) is referred to by an 'absolutive' morpheme while the marked form is referred to by an 'ergative' morpheme.

3.1.1 SUBJECT FOCUS

Clauses in subject focus are characterised by the absolutive person-marker enclitic and a verbal prefix indicating whether the verb is inherently transitive or intransitive: *ang-* marks transitive; *a'-* marks intransitive active; *a-* marks stative.

(18) a.   *A'dappo'a.*
            VRi.fall.1ABS
            I fell.

      b.   *A'dappokako   kau!*
            VRi.fall.WRN.2(F)ABS 2(F)PRO
            You're going to fall!

(19) a.   *Angnganrei   (Amir) (loka).*
            VRt.eat.3ABS Amir   banana
            He (Amir) is eating (bananas).

      b.   *Amir angnganre loka.*
            Amir VRt.eat   banana
            Amir is eating bananas.

(20) a.   *Angngittea   jangang-jangang.*
            VRt.see.1ABS bird
            I see some birds.

      b.   *Angngittei   Siti ana'-ana'.*
            VRt.see.3ABS Siti children
            Siti sees some children.

(21) a.   *Arannua.*
            VRs.happy.1ABS
            I am happy.

      b.   *Alarroi   Puang Amin.*
            VRs.angry.3ABS title   Amin
            Mr Amin is angry.

(22)   *Langnginranga*   *berangta.*
          FUT.VRt.borrow.1ABS   knife.2(H)POSS
          I want to borrow (one of) your knives.

(23) a. *A'cidongi*   *Puang Amin.*
          VRi.sit.3ABS   title   Amin
          Mr Amin is sitting down.

      b. *Puang Amin a'cidong.*
          title   Amin   VRi.sit
          Mr Amin is sitting down.

Regardless of the inherent transitivity of the verb, all of the above clauses are viewed as intransitive constructions since there is either no object or the object is indefinite. Note that in (19), (20) and (22) there are two participants for an inherently transitive verb, and in (22) the object could even be viewed as specific. In all of these constructions the object is out of focus so does not meet the requirements for a transitive construction. Only absolutive forms are used to refer to the subject. The ergative proclitics are not found, and there is no definite object referent.

These types of constructions could be viewed as antipassive, but the antipassive analysis is not justified in Konjo. In Bambam (Campbell 1989), as well as other South Sulawesi languages, there is more evidence for antipassive constructions. Prototypically these are characterised in Bambam as *always* specifying an object and requiring the *um-* prefix. Campbell labels as non-prototypical intransitives those action verbs which have no object or which incorporate the object; these are prefixed with *mam-* or *maq-*. In Konjo both of these constructions take the same *ang-* prefix, the presence or absence of an object being irrelevant. Compare examples from Konjo (24a, 25a) and Bambam (24b, 25b):

(24) a. *Ambacaa*   (*bo'-bo'*).
          VRt.read.1ABS   book
          I'm reading (a book).

      b. *Mambataä*   (*suha'*).
          INT.read.1ABS   book
          I'm reading (a book).

(25) a. *Langngallea*   *bo'-bo'ta.*
          FUT.VRt.take.1ABS   book.2(H)POSS
          I'm about to take one of your books.

      b. *Lamualaä*   *suha'mu.*
          FUT.ABS.take.1ABS   book.2(F)POSS
          I'm about to take one of your books.

Examples (19b) and (23b) both have a subject which is topicalised. Note that in both cases the subject is fronted and the verbal enclitic referring to the subject is missing.

3.1.2 OBJECT FOCUS

Object focus is characterised by a clearly specified object (albeit possibly in some earlier discourse or in full view of the participants). Two participants are expected with a transitive

verb and in the Konjo system the referent to the object of a transitive verb is the absolutive enclitic, while the referent to the subject is the ergative proclitic. Compare (28) where the object is in focus with (22) which is in subject focus.

(26) a. *Kuittei*   *balla'na.*
          1ERG.see.3ABS house.3POSS
          I see his house.

      b. *Balla'na   kuitte.*
          house.3POSS   1ERG.see
          His house I see.

(27) a. *Nahajui*   *balla'na*   (*iBaco'*) *ri*   *Kalimporo.*
          3ERG.make.3ABS house.3POSS PI.Baco' PREP Kalimporo
          He (Baco') is building his house in Kalimporo.

      b. *IBaco'*   *anghajui*   *balla'na*   *ri*   *Kalimporo.*
          PI.Baco' VRd.make.3ABS house.3POSS PREP Kalimporo
          (It was) Baco' (who) built his house in Kalimporo.

      c. *Balla'na*   *to'ji*   *nahaju*   *iBaco'.*
          house.3POSS ADD.3LIM 3ERG.make PI.Baco'
          Baco' built his own house.

(28) *Lakuinrangi*   *berangta.*
      FUT.1ERG.borrow.3ABS knife.2(H)POSS
      I want to borrow your knife (specifically indicated).

3.2 TOPICALISATION

We digress here to discuss topicalisation in more detail. A number of examples have already been discussed (2,11,12,14-16,19b,23b), where the item which is the current topic of discourse is fronted. In every case, the topic appears as the first element in the clause.

Virtually any element in the clause can be topicalised, but so far we have only seen subject and object topicalisation. In example (27b) the subject is topicalised, but in (26b) and (27c) the object is topicalised. Note that when the object is topicalised (fronted) in a subject-focus clause, it follows the same pattern as when the subject is topicalised in a subject-focus clause (see (19b), (23b)), that is, the topic occurs first in the clause and the enclitic on the verb is missing. However, when the subject is topicalised in a transitive construction (i.e. object focus) the enclitic remains intact and the definite verbaliser *ang-* is prefixed to the verb rather than the proclitic person marker.

In terms of person markers which cross-reference the subject and object, it may be said that this referencing is cataphoric. In other words, the person marker refers to a subject or object which follows the verb. If the subject or object precedes the verb (as in topicalisation), then the clitic referent to that item is missing.

Besides the normal discourse feature of fronting whatever item is the topic under discussion, there are other constructions which require topicalisation. The most common of these are questions, and thus also reponses to these questions. In examples (29a-c) and (30a-b) the focused item is also topic, and thus the enclitic is absent. Examples (30c-d) show the subject as topic in an object-focus clause, so the proclitic is replaced by a definite verbaliser.

(29) a.   *Apa ḵihaju?*
          what 2(H)ERG.make
          What are you doing?

   b.   *Apa ṉakanre   ri   ele'na?*
        what 3ERG.eat PREP morning.3POSS
        What does he eat in the morning?

   c.   *Lamejahaji*[10]   *ṉakanre   ri   ele'na.*
        sweet.potato.3LIM   3ERG.eat PREP morning.3POSS
        He just eats sweet potatoes in the morning.

(30) a.   *Inai   la'lampa   muko?*
          PI.who FUT.VRi.go tomorrow
          Who is going tomorrow?

   b.   *Inakke   la'lampa   muko.*
        PI.1PRO FUT.VRi.go tomorrow
        I'm the one going tomorrow.

   c.   *Inai   anḡkanreị   lamejahaku?*
        PI.who VRd.eat.3ABS sweet.potato.1POSS
        Who ate my sweet potatoes?

   d.   *IAli   anḡkanreị   lamejahata.*
        PI.Ali VRd.eat.3ABS sweet.potato.2(H)POSS
        Ali ate your sweet potatoes.

The following two sentences illustrate a situation where the object is fronted to show contrast. In (31) it is 'the goat which he takes care of' (not some other), while in (32) it is 'I here' who is being talked about (not someone else).

(31)   *Injo bembe ṉakalahakia   mana'mi   rua*
       that goat   3ERG.shepherd.DEF gave.birth.3CMP two

       ana'na.
       child.3POSS
       The goat he took care of gave birth to two kids.

(32)   *Inakke   minni   ṉakuangang,   mingka [apa]*
       PI.1PRO 3CMP.this 3ERG.say.TRS but   what

       napa'pihaliang   injo pulisia...
       3ERG.answer.BEN   that police.DEF
       It was I they were talking about, but (what) did the police respond...

