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1 INTRODUCTION

Kambera is an Austronesian language of the Sumba-Bima group of Central Malayo-Polynesian languages, spoken by approximately 150,000 speakers on the eastern part of the island of Sumba in Eastern Indonesia. Klamer (1994) provides a detailed description of the language. This paper discusses one of the most salient constructions in Kambera: the continuative aspect construction. This construction is illustrated in (1).

(1) Laku -nggu -nya
    go -1sG -3sD

'I am going.'

The sentence in (1) shows that in this construction the subject is marked with the genitive enclitic -nggu '1st person singular (I, my)', while the second clitic, the dative -nya '3rd person singular (him/her/it)' does not seem to have a referential function at all. This is quite a remarkable situation, because if a pronominal clitic does not have a referential function, why does it occur at all?

The aim of this paper, then, is to discuss the nature of the dative third person clitic -nya in continuative aspect constructions like (1). Is it true that -nya does not have a referential function, i.e. is an 'empty morpheme', or does it mark a verbal argument after all? To find the answer to this question, we must look at two other constructions in Kambera that are formally similar to the continuative construction.

Firstly, we will look at transitive nominal clauses - clauses with an agent that is marked with a genitive enclitic (here -nggu) and a patient marked with a dative clitic (here -nya), as illustrated in (2):

(2) Palu -nggu -nya
    hit -1sG -3sD

'I hit him.'

In this construction, the dative clitic -nya marks the verbal complement, which I will refer to as the (direct) object. The term (direct) object refers to the syntactic

* I wish to thank the audience at AFLA 2, Tom Güldemann and the anonymous referee for their comments and questions on the conference version of this paper. The revision of the paper was made possible by a fellowship of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. Abbreviations: A = accusative, APP = applicative morpheme, ART = article (su = singular, da = plural), CLF = classifier, CNJ = conjunction, CTR = marker of controlled clause, D = dative, DEI = deictic element (space/time), DEM = demonstrative, EMP = emphasis marker, G = genitive, IMPF = imperfective, LOC = locative preposition, MOD = mood marker, N = nominative, NEG = negation, PRF = perfective, RDP = reduplication.
relation between a transitive predicate and its less-agentive/controlled argument.

Secondly, we will look at clauses with a possessed nominal predicate, as in (3). In such clauses, the possessor is marked with a genitive enclitic ('nggu is the possesser of mbapa 'husband'). The NP mbapa-nggu constitutes the nominal predicate of the matrix clause and the clause has no copular verb:

(3) [Mbapa -nggu]NP -nya
husband -1sG -3sD
'He (is) my husband.'

In constructions like the one in (3), the dative clitic -nya marks the only argument of the non-verbal predicate, which in Kambera are always marked with a clitic from either the accusative or the dative paradigm. Without giving further motivation, I will use the term 'subject' to refer to the grammatical relation between an intransitive predicate (including non-verbal ones) and its single argument, as well as to the relation between a transitive predicate and its most agentive/controlling argument.

Having established this, we can compare the nature of the dative clitic in the continuous construction in (1) - where it does not seem to have a referential function - with its object-marking function illustrated in (2) and its subject-marking function in (3). This will be the content of, respectively, section 4 and 5 below.

The paper is organized as follows. First I will present the facts about Kambera pronominal cliticization that are relevant for the discussion in section 2. Then, in section 3, the characteristics of the Kambera continuous aspect construction will be discussed. Section 4 and section 5 discuss constructions that are formally related to the continuous aspect construction. Section 6 contains a discussion of the findings which are summarised in section 7.

2 PRONOMINAL CLITICIZATION IN KAMBERA

Kambera is a head-marking language (Nichols 1986) in the sense that it has rich morpho-syntactic marking on the head of the clause, the verb: pronominal, aspectual and/or modal clitics together with the verb may constitute a complete sentence. Definite verbal arguments are marked for person, number and case (Nominative (N), Genitive (G), Dative (D), Accusative (A)) by pronominal clitics attached to the verbal complex. In addition to pronominal cliticization, arguments can be expressed by (adjoined) NPs, which are then used for disambiguation or emphasis, discourse saliency or contrastivity. The NPs, including the full pronouns, are optional and do not show case marking. Basic word order is SVO: subject NP - verb/verbal complex plus clitics - object NP (Klamer 1996c).

