

11 Complement clause type and complementation strategy in Kambera

Marian Klamer

Chapter 11 of *Complementation - A Cross-linguistic Typology* [Explorations in Linguistic Typology 3], edited by R.M.W. Dixon and A. Aikhenvald. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 245-262.

1 Introduction

Kambera is spoken by approximately 150,000 speakers in the eastern region of the island of Sumba (province Nusa Tenggara Timur) in Eastern Indonesia. In non-coastal and rural areas of the region, the language is still being spoken by children, while the absence of secondary education and mass media in these areas also limits the influence of Indonesian. Kambera is thus not an endangered language in number of speakers. It is classified as belonging to the Central Malayo-Polynesian subgroup of Austronesian languages (cf. Blust 1993). Native speakers refer to the language as *hilu Humba*, the ‘Sumba language’ (in contrast to *hilu Jawa* ‘Indonesian’). In the past it has been referred to as ‘Sumbaneesch’ (Wielenga 1909), ‘Sumba(a)sch’ (Onvlee 1925), ‘Kamberaas’ (Onvlee 1984), and ‘Bahasa Sumba/Kambera’ (Kapita 1982) and Klamer (1998a) is a recent grammar of the language while Klamer (2005) presents a short overview of it. Additional references on Kambera can be found in these publications. The information presented in this chapter is based on a corpus of 12-hours of spontaneous speech, plus additional elicitation, collected in Sumba during 12 months of fieldwork between 1991 and 1994. All speakers are native speakers, and come from the same village (cf. Klamer 1998a: 4-6). Kambera has one type of complement clause, as well as one complementation strategy, and both are discussed in this chapter.

2 Grammatical overview

Kambera is a head-marking language. A Kambera sentence is build on the basis of a ‘nuclear’ (or ‘minimal’) clause, which consists of a predicate phrase (PredP) (a verbal or

nominal phrase that functions as the predicate of the clause) as well as a clitic cluster attached to that PredP.

The grammatical relations assumed for Kambera are intransitive subject (S), transitive subject (A), and transitive object (O). These grammatical relations are marked on the predicate by pronominal clitics. Kambera has two types of O: primary (direct) O (Patients, Themes), and secondary (indirect) O (Recipients, Benefactives, Goals, Locations), and both may be marked (also simultaneously) on the PredP.

The pronominal reference system of Kambera is rather complex (see Klamer 1997, 1998a,b, 2000), but for the purposes of this chapter it is sufficient to present only the following few basic facts. In a declarative, transitive clause the PredP has a verbal head, the A is canonically nominative, and the O accusative (primary O) or dative (secondary O), see (1). The NPs between brackets are syntactically optional.

- (1) (na tau wútu) na-palu-ka (nyungga)¹
 ART person be.fat 3sg.NOM-hit-1s.ACC I
 ‘The big man hit me’

The sentences in (2) illustrate how objects are marked. In case of a ditransitive verb, the secondary O is always crossreferenced, as in (2a). In addition, the primary O may be crossreferenced if it is definite, as in (2b). In such cases, it follows the secondary O marking clitic. In this position, it must be dative because of clitic cluster restrictions.

(2) a. (i Ama) na-kei-nja rí
 ART father 3sg.NOM-buy.for-3p.DAT vegetable
 ‘Father buys them vegetables’ (indefinite Patient)

b. (i Ama) na-kei-ngga-nya
 ART father 3sg.NOM-buy-1sg.DAT-3sg.DAT
 ‘Father buys it for me’ (definite Patient)

Whether or not an O is crossreferenced depends on the grammatical definiteness of the referent NP. Definiteness is marked by the presence of an article: *na* for singulars, *da* for plurals, *i* for humans. NPs that are crossreferenced on the predicate are optionally doubled, usually for emphasis or disambiguation.

In the discussion on complement clauses below, the main criterion to analyse nominal clauses as verbal complements is the fact that they may receive overt marking as arguments of the main verb only when they are definite (i.e., have an article).

S is canonically nominative:

(3) [na ài] na-tambuta [dàngu amung]
 ART wood 3sg.NOM-drop.out with root
 ‘That tree is uprooted’

There are, however, other common strategies to mark S. They include: (i) using a combination of a genitive plus a third person singular dative clitic. This marking of S expresses that the clause has continuative aspect (Klamer 2000); (ii) using a genitive clitic.