---

10   The ergative construction with an indefinite object would seem to be irregular here (*lamejaha* 'sweet potato'). However, since what is eaten is the topic being questioned, it in effect becomes something specifically referred to. Note example (19a) in contrast to (11) and (12). If the question were asked *Apa nahaju Amir?* (What is Amir doing?), the answer would be a clause in subject focus: *Angnganrei loka* (He's eating bananas). But if the question was *Apa nakanre Amir?* (What is Amir eating?), a specific response (albeit here an indefinite object) is expected and it is topicalised: *Loka nakanre* (He's eating bananas).

Another example of this construction involves the verb *sa'ring* 'to feel'. In order to express how one feels the adjective must be fronted, followed by the verb which takes the proclitic form of the person marker.

(33) a.   *Angngura <u>k</u>isa'ring?*
          how   2(H)ERG.feel
          How do you feel?

     b.   *Haji' <u>k</u>usa'ring.*
          good   1ERG.feel
          I feel good.

     c.   *Puang   Barbara <u>k</u>usa'ring.*
          title   Barbara   1ERG.feel
          I feel (so good about) Barbara.

(34)   *Rannu nyahana   <u>n</u>asa'ring saba'   rie'ja*
          happy   spirit.3POSS   3ERG.feel   because   have.LIM

          <u>n</u>auppaangi   kanre bembena.
          3ERG.find.BEN.3ABS   food   goat.3POSS
          He felt very happy (lit. happy in heart he felt) because he found fodder for his goat.

(35)   *Kaminang sanna' posona   <u>n</u>asa'ring   punna hattu*
          most   very   breathless.3POSS   3ERG.feel   if   time

          timoroi...
          east.wind.3ABS
          He felt the most worn-out during the dry season...

4. VERBAL MODIFIERS

There are several types of verbal modifiers which are of interest in dealing with Konjo person markers. *Preverbal modifiers* consist of several varieties. Location and manner adverbials function as a group, while negatives, the question why and temporal adverbials form a separate group which functions in quite a different way. Temporal and modal auxiliaries behave in many ways like the location and manner adverbials, yet have a separate function. The set of *postverbal modifiers* is very limited and behaves in a manner all its own. Each of these will be dealt with separately.

Verbal juxtaposition allows for a variety of interesting modificiations. These will be presented but no attempt will be made to give a detailed analysis.

4.1 LOCATION AND MANNER ADVERBIALS

This set of adverbials may occur either before or after the verb in a clause. Used as questions, these always precede the verb. Examples of some of the common adverbials in this group are:

Location		Manner	
kun jo	there	*ita'*	quickly
kunni	here	*malling*	slowly, long time
ri Mangkasara	at Ujung Pandang	*kuttu*	lazy
ante'	where?	*sarro*	hard
ilalang	inside	*pintallung*	three times

When a location or manner adverbial precedes the verb the absolutive person marker is suffixed to it. In (36a), (37a) and (39a) the location or manner of the action is not prominent in any way, so the adverbial follows the predicate. In the other examples the location or manner is fronted in the clause either to give it prominence or because it is the topic.[11]

(36) a. *Anjamaa   kunjo.*
          VRt.work.1ABS there
          I work there.

      b. *Ante'ko   anjama.*
          where.2(F)ABS   VRt.work
          Where do you work?

      c. *Kunjoa   anjama.*
          there.1ABS VRt.work
          There (is where) I work.

(37) a. *Kuitteko   kunjo.*
          1ERG.see.2(F)ABS there
          I saw you there.

      b. *Kunjoko   kuitte.*
          there.2(F)ABS 1ERG.see
          There (is where) I saw you.

      c. *Kunjoa   angngitteko.*
          there.1ABS VRd.see.2(F)ABS
          There (is where) I saw you.

(38)   *Nakua   gurunna   galasi annang, "Kunniko*
         3ERG.say teacher.3POSS grade six   here.2(F)ABS

         lakusuro   nai' ammenteng rioloanna
         FUT.1ERG.command up   VRi.stand in.front.3POSS

---

11 Note the interplay between three different methods of focusing on various elements in the sentence: subject/object focus is the basic dichotomy for all clauses; subject/object topic (§3.2) gives a second dichotomy; fronting of other elements in the clause is the third method used. One could refer to the fronting of location and manner adverbials (among others) as location or manner being topic in a given discourse. But clauses with fronted verbal modifiers can further be subdivided dependent on subject or object as topic. Since the discourse considerations which need to be dealt with to further clarify the various types of prominence are beyond the scope of this paper, we are using the term prominence in a rather vague way.

        urangnu   *a'pidato"*.
        friend.2(F)POSS   VRi.give.speech
        His sixth grade teacher said, "Here I will have you stand in front of your
        friends and give a speech".

(39) a.   *Lamminroko*   *ita'*.
        FUT.VRi.return.2(F)ABS quickly
        You will quickly return.

    b.   *Ita'ko*   *amminro*.
        quickly.2(F)ABS   VRi.return
        Quickly return! / Quickly you returned.

    c.   *Mallingmako*   *tinro*.
        long.time.2(F)CMP sleep
        (It was) a long time you slept.

    d.   *Kuttui*   *anjama*.
        lazy.3ABS   VRt.work
        He is lazy about working.[12]

Note that the ergative person marker (referring to the actor) remains prefixed to the verb
(37b, 38), indicating that the object is the topic under discussion, not the subject. In (37c) the
subject is the topic so the enclitic referring to the object remains suffixed to the verb.

4.2 POSTVERBAL MODIFIERS

Another set of phrase-level adverbials always follow the verb (examples 40-42).[13]. This
set consists of the following adverbials:

to'	ADD(also)	*sarring*	intense
toje'	really	*poleang*	again
ngase'/ase'	all together		

If one of these postverbal modifiers occurs, the absolute suffix is attached to it rather
than the verb.

(40) a.   *La'lampa*   *to'a*.
        FUT.VRi.go ADD.1ABS
        I also will go.

    b.   *Anjama*   *sarringa*.
        VRt.work hard.1ABS
        I work really hard.

---

[12] Although theoretically any location or manner adverbial could follow the verb, some adverbials are
prominent by virtue of the fact that they occur. In Konjo one would not talk about someone being lazy
about working unless his laziness were the topic being discussed.

[13] *to'* (and a few other phrase-level adverbials which follow the verb) will follow the auxiliary or other
adverbial if there is one, rather than the verb.

    a) *Antama'to'i.*   *A'ra' to'i antama'.*
        He's also going in.   He also wants to go in.

    b) *A'lampa to'i.*   *Anre' to' na'lampa.*   (absolute fronting with negatives
        He's also going.   He's not going either.   is discussed in §4.4.1)

    c.   *Napakahaji'   ngase'i.*[14]
        3ERG.CAUS.good all.3ABS
        He fixed all of them.

(41)   *Na alleang nakuta'nang   poleanga   injo papekanga...*
        and then 3ERG.question again.1ABS that fisherman.DEF
        Then the fisherman asked me again... (lit. Then he asked me again, that
        fisherman...)

(42)   *...mingka injo bembea talia bembena,   nunakalahaki*
        but   that goat.DEF not goat.3POSS REL.3ERG.shepherd

        to'ji,   a'ra' to'i   rie' bembena.
        ADD.3LIM want ADD.3ABS have goat.3POSS
        ...but that goat was not his goat – it was just one he was shepherding; he
        also wanted his own goat.

4.3 AUXILIARIES

Auxiliaries function like the location and manner adverbials in that the absolutive person marker is suffixed to the auxiliary rather than to the verb. Unlike the adverbials, the auxiliaries never follow the verb. In terms of phrase structure, the adverbials follow the verb and may be fronted for prominence, but the auxiliaries precede the verb. Common auxiliaries divide into temporal and modal auxiliaries:

Temporal		Modal	
maeng	already	*a'ra'*	want
biasa	usually	*kulle*	can
suang	often	*ma'ring*	able
tappa'	immediately	*anda*	not want

(43) a.   *A'ra'a   a'lampa.*
            want.1ABS VRi.go
            I want to go.

      b.   *A'kulleko   a'lopi?*
            VRi.can.2(F)ABS VRi.boat
            Can you ride in a boat?

(44) a.   *A'ra'ja   natulung.*
            want.1LIM 3ERG.help
            He just wants to help me.

      b.   *Ma'ringji   kupake.*
            permit.3LIM 1ERG.wear
            I am permitted to wear it.

