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1. Introduction

Despite the typological data presented by Munro (1982), De Roeck (1994) and others, three major assumptions about quotative constructions seem to persist in both functional and generative linguistic models: (1) that the quote is a complement of the main predicate, (2) that there is a strict dichotomy between direct and indirect speech, and (3) that quotative verbs are speech verbs, or historically derived thereof.  

In this paper I present a brief analysis of quotative constructions in Kambera and demonstrate that these assumptions do not tally with the facts of this language. Kambera belongs to the Central Malayo-Polynesian subgroup of Austronesian languages, is spoken on the island of Sumba in eastern Indonesia by approx. 150,000 speakers, and described in Klamer 1998.

In section 1 I consider the structural properties of the Kambera quotative construction and constrast them with the morpho-syntax of common Kambera verbs and arguments. In section 2, we will see that Kambera quotative constructions do not make a syntactic distinction between direct and indirect speech. More particularly, that the Kambera quotative construction is not only used for speech reports, but also to report thoughts, intentions, and physical perceptions. The latter is done by employing ideophonic roots in a quotative construction. In section 3 I discuss the use of wà as a discourse particle in two distinct types of contexts, and in section 4 the consequences our findings have for a semantic analysis of wà are
Marian Klamer discussed. I propose that, rather than a speech verb, wà has the semantics of [REPORT]. In other words, the verb used in Kambera quotative constructions does not derive from a speech verb.

2. The syntactic status of the Kambera ‘quote’

Kambera is a head-marking language; verbal arguments are commonly marked on the verb by pronominal clitics. The agent argument of a simple declarative sentence and the single argument of an intransitive predicate are canonically marked with a nominative proclitic, a patient object is canonically marked with an accusative enclitic. The coreferent NPs are optional.

(1) Na tau wútu na- palu -ka nyungga
    ART person be.fat 3sN-hit -1sA I
    ‘The big man hit me’
(2) Na ài na- tambuta dàngu amung
    ART wood 3sN-drop.out with root
    ‘That tree is uprooted’

Despite the fact that a nominative proclitic is their unmarked expression, we also find subjects expressed as genitive enclitics. The core function of a genitive clitic is to mark nominal possessors, as in (3).

(3) Na ama-mu
    ART father-2sG
    ‘Your father’

As a subject marker, the genitive is commonly used in syntactically embedded clauses; the relative clauses in (21)-(22) and the complement clause in the next example have genitive subjects:

(4) Nda ku- pi -a-nya na ngàndi-mu kuta
    NEG 1sN-know-MOD-3sD ART take-2sG pepper.plant
    ‘I didn’t know that you would bring kuta’

But we also find genitive subjects in syntactically non-embedded clauses:

(5) Ba meu-meu-na, ba na-imbu-ya
    while RDP-roar-3sG as 3sN-search-3sA
    ‘And it roared while it went after him’

This type of ‘nominal clause’ functions to provide the background information for the clauses that carry the main narrative. They express irrealis mood, which explains why they are often used in questions or in expressions of concession, amazement, exaggeration, or unexpectedness, for example:
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(6) **Hangu** ṅa **butang** -butang --ma-a-na **bai** manila,
    straight.away RDP -pull out-EMP-just-3sG real peanut
    nda na- **hili** karai
    NEG 3sN- again ask

‘He just began to pull out peanuts straight away, he didn’t even ask’

Though syntactically not embedded, nominal clauses are functionally dependent. This is also reflected in the fact that adverbials expressing tense, aspect, mood and degree have scope over them, as illustrated by **hangu** ‘straight away’ in (6) and **lundu** ‘until’ in (7), which are both obligatorily followed by nominal clauses.

(7) **Lundu** njili-nggu **ba** ku-yaulu-yu **na** wei

until be.tired-1sG as 1sN-chase-3sA ART pig

‘Till I got tired I chased the pig.’

In sum, genitive subjects are marked because they feature in clauses that are syntactically and/or discourse dependent, while the unmarked expression of subjects in main declarative clauses is by a nominative proclitic. (For more discussion, see Klamer 1998, section 4.2).