The unmarked way to express a subject in a simple declarative sentence is with a nominative pronoun. This is shown in (4). In this sentence, the verb tambuta 'drop out' is intransitive and its subject na a ti 'the tree (lit. the wood)' is marked on the verb with the nominative pronoun na- (the brackets indicate the possibility of the NPs).

(4) (Na a ti) na- tambuta duingu amung
ART wood 3sN- drop out with root
'That tree is uprooted.'

(lit. that tree it is dropped out with root)

In (5) the verb palu 'hit' is transitive, the subject na tau wátu 'the fat man' is marked on the verb with the nominative proclitic na-, the object with the accusative enclitic -ka.

(5) (Na tau wátu) na- palu -ka (nyungga)
ART person be. fat 3sN- hit -1sA I
'The big man hit me.'

(lit. the big man he-hit-me I)

In (6) the double object (applicative) verb kei.ng 'buy something for someone' has two object arguments: a patient ('direct object') and a recipient ('indirect object'). The dative clitic -ngga now marks the recipient, while the (patient) NP ri 'vegetable' is not cliticised on the verb because it is indefinite.

(6) (I Ama) na- kei -nja ri
ART give 3sN- buy -3sD vegetable
'Father buys them vegetables.'

In addition, it is also possible to cliticize both the indirect and the direct object, as illustrated in (7):

(7) (I Ama) na- kei- ngga -nya
ART give 3sN- buy -1sD -3sD
'Father buys it for me.'

(lit. Father he buys me it)

Sentence (7) shows that there are two 'slots' for object clitics, both following the verb; first, the indirect object is marked with a dative clitic followed by another dative clitic marking the direct object. This is remarkable, because the second dative clitic refers to a direct object (patient), which is usually marked with an accusative clitic, as we saw in (5) above.2

Finally, in (8) the basic function of the genitive clitic which usually marks the possessor is illustrated. A possessed NP is not necessarily definite (cf. (8a)) and the possessive clitic attaches to the phrase rather than to the head noun (cf. (8b-c)).

(8) a. Ningu uma -nggu
be.here house -1sG
'I have a house.'

(lit. (here) is a house of mine)

---

2 This is an idiosyncratic restriction on clitic clusters in Kambera: the second postverbal object clitic must always be dative. Let me note at this point that the facts given here, although correct, do not represent a full account of 'Kambera cliticization', which is much more complex and irregular than these examples suggest. (cf. the references given above)
3 CONTINUATIVE ASPECT CONSTRUCTION

The focus of this paper is to determine the role of the dative clitic in continuative aspect constructions. As we have seen, in a continuative aspect construction two pronominal clitics are attached postverbally: a genitive and a dative, in that order. In the sentences (9)-(12) the clitics in bold constitute the continuative aspect construction. The examples show that the continuative construction is used for both activity verbs, such as laku 'go' and pabanjar 'talk', and stative verbs, such as manjij 'be hungry' and poki 'be blind'.

(9) Laku -nggu -nya
   go -1SG -3ST
   'I am going.'

(10) Ka paba-banjar -du -da -nya -ka nú
    CNJ pa.RDP-talk -EMP -3PG -3ST -PRF DEI
    'So they were talking/talked' for a while.'

(11) Manji -ma -nggu -nya ina
    be.hungry -EMP -1SG -3ST mother
    'i am (feeling) hungry, mum.'

(12) Poki -na -nya? Mm, poki -na -nya
    be.blind -3SG -3ST yes be.blind -3SG -3ST
    'Is he blind?' 'Yes, he is blind.'

The function of the genitive-dative clitic construction is aspectual in the sense that it is used to express the fact that the event or state expressed by the predicate continues or endures - hence its name.

The sentences in (13) illustrate the use of the intransitive verb *mutung* 'burn with fire' in clauses with various aspectual and temporal properties. The

\[ \text{mutung -na -nya na uma} \]
\[ \text{burn -3SG -3ST ART house} \]
\[ 'The house is/was aflame/burning.' \]

b. Na - mutung
   3sN - burn
   'It burns/is burned/is burning/will burn.' etc.
   (depending on context)

c. Na - mutung -ka
   3sN - burn -PRF
   'It is burned (down).'

d. Na - mutung -pa na uma lako
   3sN - burn -IMPF ART house one, CLF
   'Still another house has burned (down).'

e. Na - mutung na uma j̧aka u- pajulu wangu epi
   3sN - burn ART house if 2sN - play use fire
   'The house will burn (down) when you play with fire.'