---

[14] One could contend that *ngase'* is not an adverbial at all but rather some sort of pronoun modifier meaning 'all of'. But since it functions as the postverbal adverbs, it is grouped with them for ease of discussion.

    c.   *Kulleja   nutunrangi?*
            can.1LIM 2(F)ERG.assist
            Can you help me?

(45)   *Maengi   angnganre iJama'   a'parri-parrimi*
        already.3ABS VRt.eat   PI.Jama' VRi.hurriedly.3CMP

        napansulu'   bembena.
        3ERG.CAUS.exit goat.3POSS
        When Jama' had eaten, he hurriedly put his goats out.

(46)   *Punna anre' jamaangku   maraeng, biasai*
        if   NEG work.1POSS different   usually.3ABS

        kususung   bicara   Konjo.
        1ERG.arrange language Konjo
        If I don't have any other work, I usually work on Konjo data.

(47)   *Manna Baco', suanga   natulung.*
        even   Baco' often.1ABS 3ERG.help
        Even Baco', he often helps me.

In the above examples the absolutive enclitic always attaches to the auxiliary, whether it refers to the subject of an intransitive clause or the object of a transitive clause. This may be viewed as the unmarked case, that is, the subject in subject focus and the object in object focus is the topic under discussion. However, there are also marked cases where the subject of an object-focused clause is the topic under discussion. Compare the forms in (44) with those in (48):

(48) a.   *A'ra'ji   antulunga.*
          want.3LIM VRd.help.1ABS
          He just wants to help me.   (cf. 44a)

      b.   *Ma'ringja   ampakei.*
          permit.1LIM VRd.wear.3ERG
          I am permitted to wear it.   (cf. 44b)

      c.   *A'kullejako   antunrangia?*
          VRi.can.2(F)LIM   VRd.assist.1ABS
          Can you help me?   (cf. 44c)

With the forms in (44) the object of the transitive clause is the topic, such that (44a) could be glossed as 'It's me he wants to help'. The subject is the topic under discussion in (48a-c), such that (48a) could be glossed 'It is he who wants to help me'. Such an English gloss is somewhat misleading, because topicalisation as found in English would be expressed quite differently in Konjo.[15] Instead the difference between subject and object topic is more subtle and highly dependent on the context of the discourse.

---

[15] *Nakke a'ra' natulung.*
    1PRO want 3ERG.help
    would be the equivalent of 'It's me he wants to help'. Here the free pronoun is added for emphasis and fronted for topic. As would be expected the object referent enclitic is missing.

4.4 ADVERBIALS WHICH REQUIRE PROCLITIC PERSON MARKERS (PROCLITICISATION)

Negatives, the question word *why?/how?* and temporal adverbials all share the same feature in Konjo with respect to person markers. Instead of taking the absolutive enclitic as the other adverbials and the auxiliaries do, these adverbials require that the proclitic form of the person marker be affixed in front of the item which follows it in the clause. Since this phenomenon occurs frequently, we will use the term *procliticisation* to refer to it in this paper. In a number of Sulawesi languages the negatives act as normal adverbials and take an enclitic form of the person marker, but several of the languages require the proclitic form with temporals. This is one of the interesting areas where these languages diverge.

4.4.1 NEGATIVES

In theory the negative focus should act like the other adverbial forms which occur before the verb, but in fact it doesn't. Because the negative lexeme *anre'* functions both as a simple negator as well as a negative existential, it cannot simply take the absolutive person-marker suffix without changing the meaning of the clause.

(49) a. *A'lampaa.*
          VRi.go.1ABS
          I am going.

      b. *Anre'a.*
          NEG.1ABS
          I'm not (here).

      c. *Anre' ku'lampa.* (**anre'a a'lampa*)
          NEG 1ERG.VRi.go
          I'm not going.

Some have tried to explain this procliticisation in terms of a split-ergative system,[16] but that seems to cloud the issue. Although the abbreviation ERG is used for ease in glossing, these proclitics are not necessarily the subject of a transitive verb. There are cases where it is the subject of an intransitive verb, and even the object of a transitive verb (as will be seen later). In Konjo when an adverbial (or auxiliary) precedes the verb as part of the verb phrase, it receives the absolutive suffix form which would normally attach to the verb. But the Konjo negative *anre'* takes the absolutive suffix form only when it functions as an existential. Since the fronted person marker cannot be suffixed to the preverbal modifier in this case, it is realised instead as a prefix on the verb. These prefixed forms are the same as the ergative person markers.

(50) a. *Angnganrea; Anre' kungnganre.*
          VRt.eat.1ABS NEG 1ERG.VRt.eat
          I am eating; I am not eating.

---

[16] Matti (in press) and Valkama (in press) both explain this as split ergative, that is, with the negative the ergative system no longer functions, but rather a nominative system, where the subject of both transitive and intransitive verbs is cross-referenced by the proclitic person marker. However, such proclitics in fact precede the verbaliser, when one exists, and thus act quite differently from their counterpart in the ergative system which could be said to substitute for the verbaliser. Neither Mamasa nor Duri have clear examples of double proclitics as discussed in §6.1, examples (93) and (94).

b. *Kukanrej;*   *Anre' kukanrej.*
1ERG.eat.3ABS   NEG   1ERG.eat.3ABS
I am eating it; I am not eating it.

(51) a. *Ammaria;*   *Anre' kummari.*
VRi.stop.1ABS   NEG   1ERG.VRi.stop
I stopped; I didn't stop.

b. *Asarroi*   *bosia.*
VRs.hard.3ABS   rain.DEF
It's raining hard.

c. *Rupa'na anre' nasarro   bosia.*
hopefully NEG 3ERG.hard rain.DEF
Hopefully it won't rain hard.

(52) *Anre'pa   kimaeng   angnganre?*
NEG.ICMP 2(H)ERG.already VRt.eat
Haven't you eaten yet?

(53) *Manna anre' na'kulle   kunaha-naha...*
even   NEG 3ERG.VRi.can 1ABS.think.about
Even if I couldn't remember it...

Note that with intransitive forms (i.e. non-object focus (50a), (51a)) these prefixes do not replace the verbaliser *a'-* or *ang-*, rather they force the *a* vowel to be reduced.[17] Thus in (50a) *kungnganre* = *ku-* + *ang-* + *kanre*. In the above examples the transitive (object focus (50b)) forms remain as they would occur without the negative. The person marker is prefixed to an adverbial in (52) and (53).

4.4.2 'WHY?' *angngura*

The question adverbial *angngura* meaning 'why?' or 'how is it?' functions like the negative adverbial in that it cannot take the absolutive person marker without changing the meaning of the clause. Again procliticisation is required.

(54) *Angngura numange   ri   kamponna   taua   na*
why   2(F)ERG.towards PREP village.3POSS people.DEF CMPL

anre' kamua sura'nu   lante?
NEG very   letter.2(F)POSS arrive
Why did you go to another area and no letters ever arrived from you?

(55) *Angngura nalohe   kamua kappala sijalu-jalu   irate   ri*
why   3ERG.many very   ships   REC.lined.up above PREP

tujunna   langi'a?
base.3POSS sky.DEF
Why are there so many ships lined up on the horizon?

---

17 Examples (51b-c) are stative verbs, so the *a-* verbaliser is simply reduced. In deliberate speech the *a*-vowel may be retained for any of the verbalisers.

(56)   *Angngura namalling   allante   kappalaya?*
         why   3ERG.long.time VRi.arrive ship.DEF
         Why did the ship take so long to arrive?

(57)   *Angngura naondangi   bahia?*
         why   3ERG.chase.3ABS pig.DEF
         Why did you chase the pig?

(58)   *Angngura nuerai   doi'nu?*
         why   2(F)ERG.request.3ABS money.2(F)POSS
         Why are you asking for your money?

(59)   *Nakuamo   iPadosa,   "Angngura nihuno   katingaloa?"*
         3ERG.say.CMP PI.Padosa why   PASS.kill fly.DEF
         Padosa said, "Why are the flies being killed?"

Unlike the negative, *angngura* may also take an absolutive person marker to clarify what is being questioned. The person marker referring to what is being questioned may be the same as either the subject or object of the verb or it may be a neutral third person *-i* referring to the activity in question (see (60a), (61b)). If that being questioned is the same as the subject or object then the person marker is repeated.