Clauses with a genitive subject are referred to as ‘nominal clauses’, and are the topic of §6 below.

The unmarked constituent word order in a Kambera transitive declarative clause is (A)VO, though VOA and VAO are often attested as well (for V, one may also read PredP). What these configurations share is that their O follows the PredP, i.e., the canonical O position is postverbal. For intransitive clauses the basic word order is VS, though SV is also often attested.

The relative freedom of constituent order in Kambera has to do with the fact that Kambera argument relations are generally marked by the pronominal clitics, rather than by changes in constituent order. In fact, since the full NPs (if present) are used for disambiguation or emphasis, we *expect* their order to be rather free.

In addition to the variable position of NPs, the distributional properties of the argument marking clitics also show a lot of variation. Representing clitics marking S, A, and O as {s, a, o} attached to the PredP (where ‘o’ is either an indirect object (‘io’) or a direct object (‘do’)), two major types of clitic orders are attested; one where A/S is marked with a (nominative) proclitic: a-PredP-o; a-PredP-io-do, s-PredP; and another where A/S is marked with an enclitic: PredP-a-o; PredP-a-io-do; PredP-s. The former type is the standard type, while the latter includes includes for example nominal clauses (see §6), and clauses with a non-verbal predicate (cf. (5) and (6) below). (For more information, see Klamer 1998a).

In other words, a uniform statement concerning either the order of nominal constituents or the pronominal markers in Kambera is difficult to make. For the purpose of this chapter, it suffices to say that definite O constituents are marked on the verb as enclitics, and if they are (also) expressed as NPs, these canonically follow the verb; just like the S marking NPs.

In addition to the pronominal clitics marking the grammatical relations, a nuclear clause also contains clitics that mark modal and aspectual notions of the clause. The entire clitic

4 Major word classes

Nominals are distinct from verbs because they may be marked for definiteness by an article (cf. above). Nouns can also be quantified by a numeral phrase, and modified by a demonstrative and/or an emphatic pronoun:

- (7) [[[tailu mbua [mbola]] nuna] una]
 three CLF basket DIST.3sg. EMPH.3sg.
 ‘THOSE three baskets’

Typical verbal properties include (i) functioning as a predicate with a nominative S/A, and (ii) the possibility of being modified by a verbal adverb, e.g. *tika* ‘almost’.

Within the category of verbs, intransitive verbs can be distinguished from transitive ones because they have only one semantic argument. As a result, they cannot occur in transitive syntactic constructions. Transitive verbs, on the other hand, have at least two semantic arguments, so if it is at all possible to use a verb with two arguments crossreferenced on the verb, I assume it is transitive. (Of course, arguments of any verb may be left implicit, to be inferred from the context.)

Kamera has no exclusively nominal morphology. There are affixes that derive only verbs: *pa-* derives causatives, and *-ng* derives applicative verbs. There are no structural arguments to distinguish a separate lexical category of adjectives in the language, but it does have a separate category of adverbs (cf. Klamer 1998a).

Table 1 presents an overview of the Kambera verbs that take a nominal complement clause (see §6.1), which verbs take a controlled clause strategy (see §7), and which verbs may take both. The table also indicates which verbs have been attested with a quotative construction (see §8). The table represents what is in my corpus, but in fact complement clauses and complementation strategies may apply to further verbs. An empty box means that the construction is not attested in my database; it is unclear whether its absence means that it is ungrammatical or that it is low in frequency. (For logistic reasons, I have not been able to consult native speakers on Sumba island for this chapter.)

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

The verbs *namu* ‘to love’ and *namung* ‘to remember fondly’³ are included in Table 1 for comparative reasons, although they have neither been attested with nominal complement clauses, nor with controlled structures -- instead, they take concrete O’s and occur in coordination structures. The verbs in the ‘Manipulation’ group express a concept where A manipulates O. This manipulation may involve speech, but the Manipulation verbs differ from Speaking verbs because they occur with an object-control clause rather than a quotative construction.