Kambera complements (including clausal ones) are crossreferenced on the verb with a pronominal object clitic. The regular form for patients/themes is an accusative clitic, as illustrated in (1) and (8), and for benefactives/ addressees/ recipients a dative one, as in (9). However, the dative is always selected (both for patients/themes and benefactives/ addressees/ recipients) when the citation form of the verb ends in a nasal. Illustrations are paàrang ‘ask someone’ in (10), where the dative object clitic -nya marks the addressee, and píng ‘know something’ in (4) where --nya marks the theme.

(8) Da- ngàndi -ya na uhu
    3pN- take -3sA ART rice

‘They take the rice’

(9) Da- ngàndi -nya na uhu i Ama
    3pN- take -3sD ART rice ART father

‘They bring father the rice’

(10) Jàka na-pààra-nya --ka nggi -ya-ka i Umbu,...
    if 3sN-ask-3sD –PRF where-3sA-PRF ART Lord

‘If he asks him where the Master is, if he asks that...’

With this information as background knowledge we are equipped to analyze the structure of quotative constructions in Kambera. The default marker in these constructions is the quotative verb wà: more than 90% of the cases of reported speech in my database (12 hours of spontaneous texts) are accompanied by this element. It has always at least one pronominal clitic attached to it: a genitive enclitic that marks the speaker. The quote itself does not differ from any other declarative clause in Kambera (neither in the morphological form of the verb, or in
its mood, aspect or pronominal marking). Usually, there is no intonational break
between the quote and the quotative verb. The following sentences are some
illustrations. The quotative verb wà is glossed as ‘report’ in the examples for
reasons to be discussed below.

(11) “Ku-ngangu –ma daku” wà -na-ma
1sN-eat -EMP EMP.1s report -3sG-EMP
“I have eaten (it)”, she said

(12) “Bidi mini-a nú” ìmbu wà -nda -i!
new male-MOD DEI NEG.IRR report -1pG-ASP
‘Don’t say it’s just the young guys!’

(13) Njadi u-u nda wà-na, ndia nda wà-na,
so yes NEG report-3sG NEG.emp NEG report-3sG
‘So he neither consents nor protests,
hí -hi -bia -nanya -ka duna
RED -cry -just -3s -PRF EMP.3s
he just keeps on crying’

The verb wà is an intransitive root verb, and is mostly used in quotative
constructions, though it can also function as a main speech verb:

(14) Wà-nggu ba wà-na hama tu-na-i nú
report-1sG while report -3sG be.same put-3sG-ASP DEI
‘I tell (it) as it was told’

Wà’s argument-marking properties are limited: its subject must always be a clitic
from the genitive paradigm (-nggu ‘1sG’, -mu ‘2sG’, -na ‘3sG’, -ma
‘1pG.exclusive’, -nda ‘1pG.inclusive’, -da ‘3pG’). In other words, wà is always part
of a nominal clause, and as such constitutes a dependent clause (see above).

Wà is morphologically regular in that it can be derived with an applicative
suffix –ng. This suffix licenses an additional addressee argument: wà ‘report’ > wà-ng
‘report, say to X’. However, the other major Kambera word formation process,
causativization, is resisted by wà, so we may say its morphological properties are
reduced.iii

The applicative suffix –ng is not visible when the verb is inflected, but is part of
its citation form. The addressee is commonly expressed by a dative object clitic.
Illustrations with the applicative form wà-ng are:

(15) E, wù -nggu -nya na ama -mu!
EXC report -1sG -3sD ART father -2sG
‘Hey, I was talking to your father!’

(16) “Mài -kai -wu” wà -na -nggai
come -2pA-HORT report -3sG-2pG
‘He says that you must come’ (lit. “You come”, he tells you’
Unlike ordinary complement clauses as the one in (4), quotes are not crossreferenced with clitics on the quotative verb, but are simply juxtaposed to the quotative clause. This is another indication that a quote is not a syntactic complement of the quotative verb. Sentence (17a) contains two quotes: “Kill the foal” and “Kill the foal, I said”. Neither can be crossreferenced on the quotative verb, as shown in (17b) and (17c).

(17) a. Tobu -nya na ana njara wâ-nggu
slaughter -3sD ART child horse report-1sG
ba wâ -mi nú
as report -2pG DEI
“‘We’ll kill the foal’, you (pl.) said’

b. [Tobu-nya na ana njara], wâ-nggu *-nya, ...
slaughter-3sD ART child horse report-1sG -3sD

 c. [Tobu-nya na ana njara wâ-nggu], ba wâ-mi *-nya, ...
slaughter-3sD ART child horse report-1sG as report-2pG-3sD

Indeed, coordinating conjunctions such as hi ‘and, so’, ka ‘so that’, ba ‘and, as, while, because’ and jàka ‘if, when’ may always appear optionally between the quote and the quotative clause, also suggesting that they are two independent, coordinated clauses. In (18) the conjunction in the quotative clause is hi, in (19) ka and in (20) jàka. Note that the quotes themselves also contain initial conjunctions: ka, hi and hi, respectively.