(60) a.   *A'dabbungki.*
           VRi.fall.2(H)ABS
           You fell down.

     b.   *Angngurai ki'dabbung?*
           why.3ABS   2(H)ERG.VRi.fall
           Why did you fall? (lit. How is it that you fell?)

     c.   *Angnguraki   ki'dabbung?*
           why.2(H)ABS   2(H)ERG.VRi.fall
           Why did you fall? (lit. How is it with you that you fell?)

(61) a.   *Angngurai kipeppe'a?*
           why.3ABS   2(H)ERG.hit.1ABS
           Why (is it) you are hitting me?

     b.   *Angnguraki   kipeppe'a?*
           why.2(H)ABS   2(H)ERG.hit.1ABS
           Why are you hitting me? (lit. How is it with you that you are hitting me?)

     c.   *Angnguraa kipeppe'a?*
           why.1ABS   2(H)ERG.hit.1ABS
           Why are you hitting me? (lit. How is it with me that you are hitting me?)

     d.   **angnguraa kipeppe'*

Examples (60c) and (61b) show the subject person marker *ki* repeated, while (61c) shows the object person marker *a* repeated. Unlike previous adverbials where the person marker appears only once either affixed to the adverbial or to the verb, this construction requires the relevant person marker to be affixed both to the adverbial as well as to the verb. Thus (61d) is ungrammatical. This use of *angngura* may well have to be viewed as two clauses,

angngura forming the first clause and the following verb phrase a second clause. Other possibilities will be discussed in §6.2.

4.4.3 TEMPORAL ADVERBIALS

The presence of a time adverbial before the verb also requires procliticisation. Consider the following examples of time focus (square brackets [] are used in (64) and (65) to set off the time phrase):

(62) a. *A'lampaa   sikarie'.*
VRi.go.1ABS yesterday
I went yesterday.

b. *Sikarie'   ku'lampa.*
yesterday 1ERG.VRi.go
Yesterday I went.

c. *Sikuranna   ki'lampa?*
when (past) 2(H)ERG.VRi.go
When did you leave?

d. *Sikuraya   kimminro?*
when (future) 2(H)ERG.VRi.return
When will you return?

(63) a. *Langnganrea.*
FUT.VRt.eat.1ABS
I'm about to eat.

b. *Sinampe'pa kungnganre.*
in.a.while   1ERG.VRt.eat
I will eat in a little while.

c. *Sinampe'pa kukanrei   lokanu.*
in.a.while   1ERG.eat.3ABS banana.2(F)POSS
I will (definitely) eat your banana in a little while.

(64)   [*Punna ele'i*]   *na'lampa   ri   sikolaya,   anre'*
if   morning.3ABS 3ERG.VRi.go PREP school.DEF NEG

namaeng   angnganre ele',
3ERG.ever VRt.eat   morning
[If in the morning] when he went to school, he hadn't ever eaten breakfast.

(65)   [*Lanteku   to'pa   ri   balla'ku   ri   tette'*
arrive.1POSS ADD.1CMP PREP house.1POSS PREP hour

limaya   ri   karahie'na]   *kunampa angnganre,*
five.DEF PREP afternoon.3POSS 1ERG.then VRt.eat

[*ri   bangnginaji*]   *kungnganre ri   Bantaeng.*
PREP night.3POSS.3LIM 1ERG.VRt.eat PREP Bantaeng
[When I finally arrived at my house at five o'clock in the afternoon] only then did I eat; [the evening before] I had eaten in Bantaeng.

Two phenomena are apparent in conjunction with time adverbials. The time word may be 'possessed' as in (62c) *sikuranna* 'it's when?' or (65) *lanteku* 'my having arrived' and *bangnginaji* 'its night/the night before'. Or the time word may act as a kind of existential as in (63b) *sinampe'pa* '(it will happen) in a little while'. Neither phenomenon lends itself readily to clear explanation without a lot more information about the historical relationship between possessives and 'ergative' person markers. Suffice it to say that these phenomena function consistently in Konjo forcing the person marker to be prefixed to the verb (or verb phrase as in (65)).

4.5 AUXILIARY VERSUS VERBAL JUXTAPOSITION

There are several different possibilities with respect to the occurrence of two or more verbs or auxiliaries coming together in a clause. In examples (60) - (61) we encountered a construction where the adverbial *angngura* did not function as a preverbal modifier, but rather a separate clause. This is a relatively uncommon construction where there is verbal juxtaposition[18] with complementation of that which is being questioned (e.g. (61b) is questioning 'how is it with you' and the complement is 'you are hitting me').

A similar construction of interest involves what could be termed 'transitive auxiliaries'. Consider the following examples:

(66) a. *Kutungkai*   *ampeppe'i*   *asunnu.*
        1ERG.purposely   VRd.hit.3ABS   dog.2(F)POSS
        I purposely hit your dog.

   b. *Kutungkaii*   *kupeppe'.*
        1ERG.purposely.3ABS   1ERG.hit
        I purposely hit it. (absolutive fronted)

   c. *Natungkaii*   *a'lampa.*
        3ERG.purposely.3ABS   VRi.go
        He purposely went. (lit. He purposed it.)

   d. *Kutungkaiko*   *kusuro*   *a'lampa.*
        1ERG.purposely.2(F)ABS   1ERG.command   VRi.go
        I purposely told you to go.

(67) a. *Kukullei*   *ambalasako.*
        1ERG.can.3ABS   VRd.respond.2(F)ABS
        I can respond to you.[19]

   b. *Kukulleko*   *kubalasa.*
        1ERG.can.2(F)ABS   1ERG.respond
        I can respond to you. (absolutive fronted)

---

[18]   See van den Berg (1989:234-242) for a discussion of this subject.
[19]   *Kulle* often functions as a normal auxiliary (43b, 44c, 48c, 53) meaning 'can'. Functioning here as a 'transitive auxiliary' it has a slightly different meaning, that of having some control over the ability to do a given thing.

c. *Kukullei   kubalasako.*
1ERG.can.3ABS 1ERG.respond.2(F)ABS
I can (do it) respond to you.

(68) a. *Naare'a   angngitteko.*
3ERG.think.1ABS VRd.see.2(F)ABS
He thought it was I who saw you. (subject topic)

b. *Naare'ko   kuitte.*
3ERG.think.2(F)ABS 1ERG.see
He thought it was you I saw.

c. *Naare'i   kuitteko.*
3ERG.think.3ABS 1ERG.see.2(F)ABS
He thought (it was) that I saw you.

(69) *Karuapa   tau   na   nikullei   ambule'i*
eight.ICMP person CMPL PASS.can.3ABS VRd.carry.3ABS

injo juku' lompoa.
that fish big.DEF
Only when there are eight people can that big fish be carried.

(70) *Nakellai   to'ja   anrongku   antama' ri*
3ERG.permit.TRS ADD.1LIM mother.1POSS enter   PREP

SMP.
middle.school
My mother herself encouraged me to enter junior high school.

(71) *Anre' minto'mo   nikellaii   amminro ri*
NEG CMP.ADD.CMP PASS.permit.TRS.3ABS VRi.return PREP

kamponna.
village.3POSS
He also wasn't even permitted to return to his village.

(72) *Anre' nakellaenga   injo anrong alleku*
NEG 3ERG.permit.TRS.1ABS that mother take.1POSS

a'lampa kale-kale.
VRi.go alone
My adopted mother there wouldn't let me go by myself.

These function like other auxiliaries, except that the auxiliary has transitive person marking. The difference between parts a and b in (66) - (68) is topic, as mentioned in examples (48a-c). In forms such as (67c) and (68c), it appears that the auxiliary is functioning as a separate verb and thus has its own person marking (i.e. the absolutive person marker is found on both the auxiliary and the main verb). This phenomenon comes under the category of verbal juxtaposition in the form of object complementation, where the enclitic *-i* refers to the entire following complement clause. Note that unlike the complementation that occurs with the question *angngura*, only the third person may be the object of the verbs *kulle* and *are'* when they take the complement.

There is much more that could be presented in conjunction with verbal juxtaposition, complementation and verbal conjoining. However, we will leave the subject with the above comments.

5. COMPLEX VERBAL MODIFIERS

It is very common for more than one element to precede the verb in a verb phrase. The absolutive enclitic will normally be suffixed to the first element (or prefixed to the second following a negative). If a postverbal adverbial occurs the absolutive will be suffixed to it (see also footnote 13).