There are a few verbs that score in both the nominal complement column and the controlled clause column. Examples are *píngu*, *njadi*, and *monung*. As indicated in the table, the semantics of these verb change under influence of the type of embedded clause. For example, *píngu* with a subject controlled clause means ‘to be able to, can’ (see (12)), while *píngu* with a nominal complement clause is translated as ‘to know (about) something’, (see (19)). Similar differences are found with *njadi* with a controlled clause (‘to be able’) versus *njadi*

plus nominal complement clause ('to be appropriate, to be possible'), and *monung* with a controlled clause ('to hope') versus *monung* with a nominal complement clause ('to trust').

6 Nominal clauses

The first identifying feature of Kambera nominal clauses is that they mark their S/A with a genitive enclitic, as in (11):

- (11) [na apu-mu], katuda-na_s [la pinu bolsak]-ka una...
 ART granny-2sg.GEN sleep-3sg.GEN LOC top mattress-PRF EMP.3sg.
 'Your granny, she will sleep on a mattress...'

Though they are syntactically independent, the discourse status of nominal clauses is dependent – usually, they represent the background information for a clause that is more prominent in the discourse, while the S/A of the nominal verb is presented as part of the event/situation expressed by the predicate more than an actively involved participant.

Nominal clauses may be independent clauses, as well as the main clause in a multi-clause construction, taking for example a controlled clause, as in (12):

- (12) ...ba nda [lalu pingu hàmu]-a-na_s [pa-kareuk] _{ContrCl}
 CONJ NEG too know be.good-MOD-3sg.GEN CTR-talk
 '...because he can't talk very well yet'

Kambera nominal clauses have the external syntax of possessed NPs. They can be clefted, as well as compared:

- (13) [hama pingu-mi_S] [dàngu [ama-mi]_{NP}] PP
 be.same know-2pl.GEN with father-2pl.GEN
 ‘You (pl) and your fathers are equally bright’

They may be marked for definiteness with an article (sg. *na*, pl. *da*), as illustrated in (14).

The function of the article *na* in this example is to make the nominal clause definite so that it can be the referent of the definite demonstrative pronoun *nuna* ‘that one’ in the first clause.

- (14) muda-a nuna, jàka jia [na pala-nda_S]
 easily-just DIST.3sg if EXIST ART cross-3pl.GEN
 ‘That’s easy for us to cross’ (lit.: ‘Easily that one, if (it’s) our crossing’)

If a nominal clause is definite, it can be crossreferenced as an argument of the main verb.

This is further discussed below.

Internally, Kambera nominal clauses are similar to verbal clauses: they may contain mood and aspect clitics, as in (15a), as well as negations, as in (16). Such grammatical elements cannot occur inside possessed NPs, as illustrated in (15b).

- (15) a. hili mandai-ma-na_S-i...
 again be.long-EMP-3sg.GEN-ITER
 ‘It (was) some time later...’
 b. * uma-ma-na-i
 house-EMP-3sg.GEN-ITER

- (16) panau-nya nyuna ka àmbu palu-na_A-nja_O-i [da ana-na]
 tell-3sg.DAT he CONJ NEG.irr hit-3sg.GEN-3pl.DAT-ITER ART child-3sg.GEN
 ‘Tell him that he shouldn't hit his children (anymore)’

Note that all of the nominal clauses discussed above are independent, i.e. they do not function as S/A or O of a main verb. There are, however, nominal clauses that do occur in such functions. Since this is a chapter on clausal complementation, the remaining part of this subsection will focus on those, though it is important to note that in my database nominal clauses that function as complements of a main verb are a tiny minority as compared to the nominal clauses that are syntactically independent.⁴

6.1. Nominal clauses as complement clauses

In (17) the nominal clause is marked as the S of the main verb *hàmu* ‘be good’. The nominal clause is a definite NP and follows the main verb. Its S is expressed as the enclitic *-na* on *ludu* ‘sing’, and the nominal clause also contains an S NP and a temporal adjunct.