In the sentences (9)-(13a) the genitive clitic marks the subject, while the dative clitic - always the third person singular - *nya* in continuative aspect constructions - seems to be superfluous as it does not express a grammatical relation. How did the dative end up in this construction? How and why did this particular construction develop an interpretation of continuative aspect? A possible answer to both of these questions will be presented in the remainder of this paper.

4 STRUCTURAL AMBIGUITY WITH TRANSLATIVE NOMINAL CLAUSES

As mentioned above, the continuative aspect construction is formally related to nominal clauses, more particularly, transitive nominal clauses. The genitive enclitic marking the subject of transitive clauses makes them resemble possessed NPs. The functional (semantic/discourse) properties of nominal clauses are diverse and rather complex (cf. Klammer 1994:94-98). However, all nominal clauses share the property that they are unasserted propositions and/or do not express the main narrative line in discourse.

The sentences (14) and (15) illustrate some simple nominal clauses. In (14) the verb *mai* 'come' is intransitive and the genitive subject is - *na* '3s, his/her/its'. In (15) the verb *pulu* 'hit' is transitive and the subject is genitive - *mu* '2s, your', while the object is marked with dative - *nya* '3s, it'.

3 Kambera has no tense marker(s); in this sentence the remote deictic element *na* 'there/then' forces the past interpretation.
4 *Mutung* is an intransitive verb only meaning 'burn with fire', i.e. it does not have the derived meaning of a physical sensation which the English translation has, neither is it transitive. Transitive 'burn' in Kambera is lana, meaning 'roast, grill, burn something'.

continuative aspect marking of the subject in (13a) makes the aspect unbounded, continuous and non-completed compared to the (default) nominative marking of the subject in the sentences (13b-d):

(13) a. Mutung -na -nya na uma
    burn -3SG -3ST ART house
    'The house is/was aflame/burning.'

b. Na - mutung
   3sN - burn
   'It burns/is burned/is burning/will burn.' etc.
   (depending on context)

c. Na - mutung -ka
   3sN - burn -PRF
   'It is burned (down).'

d. Na - mutung -pa na uma lako
   3sN - burn -IMPF ART house one, CLF
   'Still another house has burned (down).'

e. Na - mutung na uma j̧aka u- pajulu wangu epi
   3sN - burn ART house if 2sN - play use fire
   'The house will burn (down) when you play with fire.'
These sentences show that nominal clauses may be based on both intransitive and transitive verbs. Consider also the sentences (16)-(20) below, which show that the syntactic distribution of nominal clauses is diverse: they may either be a subordinate clause, as in (16), or a main clause, as in (17). Formally, they are verbal constructs with nominal external syntax. In addition to their subject being genitive, the nominal properties of these clauses are apparent from the following facts: (i) they may be specified for definiteness with the definite article na as in (16) and (18) (cf. indefinite (14), (17), (19)); (ii) they may be verbal arguments crossreferenced on the matrix verb, as in (16); (iii) they may be clefted as in (18) and (iv) they may be compared as in (19). However, the core of a nominal clause is verbal and its internal structure is clauseal, as evidenced by the fact that it can contain negations, as in (17) and (20); āmbu in the latter example only negates propositions, not entities - and/or modal clitics, as nda does in (17).

After this brief excursion on nominal clauses in Kambera, note that what is relevant for the present discussion is only that intransitive nominal clauses formally differ from transitive ones in the absence vs. presence of an object marking clitic (e.g. (14) vs. (15)). This seems an extremely trivial observation, but recall that intransitive verbs in the continuative aspect construction (e.g. 's (9)-(13a)) do have an object clitic. At least, they do have a clitic attached with the same shape as the third person singular dative clitic whose regular, standard function is to mark objects.