Chart 3 gives the order of preference for absolutive affixation (ERG- equals the proclitic; -ABS equals the enclitic):

CHART 3: ABSOLUTIVE[20] CLITIC POSITION

NEG ⎫ TIME ⎬ (ERG-)	AUX MANNER ⎫ (-ABS) LOCATION ⎭	VERB (-ABS)	POST-VERBAL ⎫ Adverbials ⎬ (-ABS) (PVA) ⎭
WHY ⎭			
1	2	4	3

It is theoretically possible to have several other combinations, such as WHY with TIME or LOCATION with AUX, etc. However, in the Konjo clause it would seem that other techniques are employed instead so that the load on the verb phrase doesn't become too heavy. Besides expected techniques such as splitting up clauses, a device that is frequently used is the *na* complementiser (see §6.1). Examples follow for each of these positions (the positions are noted in square brackets [] as appropriate):

Position 1:

(73)　　*Rie'mo　　se're　hattu　nangngera　　　　doa　tang　nasa'ring*
　　　　have.CMP　one　time　3ERG.VRt.request　pray　NEG　3ERG.feel

　　　　paua ...
　　　　tell.DEF
　　　　One time when they were praying, without realising their words...
　　　　　　[TIME (ERG-)VERB]　　　　　　　[NEG (ERG-)VERB]

(74)　　*Mukopi　　　ku'kulle　　a'lampa ri*
　　　　tomorrow.ICMP　1ERG.VRi.can　VRi.go　PREP

　　　　padedde'　　bulaenga.
　　　　NMS.knock　gold.DEF
　　　　Tomorrow I can go to the goldsmith.
　　　　　　　[TIME (ERG-)AUX VERB]

(75)　　*Anre'mo　　nasa'ringi　　ta'burusu　　　ere*
　　　　NEG.CMP　3ERG.feel.3ABS　NVOL.overflow　water

---

[20]　Absolutive here denotes the function of the person marker (i.e. the referent to the subject of an intransitive clause or the object of a transitive clause).

> *matanna   anronna,   mingka naparrangi*
> eye.3POSS mother.3POSS but   3ERG.endure.3ABS
>
> *koddeka   niittei   ri   ana'na   na*
> suppose.WRN PASS.see.3ABS PREP child.3POSS and
>
> *nakua   "Angngurai̲ ki̲sara   amma'?"*
> 3ERG.say why.3ABS 2(H)ERG.sad mother
> Without realising it his mother's tears were flowing, but she held them back
>   [NEG (ERG-)VERB]
> lest she be seen by her children and they ask, "Why are you sad, mother?"
>   [WHY(-ABS) (ERG-)VERB]

(76)   *Punna maingmi   nakke paua   kupansulu'   anre'*
       if   already.3CMP 1PRO word.DEF 1ERG.CAUS.exit NEG

       na'kulle   ku̲pinra.
       3ERG.VRi.can 1ERG.change
       If I have uttered a word, I cannot change it.
                           [NEG (ERG-)AUX (ERG-)VERB]

(77)   *Injo pangngamaseanna   siurang   pammettana   ri*
       that NMS.pity.NMS.3POSS REC.with   NMS.love.3POSS PREP

       nakke anre' nakukullei̲   ku̲balasa.
       1PRO NEG 3ERG.1ERG.can.3ABS 1ERG.repay
       Her sympathy and love for me I can never repay.
           [NEG (ERG-)(ERG-)AUX (ERG-)VERB]

(78)   *...manna nikura,   anre' nakullei̲   ni̲tora',   anre'*
       even   PASS.how NEG 3ERG.can.3ABS PASS.hit NEG

       to'   na   nak̲abbang.
       ADD   CMPL 3ERG.harm
       ...no matter what, he couldn't be hit, he also couldn't be harmed.
       [NEG (ERG-)AUX VERB]

A few notes are in order: a) In (75) the clause *anre'mo nasa'ringi* is transitive with subject topic (cf. 50b) so the negative appears not to affect the person markers; b) in (76) the clause *anre' na'kulle kupinra* is also transitive, but the object is topic, so the object referent is prefixed to the auxiliary while the subject referent remains prefixed to the main verb; c) in (77) the auxiliary *kullei* is of the transitive kind, so it takes the proclitic person marker; also the object is topic so it must also be prefixed to the auxiliary, with the result that there are two proclitics on the auxiliary as well as the expected proclitic on the verb; d) in (78) the *ni*-passive is found, but its effect is insignificant. It is the use of the 'transitive auxiliary' *kulle*

which affects the position of the person markers.[21] In the second clause of (78) the use of *to'* after *anre'* is without a person marker because it is separated from the following clause by *na* complementiser.

Position 2:

(79)   *Mingka punna angnganrei   balahoa, biasai   nakanre*
       but   if   VRt.eat.3ABS rat.DEF usual.3ABS   3ERG.eat

       balaho punna kurangi   erena.
       rat   if   less.3ABS water.3POSS
       But when the rats eat, they usually eat it if there's not enough water.
                                [AUX(-ABS) (ERG-)VERB]

(80)   *Alla-taalaji intu a'kulle   ansareki   apa-apa*
       God.3LIM   that VRi.can   VRd.give.1PL.INC.ABS whatever

       nikaa'rakia.
       PASS.ADJ.want.TRS.DEF
       Because God can give us whatever is desired.
                        [AUX VERB(-ABS)] (underlyingly [AUX(-ABS) VERB(-ABS)])

(81)   *Sanggenna   nakua   karaenga, "Inai   angkullei*
       until.3POSS 3ERG.say   king.DEF   PI.who   VRd.can.3ABS

       ansaurui   inni bali   antama'a..."
       VRd.defeat.3ABS this enemy enter.DEF
       At which time the king said, "Whoever can defeat this enemy who has come in..."
                                [AUX VERB(-ABS)] (actually [AUX(-ABS) VERB(-ABS)])

(82)   *Punna kullea   nuhuno,   jariko*
       if   can.1ABS 2(F)ERG.kill happen.2(F)ABS

       intu antama'.
       that enter
       Only if you kill me will you be able to enter (my village).
                        [AUX(-ABS) (ERG-)VERB]

Notes: a) The auxiliary in (80) does not take the subject referent enclitic because the subject is a free preverbal nominal *Alla-taalaji intu*. Note also in this case the auxiliary takes the intransitive verbaliser *a'-*, while the verb takes the definite-object verbaliser *ang-*; b) in contrast to (80), the auxiliary in (81) is transitive, and thus requires the transitive verbaliser – in this case the definite-object verbaliser – because of the free nominal subject *inai*. This same verbaliser *ang-* is also required on the verb.

---

[21] It may be of interest to follow through the formation of this construction. The basic clause would be *nitorai* 'he was hit'. The auxiliary 'can' could be added in two ways. The first uses the normal auxiliary in intransitive form *a'kullei nitora'* 'he could be hit (or he could not be, depending on whether someone wanted to or not)'. If this form is then negated, the enclitic *-i* becomes proclitic *na-* and is prefixed to the auxiliary – *anre' na'kulle nitora'* 'he could not be hit (for some reason)'. The second possibility is to use the 'transitive auxiliary' form which requires both a proclitic and an enclitic on the auxiliary – *nakullei nitora'* 'he could be hit (i.e. he was not invincible)'. If this form is negated the auxiliary remains as it is – *anre' nakullei nitora'* 'he could not be hit (i.e. he was invincible)'.

Position 3:

(83)   *Punna anre' nanumari, kuhuno ngase'i.*
       if   NEG   3ERG.run 1ERG.kill all.3ABS
       If they don't run, I will kill them all.
                          [(ERG-)VERB PVA(-ABS)]

(84)   *Nakua, "Kisuro   ngase'mi amminro injo*
       3ERG.say 2(H)ERG.order all.3CMP VRi.return that

       joa'ta   taunta...".
       king's.man.2(H)POSS person.2(H)POSS
       He said, "Order all of them to go home, your men and companions...".
                          [(ERG-)VERB PVA(-ABS)]

(85)   *Injo tasse'rea   kalibbong biasa to'i   nipasilamung*
       that CTP.one.DEF hole   usual ADD.3ABS PASS.plant.with

       bataraya   siurangang bue.
       corn.DEF REC.with   bean
       In each of the holes the corn is also usually planted together with beans.
                        [AUX PVA(-ABS) VERB]

(86)   *...assuro a'baju   to'i   tanru'.*
       VRi.order VRi.make ADD.3ABS horn
       ...have them also make horns.
                    [VERB VERB PVA(-ABS)]

(87)   *Na alleang nakuta'nang poleanga   injo papekanga*
       and then   3ERG.ask   again.1ABS that fisherman.DEF

       nakupihalii   angkua...
       3ERG.1ERG.answer.TRS   VRt.say
       Then the fisherman asked me again and I answered him saying...
                          [(ERG-)VERB PVA(-ABS)]

Notes: a) example (85) is an example of postverbal adverbials following the auxiliary rather than the verb; *biasa to'i*; b) juxtaposed verbs are common in Konjo, although the type found in (86) is not discussed specifically in this paper.