- (17) nda na_S-hàmu ndoku <na ludu-na na tau la rudung>_S
 NEG 3SG.NOM-be.good NEG.EMPH ART sing-3sg.GEN ART person LOC night
 ‘That people sing at night is not nice at all’

In (18) the nominal clause functions again as the S of the main verb, but now it precedes the main verb. Note that the complement clause refers to the entire event of the meeting, not to for example the manner in which the meeting took place.⁵

- (18) <na hambur-na-nja>_S nda na_S-njadi-a
 ART meet-3sg.GEN-3PL.DAT NEG 3SG.NOM-be.appropriate- MOD
 ‘His meeting of them (i.e. the fact that he met them) was inappropriate’

In (19) we find a nominal clause in O function. It follows the main verb, i.e. appears in the canonical position for O NPs:

- (19) nda ku-pí-nya_O <na karuhi-na banda>_O
 NEG 1sg.NOM-know-3sg.DAT ART demand-3sg.GEN cattle
 ‘I do not know about his demanding cattle’

A nominal complement clause can contain a negation. It can also contain two NP arguments, as in (20) and (21) where the O is a definite NP and the A is part of an NP headed by *parai* ‘work’. A nominal clause that contains an S NP is illustrated in (22).

- (20) na-ita-ya_O
 3sg.NOM-see-3sg.ACC
 <na katáku-na-nya [na hamayang-na] [parai-na i Ama-na]>_O
 ART accept-3SG.GEN-3SG.DAT ART pray-S.GEN work-3SG.GEN ART father-3sg.GEN
 ‘He sees that his prayer is accepted by his father’
 (lit. he sees his_j acceptance of his_k prayer (as) the work of [his_k father]_j)

- (21) ...ba lalu ita dí-na-nya_O-i-ka nú, [...] <na lalu mbuha-na-nya
 CONJ too see be-3sg.GEN-3sg.DAT-ITER-PRF DIST ART too like-3sg.GEN-3sg.DAT
 ‘...because he saw only too well the big liking

[na ana njara] [parai-na nyuna yena i Umbu Mada]>_O
 ART child horse work-3sg.GEN he this.one ART Sir Mada
 of the foal by Sir Mada' (i.e. that Sir Mada liked the foal very much)

- (22) ku-manggadipa-nya_O <na meti-na na ama-nggu>_O
 1sg.NOM-dream-3sg.DAT ART die-3sg.GEN ART father-1sg.GEN
 'I dreamed about my father dying'

The O of the main verb in (22) is *-nya* and this enclitic is coreferent with the nominal clause as a whole – that is, the event of my father dying. If the clitic had been referring to my father --who died-- the sentence would have been:

- (23) ku-manggadipa-nya_O ba na-meti na ama-nggu
 1sg.NOM-dream-3sg.DAT CONJ 3sg.NOM-die ART father-1sg.GEN
 'I dreamed about him, that he (my father) died'

Since only definite O's are crossreferenced, an indefinite nominal clause cannot be crossreferenced with an O marking clitic on the main verb. An illustration is (24). Articles mark definiteness in Kambera, and since the nominal clause lacks an article, it is grammatically definite and cannot be marked on the main verb. Instead, it occurs in a coordination. Note also that the O of *pàda* 'notice' in the first clause refers to a person, and has the same referent as the S of the nominal clause (*na ama-nggu* 'my father'). This is not an instance of argument raising, since the argument is marked twice – in the first as well as the second clause.

- (24) hina-ka hi ku-pàda-ya ba <mbeni-na na ama-nggu>
 newly-PRF CONJ 1sg.NOM-notice-3sg.ACC CONJ be.angry-3sg.GEN ART father-1sg.GEN
 ‘Only then did I notice him, that my father was angry’

In conclusion, Kambera nominal clauses are clauses with a genitive subject that may be marked for definiteness, and occur in comparative constructions in the same way that NPs do. They are generally used as syntactically independent clauses, may be juxtaposed or coordinated to another clause, or govern a controlled clause. The internal structure of nominal clauses is verbal: they contain negations and modal and aspectual clitics. Nominal clauses function as complement clauses when they are cross-referenced as the S or O of a main verb. (I have no examples of nominal clauses in A function.) Nominal complement clauses are, however, a small minority in my database; the majority of the nominal clauses is grammatically independent. In addition, I have found no examples of nominal complement clauses which contain negations and/or aspect or mood enclitics. To me this suggests that such configurations are either ungrammatical or very marked.