So far, we have seen three ways to mark an intransitive subject: with a nominative proclitic (e.g. (4)), with a genitive clitic (e.g. (14)) and with a combination of two clitics, a genitive and a dative (as in the continuative aspect construction in (9)-(12)). We have also seen that, though the continuative aspect construction is only used to mark the subject of intransitive verbs, it is formally similar to transitive nominal clauses.

Consider the contrasting sentences in (21). (21a) illustrates an intransitive nominal clause, (21b) a transitive (applicative) nominal clause with an object clitic -nya, and (21c) an intransitive verb in the continuative aspect construction. The two clitics in the continuative aspect construction behave as one morpho-syntactic element.

As the translation of (21c) shows, the dative clitic in this continuative construction is not considered to mark an object. Evidence for this is given in (22). These sentences contain the compound verb hunju tobug 'slaughter various animals' (lit. 'slaughter pigs and slaughter cows'). This compound verb must always have a plural object: it indicates the slaughtering of minimally one pig and one cow.

5 The intransitive verb kanabu 'fall' can be made applicative. Applicative formation adds an extra (applicative/indirect object) argument and makes the verb transitive, as illustrated in (i):

(i) kanabu 'fall' applicative -ng → kanabu.ng 'fall on X'

For a discussion of Kambera applicative formation and the relation between the nasal affix and the dative object clitic, see Klamer (1994:189-229).
slaughter.pig slaughter.cow -3pG -3sD
Intended reading: 'They were slaughtering it.'
(pig and cow)

c. Hunju tobung -da -nya.
slaughter.pig slaughter.cow -3pG -3sD
'They were slaughtering.'

In (22a) the (obligatorily) plural object of the verbal compound is indeed marked with a plural clitic (-nya). The sentence in (22b) has a singular object clitic (-nya) and is therefore ungrammatical. Yet, sentence (22c) is grammatical, although it also features the singular object clitic, -nya. How can we explain this? What is the nature of the dative object clitic here?

Observe that in (22b) the object is explicit, while in (22c) it is left implicit. Another difference between these two sentences is that in (22b) the verb tobu 'slaughter cow' does not end in a velar nasal, whereas in (22c) it does. The full lexical and citation form of the verb tobung 'slaughter cattle' has a final nasal consonant. Kambera has a number of transitive verbs like this, i.e. ones that end in a velar nasal. These verbs always express their object with the (prenasalised) dative clitic (allomorph) and lose the final stem nasal in the process. In a sense, the final nasal of such a transitive verb is thus in complementary distribution with a dative clitic that marks its object (see also Klamer 1994:202-208). This is the case in (22a), where the object is the dative plural, -nya. In (22b) the verb has also lost its final nasal as a result of the presence of the singular dative clitic, -nya. In (22c), however, we observe that with the dative clitic -nya the verb retains the final nasal. That is, the nasal is not in complementary distribution with the object clitic here, as it should be. We must therefore conclude that the dative clitic -nya in (22c) cannot be an object-marking clitic, as it was in (22a), but must be marking something else. If it were an object clitic, sentence (22c) would have been ungrammatical like (22b) because the compound verb hunju tobung 'slaughter pig and slaughter cattle' cannot have a singular object (-nya). Since (22c) is grammatical, it cannot be an ordinary transitive nominal clause. We may conclude that what we have here is a continuative aspect construction, similar to the constructions in (9)-(12).

In sum, we have established that, although the continuative construction may be structurally ambiguous with transitive nominal clauses, there is an important difference between the two constructions: the dative clitic in transitive nominal clauses is an object marker (as in (22a)) whereas in continuative constructions it is not (as in (22c)). This contrast is formally reflected in verbs ending in a final nasal consonant.

5 FORMAL RELATION WITH CLAUSES WITH A POSSESSED NOMINAL PREDICATE

If the dative clitic in continuative aspect constructions does not mark an object, what does it mark? To answer this question, we now consider another construction to which the continuative construction is formally related: clauses with possessed nominal predicates.

57 THE DATIVE CLITIC IN KAMBERA

In Kambera, the argument of a non-verbal predicate is standardly marked with an accusative clitic and the language has no ( overt) copular verb. This is shown by example (23), which illustrates a locational (PP) copular predicate, and by example (24), which illustrates a non-possessed nominal predicate.

(23) [Lai nda] -kama
LOC DEF -1pA
'We (are/were) over there.'