6. COMPLEX CLAUSES

In this section let us consider three types of complex clauses which are significant in discussing person markers. All of these employ the conjunction *na*, but with different meanings. A temporal clause may be linked to the action that follows by *na*; a complement of the question *angngura* is introduced by *na*; two coordinate clauses are linked by *na*. While there are other types of complex clauses, these three serve to illustrate the form and position of person markers in such clauses.[22]

---

22   See Sirk (1983:91-94) for a discussion of similar constructions in Bugis.

6.1 CONSECUTIVE LINKING

In §4.4.3 several examples were given where the time adverbial was actually a temporal clause. In (65) the use of the possessive following the verb in these situations was introduced. The subordinate time clause may be followed by a complementiser *na* meaning 'then, when' or 'when it happened that'. Without going into the semantic distinctions between those temporal clauses which employ the *na* complementiser and those which don't, we will look at the structure of those with the *na* complementiser.

(88)   [*Injo hattua   ri   naungku   ri   kajua*]   *na*
        that   time.DEF PREP down.1POSS PREP tree.DEF CMPL

        kunai'   ri   lopinna...
        1ERG.up PREP boat.3POSS
        [At that time when I got down from the tree], then I got into their boat...

(89)   [*Narapi'i   sihulang*] *na*   *kumminro*
        3ERG.reach.3ABS one.month CMPL   1ERG.VRi.return

        battu a'pangngaji   ri   masigi'a...
        from VRi.CAUS.VRt.chant PREP mosque.DEF
        [It had been a month] when (it happened that) I was returning from teaching chanting at the mosque...

(90)   [*Ruama   minggu lanteku*]   *na*
        two.1CMP week   arrive.1POSS CMPL

        kungngu'rangi   angkua labbusumi   cutiku...
        1ERG.VRt.remember VRt.say finish.3CMP leave.1POSS
        [It was two weeks after my arrival] when I remembered that my vacation was over...

(91)   [*Minrona   iLe'leng   battu ri   kokonna*]   *na*
        return.3POSS PI.Le'leng from PREP field.3POSS CMPL

        napeppe'i   ana'na.
        3ERG.hit.3ABS child.3POSS
        [After Le'leng came back from his field], then he hit his child.

(92)   [*Lantenamo   ri   balla'*] *na*
        arrive.3POSS.CMP PREP house CMPL

        nahuntulangmi   anronna   a'cidong...
        3ERG.discover.3CMP mother.3POSS VRi.sit
        [He had arrived at the house] when he discovered his mother sitting...

(93)   [*Kulle kapang rie'a   sampulo bangngi a'pangngajara*
        can   maybe have.1ABS ten   night   VRi.CAUS.VRt.teach

        pangngajiang   ri   masigi'a],   *na*
        NMS.VRt.chant.NMS PREP mosque.DEF CMPL

        kunamaei   pole injo sumpae' kapala
        1ERG.3ERG.come.TRS again that earlier   head

desana...
village.3POSS
[I'd been teaching Koranic chanting about ten nights in the mosque] when he approached me again, that village chief earlier referred to...

(94)   [*Ri* *galasi appa'a*]   *na*   *kunataba*   *garring sarro...*
        PREP class four.1ABS CMPL 1ERG.3ERG.hit sick   hard
        [I was in fourth grade] when a serious illness struck me (lit. me it struck)...

In these sentences there are examples of procliticisation. With intransitive clauses, the person marker is procliticised as would be expected when there is a fronted temporal adverbial (89) - (90). As has been seen (63c), a preverbal time adverbial does not necessitate absolutive fronting with transitive clauses. The same is true with subordinate temporal clauses. In (91) and (92) the person markers are as they would be on the verb if it occurred by itself. But now note that in (93) and (94) there are two person markers prefixed to the verb (phrase). Again the notion of topic clarifies the difference between (91) and (92) and sentences where the object person marker is fronted (93) and (94). In subject focus the subject is by default also the topic, but in object focus either the subject or object may be the topic of the discourse. In (91) and (92) the subject is topic so the object referent is suffixed to the verb as is the unmarked case. In (93) and (94) the first person is already prominent in the subordinate clause and the topic under discussion, so, as the object of the main clause, it must be fronted. Since procliticisation is required if the absolutive is fronted in these constructions, the result is the unusual phenomenon of two proclitic person markers juxtaposed before the verb (the object referent prefixed to the subject referent). It would be very difficult to refer to this as a nominative/accusative manifestation of person markers in a split-ergative system,[23] that is, subordinate temporal clauses forcing a nominative form in an otherwise ergative/absolutive system. Rather, it is the result of procliticisation (i.e. a clitic which has been fronted as topic and which cannot be suffixed to the temporal clause as would be expected in this system).

6.2 COMPLEMENTATION

A form of complementation was seen above with the verb 'to think' *are'* (68c), but there was no complementiser. The question 'why?' *angngura* commonly takes a complement with *na* as the complementiser. In examples (54) - (59) we saw how *angngura* was used as a preverbal modifier similar to negatives and temporal adverbials. The use of the complementiser *na* questions the reason for the entire following clause as a unit action while its absence questions (focuses on) the word immediately following, usually a verb or adjective.

(95)   *Angngurai na*   *nuisse'i*   *angkua*
        why.3ABS CMPL 2(F)ERG.know.3ABS VRt.say

        iami   *inni tau*   *toaku?*
        3PRO.3CMP this person old.1POSS
        How is it that you know that these are my parents?

(96)   *Nakuamo*   *iHaking,*   "*Angngura na*
        3ERG.say.CMP PI.Haking why   CMPL

---

23   This is an extension of the concept as discussed in fn. 16.

> _kisarea_   pole   _doi'_?"
> 2(H)ERG.give.1ABS   again money
> Haking said, "Why are you giving me money again?"

(97)   _Angngura na   nua'ra'   kamua amminahang ri_
        why   CMPL 2F.ERG.want very VRi.follow PREP

        purinannu?
        uncle.2(F)POSS
        Why ever did you want to follow your uncle?

(98)   _Angngura na   nunahoja?_
        why   CMPL 2(F)ERG.3ERG.look.for
        Why is it you he's looking for?

6.3 COORDINATE CLAUSES

The conjunction _na_ is also used to connect the two clauses in a simultaneous-action construction, but with the meaning 'and'. In (101) the conjunction is missing (an option when a nominal intervenes) and the two clauses are juxtaposed with the same simultaneous action meaning.

(99)   _A'pallua   na   kussassa._
        VRi.cook.1ABS and 1ERG.VRi.launder
        I am cooking and washing clothes (at the same time).

(100)   _Adinginga   na   kuhambang._
        VRs.cold.1ABS and 1ERG.hot
        I am cold and hot (at the same time).

(101)   _Maeng injo naraka'ma   anrongku   kunahau._
        already that 3ERG.hug.1CMP mother.1POSS 1ERG.3ERG.kiss
        After that my mother hugged me and she kissed me.

(102)   _Napakanrea   na   kunapainung._
        3ERG.feed.1ABS and 1ERG.3ERG.give.drink
        He fed me and he gave me a drink.

(103)   _Kupakanrei   na   kupainungi._
        1ERG.feed.3ABS and 1ERG.give.drink.3ABS
        I fed him and I gave him a drink.

(104)   _Sabbara to'i   na   naparrang   punna rie'_
        patient   ADD.3ABS and 3ERG.endure if   have

        angngelle'-ngelle'i.
        VRt.ridicule.3ABS
        He was also patient and he endured it if there were those who made fun of him.