7 Complementation strategy: Controlled clauses

A second type of embedded clause in Kambera I refer to as ‘controlled’ clauses. Controlled clauses follow a main verb, and are introduced by a marker of subordination, the proclitic *pa*.⁶ In (25a-b) the contrast between coordination and control is illustrated.

(25) a. Two coordinated clauses:

ta-pakiring [ka ta-tinu-nya na lau haromu] _{ContrCl}

1pl.NOM-start CONJ 1pl.NOM-weave-3sg.DAT ART sarong tomorrow

‘We start (with this) so that we’ll weave the sarong tomorrow’

b. Main and controlled clause:

ta-pakiring [pa-tinu-nya na lau haromu] _{ContrCl}

1pl.NOM-start CTR-weave-3sg.DAT ART sarong tomorrow

‘We start to weave the sarong tomorrow’

By definition, controlled clauses do not have an overt S/A. Their S/A is implied and coreferent with an argument of the main verb - either the main S/A (‘subject control’, shown as ‘Subj’ in Table 1), as in (26), or the main O (‘object control’, shown as ‘Obj’ in Table 1), as in (27):

(26) pareta-ya ka na-pingu [pa-ràma] _{ContrCl}

instruct-3sg.ACC CONJ 3sg.NOM-know CTR-work

‘Instruct him so he knows what to do’

(27) paràha-na-nja-ka, [pa-laku [pa-himbu iyang] _{ContrCl}] _{ContrCl}

command-3sg.GEN-3pl.DAT-PRF CTR-go CTR-search fish

‘He commanded them to go and look for fish’

In a controlled clause the controlled S/A cannot be expressed, with neither a nominative nor a genitive (nor any clitic), compare (28a-b):

- (28) a. ku-parahaya-ya [pa-nda kambàlik] _{ContrCl}
 1sg.NOM-trust-3sg.ACC CTR-NEG lie
 ‘I trust him not to lie’
- b. ku-parahaya-ya pa-nda *na-kambàlik / *kambàlik-na
 1sg.NOM-trust-3sg.ACC CTR-NEG 3SG.NOM-lie lie-3sg.GEN

Controlled clauses are not analysed as syntactic complements of the main verb for two reasons.⁷ First, because the verb heading a controlled clause may be intransitive and have its own S, so that the controlled clause cannot be the syntactic argument of the main verb. Examples are the verb *lua* ‘go’ in the second part of (29), and *laku* and *mài* in (30) and (31):

- (29) parenggang [pa-taku wài] _{ContrCl} ka u-lua [pa-manahu] _{ContrCl}
 hasten CTR-draw water CONJ 2sg.NOM-go CTR-cook
 ‘Quickly draw some water (from the well) so you can go cooking’
- (30) na-laku mài-pa [pa-hili karai-ka] _{ContrCl}
 3sg.NOM-go come-IMPF CTR-again ask-1sg.ACC
 ‘He came yet again to ask me again’
- (31) na-mài [pa-danggang winu] _{ContrCl}
 3SG.NOM-come CTR-sell betel.nut
 ‘He came to sell betel nut’

The second reason why controlled clauses are not considered syntactic arguments of the main verb is because they cannot be marked as such with clitics on the main verb. If the main verb is transitive, it can of course have an O marking enclitic attached to it, but this clitic always refers to a concrete entity, i.e. never to the (proposition of the) controlled clause. This is illustrated in (32)-(33). If the O of the main verb and the O of the embedded verb refer to the same person, this person is cliticised on both verbs.

- (32) nda ku-mbuha-a-nggau-pa pa-lei-nggau
 NEG 1sg.NOM-want-MOD-2sg.DAT-IMPF CTR-have.as.husband-2sg.DAT
 ‘I no longer want you for a husband’

- (33) na-bàtir-ngga pa-pa-meti-ka nyungga
 3sg.NOM-threaten-1sg.DAT CTR-CAU-die-1sg.ACC I
 ‘He threatens to kill me’

The internal structure of controlled clauses is more restricted than main clauses, because they (i) always lack an overt S/A, and (ii) do not have their own aspect and mood markers. At the same time, controlled clauses may have their own negation, as in (28), and also contain adverbs, as well as full object NPs, as illustrated in (34), which contains the adverb *mema(ng)* as well as the O NP *da makudu* ‘the small ones’:

- (34) jàka u-mbuhang [pa-kahau mema-nja da ma-kudu] ContrCl
 if 2sg.NOM-want CTR-separate immediately-3pl.DAT ART REL-be.small
 ‘If you want to separate the small ones immediately...’