(24) Hurundu -ya
soldier -3sA
'He/it (is) a soldier.'

In (25), where mbapa-nggu is the possessed nominal predicate, the dative clitic -nya marks the subject of the clause:

husband -1sG -3sD
'He (is) my husband.'

Thus, clauses with a non-verbal predicate never contain an (overt) copular verb. Furthermore, in constructions where the nominal predicate is possessed, a dative clitic follows the genitive possessor and is used to mark the predicate’s subject (instead of the usual accusative clitic). This clitic sequence is identical to the one we observed in continuative constructions. How do the two constructions relate to each other?

We saw that a clause with a non-possessed nominal predicate always has an accusative subject, as in (23)-(24). In (24), the lexical head of the predicate is a noun. However, a nominal predicate can also consist of a verb with a genitive subject. In other words, nominal clauses, as discussed in the previous section, may constitute nominal predicates too. This is shown in (26) below, where the predicate does not contain a noun, but the stative verb tarahik 'be slippery'.

In (26a), the nominal predicate is tarahik-na [na aka], 'the road’s (being) slippery'. The subject NP of tarahik is na aka, marked on the verb with -na. This subject is contained in the nominal predicate that is predicated of the matrix subject -ya. (26b) shows the same verb being used in the continuative aspect construction.

(26) a. [Tarahik -na na aka] -ma -ya...
be.slippery -3sG ART road -EMP -3sA
'It (is because of) the road's (being) slippery...'

b. Tarahik -na -nya na aka
be.slippery -3sG -3sD ART road
'The road is (being) slippery.'

Thus, there is an analogy between the clauses with nominal predicates in (24) and (25) and the nominal clause-predicate in (26a). Following this line of thought, we can assume that the continuative aspect construction in (26b) has a similar structure

Kambera does not have a category of adjectives. For arguments see Klamer (1994:112-116.)
as well. In other words, the clitic -nya in (26b) can be seen as the subject of the nominalised predicate tarahik-na, as represented in (27). The subject -na of the verb tarahik is contained in the nominal predicate which is predicative of the matrix subject -nya.

(27) [[Tarahik -na]\textsubscript{NP} \textsubscript{predcom}] be.slippery -3sG -3sD

\begin{diagram}
  \text{IP} \\
  \text{Spec} \\
  \text{NP} \\
  \text{tarahik-na} \Delta^* -nya
\end{diagram}

A continuative aspect construction as in (28) can thus be paraphrased as 'it (is) my going', which renders the interpretation of the continuative construction quite adequately. In addition, this analysis has two other advantages, both pertaining to the status of the dative clitic: (i) the dative clitic is not a meaningless empty morpheme, but has the real function of marking the matrix subject, and (ii) the fact that the dative clitic is always third person singular is now explained: it is used as an expletive subject (like it in it rains).

(28) Laku -nggu -nya
go -1sG -3sD
'It (is) my going' \textrightarrow{} I am going

This analysis is probably correct from a diachronic point of view. However, there is some synchronic evidence that the genitive-dative clitic cluster is no longer part of a biclausal structure, but has been reinterpreted to mark one argument (rather than two). This evidence will be discussed in the remainder of this section.

Present-day scholarship on Kambera considers the genitive-dative clitic in a continuative aspect construction as an inseparable unit: both clitics cannot be separated from each other, whereas in a clause with an ordinary possessed nominal predicate, they can. This is illustrated in (29) and (30), where the element separating the clitics is a full pronoun nyungga 'I' in (29) and an emphatic enclitic -ma in (30).

(29) a. * [Laku -nggu] nyungga -nya /-ya
go -1sG I -3sD / -3sA
'Intended reading: I am going.'

b. [Mhapa -nggu]\textsubscript{pr} nyungga -ya
husband -1sG I -3sA
'He (is) my husband.'

(30) a. * [Laku -nggu] -ma -nya
go -1sG -EMP -3sD
'Intended reading: I am going.'

b. Laka jia -ha da banda, [banda -nda][\textsubscript{pr}] -ma -nya
if \text{EXIST} -3pA ART cattle cattle -1pG -EMP -3pD
'About the cattle, they (are) our cattle (not yours).'

c. Laku -ma -nggu -nya
go -EMP -1sG -3sD
'I am going.'