Without an understanding of how topic functions in these constructions and with limited data, one might speculate that simultaneous action evokes a nominative/accusative structure (as does Matti, in press). But added data such as in (103) clearly show that there are also

absolutive/ergative forms of simultaneous action. Again topic is the distinguishing factor, such that the topic referent must be fronted in the second clause. In (103) the subject is topic and thus already preverbally marked, whereas in (102) the object as topic is fronted.

7. OTHER CONSTRUCTIONS

The following three constructions – passive, imperative and completive -*mo* – have been encountered in various examples throughout this paper, but have not yet been clarified. They are presented here to show how they affect person marking in Konjo.

7.1 PASSIVES

In his paper 'The demise of focus and the spread of conjugated verbs in Sulawesi' van den Berg (this volume) explores the interrelationship between conjugated forms and passive strategies in several Sulawesi languages. In terms of his analysis, Konjo would be said to have retained the *ni*-form which now indicates a passive construction. In Bambam (Campbell 1989), as in Padoe, the passive construction is without exception agentless and functions as an intransitive verb. In Konjo, passive functions as English speakers would 'expect' it to, that is, the patient becomes the subject, a passive prefix *ni-* replaces the actor prefix and the actor is demoted to an oblique phrase or dropped altogether.[24]

> (105) a. *Kupeppe'ko.*
>   1ERG.hit.2(F)ABS
>   I hit you.
>
>   b. *Nipeppe'ko*   (*ri*   *nakke*).
>   PASS.hit.2(F)ABS   PREP   1PRO
>   You were hit (by me).
>
>   c. *Ulunna*   *nipeppe'.*
>   head.3POSS   PASS.hit
>   His head was hit/ he was hit on the head.
>
> (106) *Nakke nieranga*   *a'lampa ri*   *balla'*   *garringa*
>   1PRO PASS.take.1ABS   VRi.go PREP   house   sick.DEF
>
>   *nisuro*   *paressa...*
>   PASS.command examine
>   I was taken to the hospital and (they) were told to check me...
>
> (107) *IHakingji*   *nisuro*   *a'kammi'*   *balla'.*
>   PI.Haking.3LIM   PASS.command   VRi.guard   house
>   Only Haking was told to guard the house.

---

[24] Although it is possible to have the actor designated by an oblique phrase, this is not the norm. In a procedural text on working ricefields from which example (108) is taken, over 80 per cent of the verbs are passive form – a common discourse feature of descriptive texts – and not one of them specifies the actor, which is obviously 'we' the hearers. However, in narrative texts it is not uncommon that the agent will be supplied in a passive construction (such as (113) and (114)). An overt agent may also be supplied to clarify a situation which might otherwise not be obvious (*Nibetai Ali ri Amir.* 'Ali was beaten by Amir'.).

(108)   *Jari punna maengi   nitahuri   pare*
       so   if   already.3ABS PASS.scatter.TRS paddy

       niallemi   nisembo'...
       PASS.take.3CMP PASS.mud.cover
       Once the rice seed has been scattered, it is taken and covered with mud...

(109)   *Mingka anre' nipauangi   angkua   anre' nama'ring...*
       but   NEG PASS.tell.BEN.3ABS VRt.say   NEG 3ERG.permit
       But he wasn't told that it wasn't permitted...

(110)   *Ante'i   pakua punna nikellaengi   ammantang*
       where.3ABS   thus   if   PASS.permit.TRS.3ABS   VRi.stay

       ri   balla'a?
       PREP house.DEF
       How about it if she is forced to stay at the house?

(111)   [*Naia   injo hattua   ri   ansulu'kumo   ri   balla'*
       and.3PRO   that time.DEF PREP exit.1POSS.CMP PREP house

       garringa] na   kunipainro   mae ri   balla'
       sick.DEF CMPL 1ERG.PASS.CAUS.return come PREP house

       nukusehaya...
       REL.1ERG.rent.DEF
       [It was at the time of my getting out of the hospital] that I was taken back to
       the house which I was renting...

(112)   *Assambajangko   ri   anre'napa*
       VRi.pray.2(F)ABS PREP NEG.3POSS.ICMP

       nunisambajangi.
       2(F)ERG.PASS.pray.TRS
       Pray before you are prayed over.

(113)   *Injo tau   ruaya   na   nitobo'   ri   karaenga anre'*
       that person two.DEF CMPL PASS.stab PREP king   NEG

       sala-salanna.
       wrong.3POSS
       The two who were stabbed by the king didn't do anything wrong.

(114)   *Niallemi   iHaking   ri   patanna   kappala*
       PASS.take.3CMP PI.Haking PREP owner.3POSS boat

       nampa nierang   a'lampa...
       then   PASS.carry VRi.go
       Haking was taken by the owner of the boat and then taken...

(115)   *Apa nisessaangko?*
       what PASS.difficult.BEN.2(F)ABS
       What are you being made frustrated about?

(116)   *Lohemo   buanganna nihalliangi   iHaking,*
       much.CMP   kind.3POSS PASS.buy.BEN.3ABS PI.Haking

sangka'mi   pake-pakena,   kare'-karenaang
complete.3CMP clothes.3POSS toys

a'bua'-buangangmi   nipa'riekangi.
VRi.various.kinds.3CMP PASS.CAUS.VRi.have.BEN.3ABS
All kinds of things were bought for Haking, his clothes were complete, and
all kinds of toys were got for him.

(117)   *Arami*   *niahangangi,*   *karaeng.*
        don't.3CMP   PASS.bury.PROH king
        Don't let him be buried, king.

The *ni-* passive prefix functions as any of the verbaliser prefixes, substituting as it were for the actor prefix.[25] Note that in (108) the adverbial *maeng* takes the absolutive suffix as normal even though this is a passive construction. In (111) and (112) the subordinate time clause requires procliticisation as expected. Example (105c) is an example of topicalisation; as expected the enclitic is missing. Examples (113) and (114) have overt agents introduced by the preposition *ri*. In (115) and (116) the object of the clause is topicalised, the agent is missing and it is the indirect object which has become the surface subject of the clause.

7.2 IMPERATIVES

In Konjo only the second person proclitic person marker may be deleted in an imperative construction, never the absolutive enclitic. One might therefore argue that this is evidence that Konjo is an ergative language. Recall, however, that second person free pronouns only occur as emphasis while the person markers indicate the person of subject and object. Since any deletion of second person is a morphological function, not a syntactic function, the fact that Konjo has a morphologically ergative system is again reinforced.

(118) a.   *Lampako!*   / *Lampamako!*
          go.2(F)ABS   go.2(F)CMP
          Go!   Go!

      b.   *Peppe'i!*
          hit.3ABS
          Hit it!

(119) a.   *Dahu saa!*
          give mild.IMP.1ABS
          Give it to me!

---

[25]   It is interesting to note this passive construction in light of the controversy about the role of passive in ergative languages. In Konjo the passive prefix could be viewed simply as another ergative prefix person marker meaning 'someone'. Contrast *naittea* 'he saw me' with *niittea* 'someone saw me (or I was seen)'. In Mamuju (Strømme, in press) *ni-* not only marks passive, but it also marks second person honorific and first person inclusive in the ergative set. In Konjo, however, since it is possible to specify an oblique actor (albeit textually less frequent), we could view passive as an intransitive construction, the syntactic object becoming subject and the clause losing its transitivity, thus taking the absolutive suffix, *nitobo'i ri karaenga* 'he was stabbed by the king'. In either case there is no change in the status of the participants, that is, the absolutive person marker remains unchanged (there is no case marking for the free-form nominals). Since the semantic object of the verb does not change and the morphological form remains absolutive, how does one view the transitivity of the verb?

    b.   *Amminro   sako!*
         VRi.retum mild.IMP.2(F)ABS
         Return home!

(120) a. *Sarea   bo'-bo'ta!*
         give.1ABS book.2(H)POSS
         Give me one of your books!

    b. *Kisarea   bo'-bo'ta!*
         2(H)ERG.give.1ABS book.2(H)POSS
         Give me one of your books!

In both the normal imperative (118) and the softened imperative (indicated by the *sa* form in (119) the absolutive suffixes remain intact, while the prefixed person markers are normally deleted (see (118b) and (119a)). Whereas deletion of the prefixed person markers is the norm, they need not be deleted (120). The second form would be considered more polite (as an inferior to his superior).