A sequence of several controlled clauses must involve either subject or object control; a combination of both is ungrammatical, as a comparison of (35a,b,c) shows.

- (35) a. ta-paràha-ya pa-kaliti njara
 1pl.NOM-force-3sg.DAT CTR-ride horse
 ‘We forced him to ride a horse’
- b. ta- kama -nya_i pa-paràha-ya_i ka na-kaliti njara
 1pl.NOM- try-3sg.DAT CTR-force-3sg.ACC CONJ 3sg.NOM-ride horse
 ‘We tried to force him to ride a horse’ (lit.: ‘...to force him so he rides a horse’)
- c. * ta-kama-nya pa-paràha-ya pa-kaliti njara
 1pl.NOM-try-3sg.DAT CTR-force-3sg.ACC CTR-ride horse
 Intended reading: ‘We tried to force him to ride a horse’

In conclusion, Kambera control clauses are a complementation strategy where the S/A or O of the main verb (transitive or intransitive) is coreferent with the unexpressed S/A of the embedded verb. In a number of respects, the Kambera control clauses are similar to the Potential type of complement clauses discussed in Chapter 1. However, since they are not a syntactic complement of the main verb and cannot be crossreferenced as an argument of it, they are not considered complement clauses in this book.

8 Perception verbs and the quotative construction

In § 6 we saw that the verb *ita* ‘see’ has a nominal clause complement if the perception is of an activity or an event rather than a person, cf. (20) and (21). *Rongu* ‘hear’ also takes a nominal clause complement in (36):

- (36) na-rongu-ya_O <na kareuku-na i Peteru >_O
 3sg.NOM-hear-3sg.ACC ART talk-3sg.GEN ART Peter
 ‘He heard Peter(’s) talking.’

However, perception verbs taking nominal complement clauses appear to be marginal. More often, the event/activity is expressed in a coordinated clause, as in (37), or as part of a complex NP, as in (38).

- (37) da-rongu-ka ba na-ngàndi-ya-ka tau kawini
 3pl.NOM-hear-PERV CONJ 3sg.NOM-take-3sg.ACC-PERV person woman
 ‘They heard that he had already taken a wife.’

- (38) nda i-rongu-a nyimi tau kapihu?
 NEG 2pl.NOM-hear-MOD you.pl person to.fart
 ‘Didn’t you all hear someone farting?’ (lit. ‘...hear a farting person?’)

In the majority of cases, *ita* and *rongu* have a personal O, followed by a coordinated clause, as illustrated in (39a) and (40a). Here, the O-marking enclitic cannot be used to refer to an event or an activity, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (39b), (40b), and *ita/rongu* cannot govern a controlled clause, as (39c), (40c) illustrate.

Kambera has no plain verb ‘to think’, *patandang* and *pangàdang* always take as their O an object thought about. Kambera has borrowed the verb *pikir* ‘to think’ from Indonesian, but in Kambera, *pikir* also has an O with a personal referent, while a coordinated quotative clause expresses the thought itself:

- (43) ‘ais’, na-pikir-ya, ‘ka tobu-nya na ana njara...’
 EXCL 3sg.NOM-think-3sg.ACC CONJ kill-3sg.DAT ART child horse
 ‘Oh no’, he thought of him (i.e. his child), ‘if the fowl is killed...’

9 Summary and conclusions

Kambera has only one type of complement clause, the nominal complement clause, but this type is not so frequently attested. In general, clause coordination is the preferred strategy to express notions that other languages may express by complement clauses. The coordinated clause may be a simple main clause, but it may also be a quote -- especially if the first verb is a verb of speaking or thinking. A very productive complementation strategy is the one where the main verb takes a controlled clause, whose S/A is empty and coreferent with either the S/A or the O of the main verb.

In Kambera, negation is expressed with a clause-initial negator, as illustrated in (17), (28a), and (38). Notions of causation and permission are expressed by deriving a verb with the causative prefix *pa-* (cf. Klamer 1998a).