Splitting up the clitic cluster is impossible in continuative aspect constructions, as shown in (29a) and (30a), but is possible in the construction from which (as we argued) the continuative aspect construction must have originated: a clause with a possessed nominal predicate, as shown in (29b) and (30b). Sentences (29c) and (30c) are the correct form for the intended readings given. Like any other subject NP, the full pronoun nyungga that is used for emphasis in (29) occurs before or after the verbal complex. The position of the emphatic clitic -ma in (30) is between the verb and the clitics that mark the verbal arguments (subject and object). This is the usual pattern when the clause has a verbal head.

To conclude: the fact that the genitive-dative cluster in continuative constructions cannot be split, suggests that nowadays this clustor is interpreted as one inseparable unit marking the subject of the clause.

6 DISCUSSION

We have seen that intransitive continuative aspect constructions show (i) (surface) ambiguity with transitive nominal clauses and (ii) the result of the reanalysis of a biclausal structure (with an empty copula), as in (31a), into one clause, as in (31b):

(31) a. \text{[verb + subject]}\textsubscript{3} \Delta \text{subject}\textsubscript{5}

b. \text{[verb + subject]}\textsubscript{5}

This means that, if the meaning of the verb allows it, a sentence in Kambera may be analysed in three different ways, as is the case in (32):

(32) a. Kukah -na, -nya, -ka yia
rub -3sG -3sD -PRF then
'He\textsubscript{5} was rubbing it.'

b. [Kukah -na][\textsubscript{pr}] -nya, -ka yia
rub -3sG -3sD -PRF then
'\textit{i}, (was) [his\textsubscript{5} rubbing].'

\footnote{As Kambera does not have (overt) copular verbs, one can assume an empty copular verb or none at all in this construction, but this is irrelevant to the issue at hand.}
MARIAN KLAMER

c. Kukah -na -nya, -ka yia
rub -3sG -3sD -PRF then
'He was rubbing.'

Sentence (32a) contains a transitive verb with a definite object that is marked with an object clitic on the verb. The homophonous sentence in (32b) is glossed as if it consists of a nominal clause predicated over the expletive subject -nya, while the same clause is interpreted in (32c) as a continuative aspect construction.

Nominal constructions that have developed over time into constructions with particular aspectual functions (like 'continuative' or 'progressive') have been attested cross-linguistically (Heine & Reh 1984, Heine, Claudi & Hännemeyer 1991, Heine 1994).

In Dutch, for instance, the progressive aspect is expressed by a copular verb followed by a PP-predicate containing an infinitival verb form preceded by an article and a preposition, as shown in (33). In English, the progressive form of the verb is used in nominalizations, as in (34).

(33) Hij is [aan [het rumen]bo]p
he is to the run
'He is running.'

(34) He is running, his running

In Diola Fogny (West-Atlantic, Niger-Congo), progressive aspect is expressed by both a nominal (buruk') and a pronominal (bo) form of the verb:

(35) buruk n -an di bO (Sapir 1965:113; Heine 1993:32)
work I am in it
'I am working.'
(lit. work I am in it)

In the Bantu language, Ewe, the progressive also exhibits nominal behaviour (Clements 1975, Heine, Claudi & Hännemeyer 1991, Heine 1994).

The genesis of progressives like these can be considered a specific type of grammaticalization process which maps a basic cognitive structure into linguistic form (again, Heine, Claudi & Hännemeyer 1991, Heine 1994). When we consider grammaticalization patterns across languages, it appears that when words or constructions are reinterpreted, the type of reinterpretation that takes place is not random, nor free, nor variable per language/person, but follows certain typical pathways and seems to be bounded by rules. The way this is often accounted for in grammaticalization studies is to assume that reanalysis follows certain universal, cognitive pathways: basic grammatical structures are the verbalisation of basic cognitive structures. As a new grammatical structure develops out of reanalysis, this shows a possible alternative way to map cognitive structure into linguistic structure.

Basic cognitive units are assumed to be the following (Heine, Claudi & Hännemeyer 1991:32-32, Heine 1993:31):

Ambiguities as in (32) are not common and only occur if a transitive verb has an implied/covert object. If the verb is interpreted as having an overt object, then it must be marked third person singular.