7.3 COMPLETIVE *-mo*

In general the Konjo completive *-mo* functions together with a person marker (*-ma* 1CMP, *-mako* 2(F)CMP, *-maki* 2(H)CMP or 1PL.INC.CMP, *-mi* 3CMP). If the completive morpheme occurs, it follows the movement patterns of the peripatetic person markers.[26] The completive marker *-mo* may also function independently. If so, its usual discourse function is to advance the story-line. The presence of *-mo* suffixed to a verb always forces the absolutive enclitic to be fronted and prefixed to the front of the verb.

(121)   *Nakuamo   iJama'   ilalang   ri   atinna*
            3ERG.say.CMP PI.Jama' PREP.inside PREP heart.3POSS

            rannui   nyahaku...
            happy.3ABS breath.1POSS
            Jama' said to himself, I'm really happy...

(122)   *Nanipauangmo   karaenga ri   Paratihi angkua...*
            3ERG.PASS.tell.BEN.CMP king.DEF PREP Paratihi VRt.say
            The king of Paratihi was told saying...

(123)   *Kunapeppe'mo   Ali.*   (normally *napeppe'a*)
            1ERG.3ERG.hit.CMP Ali
            Ali hit me.

(124)   *Nakupammulaimo   bica'-bicaranna*
            3ERG.1ERG.CAUS.VRt.begin.TRS.CMP talk.about.3POSS

---

[26] Although outside the scope of this paper, it is interesting to note that the completive marker *-mo*, as well as the incompletive *-pa* and the limiter *-ja*, do not prefix to the verb as the absolutives do in cases of negative or temporal adverbials *(Sikurayapa nu'lampa?* 'When will you be leaving?'; *Anre'mo na'kulle angngittei.* 'He couldn't see it anymore.'). Rather a neutral form (*-mo* CMP, *-pa* ICMP, *-ja* LIM) is suffixed to the adverbial – *anre'ja* 'nothing'.

        assarupu'a.
        VRi.field.work.DEF
        I will begin the story of working the fields.

(125)   *...naiami   injo narie'   ngase'mo ana'-ana'*
         and.3PRO.3CMP that   3ERG.have all.CMP children

        buru'nea   battu annattaki.
        male.DEF come VRt.cut.TRS
        ...and so all the young men have come to cut the corn.

Completive *-mo* occurs frequently with certain key words such as *rie'* 'to be', *anre'* 'not', *maeng* 'ever', but only when it occurs with the verb does it affect person-marker clitics.

8. CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is abundantly evident that the movement of Konjo person-marker clitics plays a significant role in signalling various types of focus as well as topicality. Without an understanding of how focus and topic (as described in this paper) interact there is little hope of unravelling the complexities of Konjo syntax and discourse. This has been an attempt to present a reasonable analysis of Konjo person-marker clitics.

Several basic conclusions can be summarised:

1) Konjo has a clear ergative/absolutive system functioning morphologically in all aspects of the syntax. Procliticisation is not due to a split-ergative system.

2) Transitivity is defined in terms of the definiteness of the object. As a semantic concept antipassive plays a role, but syntactically there are no antipassive constructions in Konjo.

3) Focus is defined as the syntactic pivot of a sentence (i.e. intransitive clauses are in subject focus, transitive clauses are in object focus). Much of the burden for specifying the subject or object is on the person markers.

4) Topicality plays a strategic role in Konjo. Not only are free-form nominals topicalised by fronting, but also the person markers referring to the subject or object as topic are also fronted. With intransitive clauses this is seen in the absolutive moving to precede the verb if there are elements which modify the verb (39d). With transitive clauses this is seen in two ways: (a) when object is topic, if the absolutive can be suffixed to a preverbal element, it will be (47); otherwise it is procliticised (102). This results in the unusual occurrence of two 'ergative' person markers on a verb; (b) when subject is topic, the subject referent will either be evident in prior discourse (11) or be suffixed to a preverbal element (48a), the definite object verbaliser *ang-* prefixed to the verb, and the object referent suffixed to the verb.

Considerably more analysis is needed to clearly identify when person markers are omitted. It has been shown in this paper (§3.2) that when a free-form nominal topic is fronted, its absolutive referent is omitted. There are many situations in complex clauses where the person marker is omitted, having been specified in some other part of the sentence, but rules governing such omissions must await future analysis.

Having clarified the issues of focus and topic, we are now prepared to look more carefully at several other discourse features, including among others: (a) the role of *-mo* in advancing the story-line; (b) the choice of subject or object as topic; (c) the use of free pronouns for

emphasis; and (d) the clarification of when the completive, incompletive, and limiter clitics are used and how they relate to each other.

There is also an appeal to try to unravel the question of where the clitic person markers came from. If one were to look at them as equal to free-form nominals, the whole question of syntactic ergativity would have to be reconsidered. One might conjecture that what seems to be a rather confusing mesh of an ergative/absolutive morphological system with a nominative/accusative syntactic system merely reflects the diverse makeup of the Konjo people whose peripatetic history gives evidence of contact with various peoples and languages. Given more in-depth analysis of the discourse, this beautifully complex language will yield to clear explanation.

APPENDIX: ABBREVIATIONS

ABS	absolutive (suffix/enclitic) person marker
ADD	additive
ADJ	adjective marker for derivations (*ka-*)
AUX	auxiliary
BEN	benefactive
CAUS	causative
CMP	completive (*-mo, -ma, -mi, -mako, -makɪ*)
CMPL	complementiser (*na-*)
CTP	count prefix (*ta'-*)
DEF	definite (determiner) (*-a*)
ERG	ergative (prefix/proclitic) person marker
EXC	exclusive
F	familiar
FUT	future (*la-*)
H	honorific
ICMP	incompletive (*-pa, -pi, -pako, -pakɪ*)
IMP	imperative
INC	inclusive
INT	intransitive
LIM	limiter (*-ja, -ji, -jako, -jakɪ*)
NEG	negative (*anre'*)
NMS	nominaliser (*pa-, -ang*)
NVOL	non-volitional action (*ta'-*)
PASS	passive (*ni-*)
PI	person identifier (for proper names or pronouns – *i-*)
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PREP	(general) preposition (*ri*)
PRO	(free-form) pronoun
PROH	prohibitiser (*-i*)
PVA	postverbal adverb
REC	reciprocal (*si-*)
REL	relative (clause designator *nu-*)

TRS   transitiviser (*-i*, *-ang*)
VRd   .   definite verbaliser (transitive with definite object *ang-*)
VRi   intransitive (active) verbaliser (*a'-*)
VRs   (intransitive) stative verbaliser (*a-*)
VRt   transitive verbaliser (*ang-*)
WRN   warning suffix (*-a*)

REFERENCES

Andersen, Stephen, 1976, On the notion of subject in ergative languages. In Charles N. Li, ed. *Subject and topic: papers.* New York: Academic Press.

Campbell, Philip J., 1989, Some aspects of Pitu Ulunna Salu grammar: a typological approach. MA thesis, University of Texas, Arlington.

Dixon, R.M.W., 1979, Ergativity. *Language* 55:59-138.

Dixon, R.M.W., ed., 1987, *Studies in Ergativity.* Amsterdam: North Holland. (Reprinted from *Lingua* 71.)

Friberg, Timothy and Barbara Friberg, 1991, Notes on Konjo phonology. *NUSA* 33:71-115.

Givón, Talmy, 1984, *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson, 1980, Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56/2:251-299.

Larsen, Thomas W., 1987, The syntactic status of ergativity in Quiché. In Dixon, ed. 1987:33-59.

Marantz, Alec, 1984, *On the nature of grammatical relations.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Martens, Michael, 1988, Focus or ergativity? Pronoun sets in Uma. In H. Steinhauer, ed. *Papers in Western Austronesian linguistics* No. 4. *PL*, A-79:263-277.

Matti, David F., in press, Mamasa pronoun sets. *NUSA*.

Sirk, Ü., 1983, *The Buginese language.* Trans. E.H. Tsipan. Moscow: Nauka.

Strømme, Kari K., in press, Person marking in the Mamuju language. *NUSA*.

Valkama, Kari, in press, Person marking in Duri. *NUSA*.

van den Berg, René, 1989, *A grammar of the Muna language.* Dordrecht: Foris.