References

- Blust, R.A. 1993. 'Central and Central-Eastern Malayo Polynesian'. *Oceanic Linguistics* 32.241-293.
- Kapita, Oe. H. 1982. *Kamus Sumba/Kambera-Indonesia*. Waingapu: Gereja Kristen Sumba.
- Kapita, Oe. H. 1983. *Tatabahasa Sumba Timur dalam dialek Kambera*. Ende: Arnoldus.
- Klamer, Marian. 1997. 'Spelling out clitics in Kambera'. *Linguistics* 35.895-927.
- Klamer, Marian. 1998a. *A grammar of Kambera*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Klamer, Marian. 1998b. 'Kambera intransitive argument linking'. *Studia Linguistica* 52.2.77-111.
- Klamer, Marian. 2000. 'Continuative aspect and the dative clitic in Kambera', pp 49-63 of *Formal issues in Austronesian Linguistics* [Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 49], edited by Ileana Paul, Vivianne Phillips and Lisa Travis. Dordrecht/Boston/Londen: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Klamer, Marian. 2002. 'Report constructions in Kambera (Austronesian)'. pp 323-340 of *Reported discourse*, edited by Tom Güldemann and Manfred von Rucador. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Klamer, Marian. 2005. 'Kambera'. pp 709-734 of *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, edited by K. Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. London: Curzon Press.
- Klamer, Marian. To appear. 'Differential subject marking in Kambera.' To appear in *Differential Subject Marking* [Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory], edited by Helen de Hoop and Peter de Swart. Dordrecht/Boston/ London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Onvlee, L. 1925. *Eenige Sumbasche Vertellingen*. Leiden: Brill.

Onvlee, L. 1984. *Kamberaas (Oost-Soembaas) - Nederlands Woordenboek*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Wielenga, D.K. 1909. *Schets van een Soembaneesche spraakkunst (naar 't dialect van Kambera)*. Batavia: Landsdrukkerij.

Notes

¹ Some conventions for Kambera orthography: ng = [ŋ], ngg = [ŋg], j = [tʃ], nj = [ntʃ], y = [j], ny = [nj], b = [ɓ], d = [ɗ], à = [ɑ], á [a:], í = [i:], ú = [u:].

² Elsewhere (Klamer 1998a, To appear) I describe how the accusative is used to mark (i) the S of imperatives, (ii) S's with a generic or impersonal referent, and (iii) S's of stative verbs that are modified for degree. In addition, the accusative is an option for all intransitive verbs to express (iv) an S that is less in control than it would canonically be expected. The common denominator in all these cases is that S lacks control of the situation/event described by the predicate.

³ *Namu-ng* is morphologically related to *namu*. The productive function of the suffix *-ng* is to derive applicatives, but its function in today's *namung* is not (or no longer) transparent.

⁴ In this section, I discuss a subset of the clauses that are called 'nominal clauses' in Klamer 1998a (section 4.2): those nominal clauses that function like verbal arguments and are crossreferenced by a pronominal clitic on the verb are referred to as nominal complement clauses. Klamer (1998a: 315-316) also recognises that these clauses occur as one of the three types of subordinate clauses in Kambera.

⁵ The latter notion would be expressed using *hori* 'custom' and a relative clause:

(i) na hori pa-hambur-na-nja nda na-njadi-a
 ART custom REL-meet-3sg.GEN-3pl.DAT NEG 3sg.NOM-be.appropriate-MOD

'The manner in which he met them was inappropriate.'

⁶ The morpheme *pa-* that introduces a complement clause is not a prefix but a clitic since it attaches to the edge of a syntactic phrase (the embedded clause) rather than to a morphological base (e.g. a verb), as can be seen in e.g. (28) and (30), where it attaches to a negation and an adverb respectively.

⁷ Klammer (1998a:338 v.v.) describes the Kambera controlled clauses in section 8.2 which is called ‘Complement clauses’. The arguments presented in the current chapter show that the Kambera controlled clauses are not actually syntactic complements of the main verb. In the terms of the present book, Klammer 1998: section 8.2 describes various ‘complementation strategies’ in Kambera.