(c) This would be no ambiguity with the third person singular dative clitic in continuative aspect constructions. Finally, this sentence must not contain an additional object NP, because such an NP would force the transitive reading of the verb.

As the third column in (37) shows, cross-linguistically the grammatical categories Tense and Aspect in particular are typically expressed by making use of event schemas like the ones mentioned. For example, recall that the Dutch and Diola Fogny progressives, illustrated above in (33) and (35) respectively, use locative PI to express progressive aspect, i.e. the progressive gets the formal expression of the event schema for Location. In languages where the Location schema is used for the genesis of progressive/continuative, this development goes hand in hand with the nominalization of the predicate, since only a nominalized verb can be a proper location for Y (for more discussion, see Heine 1993 and references cited there). I this respect, Dutch and Diola Fogny are quite unexceptional; the majority of the languages studied until now use the Location, Motion or Action schema to express: continuous/progressive aspect.

Kambera is slightly unusual in that it uses an Equational structure to express: progressive aspect ("X is Y" as in 'it is my going', e.g. (28)). However, there are other languages that use the same schema to express the progressive, such as: the Bantu language Nkore-Riga (Taylor 1985) and Haiya (Hyman & Watters 1984). Consider the Haiya illustrations in (38). (38a) shows a basic copula construction that in (38b) the same copula element ni appears in the progressive aspect. The only formal difference between the progressive in (38b) and the 'present habitual' in (38c) is the use of the copula ni. This copula is therefore functioning in (38b) as present progressive asp.
In this paper we have considered in some depth a salient Kambera aspectual construction containing a dative pronominal clitic, which, in this construction, has no clear referential function. It was argued that the construction is formally related to a copula construction (based on an Equational event schema) and that it is the result of a diachronic process of reanalysis of a biclausal structure followed by the fusion of the two clauses into one. An obvious motivation for the reanalysis is the need for economy (the economy of cognitive processing) which prefers a simpler, monoclusal structure to a more complex one.

Returning to the Kambera dative aspect, there are two ways to analyse this construction synchronically. Either we analyse it as a cluster in which the first clitic (the genitive) marks the subject while the second clitic (the dative) has been reanalysed as an aspectual clitic marking dative or, subject, we consider the complete clitic cluster to have only one referent: the subject of the verb.

An argument against the first analysis is that the dative clitic -nya is not productively used to mark aspect; except in the structure under discussion, it only marks phonological arguments. Kambera has three other clitics marking aspect: -ka 'perfective', -pa 'imperfective' and -i 'literary'. The distributional properties of these clitics are distinct from those of the pronominal clitics (see Klamer 1994, 1996b). Therefore, I will not go as far as claiming that synchronically -nya is (already) a marker of dative aspect, but I conclude instead that at present Kambera employs a new dисyllabic pronominal form - one that consists of a sequence of a genitive clitic and the dative clitic, -nya, and which is used to mark the subject of intransitive verbs in the continuous aspect. The paradigm of this pronominal form is given in (39):

(39) 1s -nggunya
2s -munya
3s -nya
1p(misc) -ndunya
1p(excl) -many
2p -nya
3p -dunya

We saw above that the dative clitic originally expressed the matrix subject of a nominal predicate (verb plus genitive subject) as some sort of expletive. However, reanalysis took place, followed by fusion of the biclausal structure into one clause (e.g.s (31a-b)). Therefore, in the paradigm in (39), the dative clitic has (most of) its semantic content because its referential function has become zero and/or is merged with the genitive clitic (the original embedded subject). In other words, the cluster as a whole no longer refers to two subjects of two distinct predicates but to one.

This new subject paradigm for subjects in continuous aspect involves an increase of phonological information: the pronominal markers of (39) are disyllabic and prosodically independent. In addition, it involves an increase of semantic information: the pronominal is no longer a marker of person/number only, but one that marks person/number of arguments of intransitive verbs in the continuous aspect.

7 CONCLUSION

There are two fundamental principles that often play a role in diachronic change: a principle of economy (of lexical representation, cognitive processing, phonetic expression, etc.) and a principle of clarity. The trend of greater economy is restricted by the communicative function of language which entails clarity (see Hall 1992 and references cited there).