(18) ‘Ai Umbu, ka nda u- mila-ngga nú eti’
EXC Lord so.that NEG 2sN-be.poor-1sD DEI liver
hi wâ -na -nya
and report -3sG-3sD
“‘Oh sir, if you would take pity on me,’” he said to him’
(Lit. ‘‘Wouldn’t you have a poor liver for me,’’ he said to him’)

(19) ‘...hi na- ana hàmu na wâi ngera-mu’
and 3sN-DIM be.good ART water spirit-2sG
ka wâ-du -du-nya-ka nú
so.that report-3pG -MOD-3sD-PRF DEI
“‘...so that you will fare well’ (lit. so that your fate will be a little better), they said to him’

(20) ...hi nda rongu hàmu-bia-da-nya-i-ka
and NEG hear be.good-MOD-3pG-3sD-ASP-ASP EMP.3p
“‘...and they won’t hear it clearly once again’;
jàka wâ-na-ka i Umbu Mbara, ...
when report-3sG-PRF ART Lord Mbara
when Lord Mbara said that...’
Another important difference between Kambera quotes and true verbal complements is the fact that though the unmarked constituent order in Kambera is verb-object, without exception quotes precede the quotative verb (i.e. represent OV word order).

In addition, the fact that Kambera quotes may appear without the quote verb wà also suggests that they are not verbal complements but embedded at the discourse level.

Evidence for the non-transitive status of wà is that this verb, unlike normal transitive verbs, cannot appear in object relativizations. Object relativizations in Kambera are marked by the morpheme pa-. Patients/themes and beneficiaries/addressees/recipients undergo the same relativization. Below this is illustrated for the theme of ngàndi ‘take something’ and the recipient of ngàndi-ng ‘take something to someone’:

(21) Na nggula na pa- ngàndi-nggu
ART sugar ART RMO- take -1sG
‘The sugar that I took (along)’

(22) Da makaweda da pa- ngàndi-nggu nggula
ART old.woman ART RMO- take.to-1sG sugar
‘The old ladies whom I brought the sugar’

Relativizations are standardly used in questions, as in (23), and may function like passives, as in (24) and (25). (Kambera does not have a separate passive construction, as argued in Klamer 1996; 1998, section 8.1.5).

(23) Nggàra pa- ngàndi-mu, Rambu?
what RMO- like-2pG Lady
‘What did you bring, ma’am?’

(24) a. [Nggula [pa- ngàndi-na]] -nya
sugar RMO- take-3sG -3sD
‘It (is) sugar that (is) brought by her’

b. [Pa- ngàndi (-na)] -yu
RMO- take (-3sG) -3sA
‘It is brought (by her)’

If we now consider the quotative verb wà, we find that this verb never appears in object relativizations, or in such passive-like structures:

(25) * [Pa- wà -mu] -nya
RMO- report -2sG -3sD
‘It is said (by her)’

Does this mean that a Kambera speaker cannot question what is being said? The answer is negative: in questions about the content of a quote, a bare form of wà is used – the object relative marker pa- is absent:

(26) Nggàra wà -mu, Rambu?
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what report -2pG Lady
‘What did you say/think, ma’am?’

Interestingly, the same construction is used to question adjuncts of wà, such as pira ‘how much’, and nggiki ‘how, in what way’:

(27) “Pira wà-mu-nja nù?” “Ana hau ndui” wà-na
how.much report-2sG-3pD DEI DIM one money report-3sG
“How much did you ask from them?” “‘Just one coin’, he said’

(28) Nggiki wà-nggu ba ku- karai -nya?
how report-1sG while 1sN- ask -3sD
‘How should I ask him?’

The absence of the relative marker in these questions is explained when we assume that the questioned elements are all adjuncts: like pira ‘how much’, and nggiki ‘how’, nggàra ‘what’ does not question an argument but an adjunct of wà. This confirms our analysis that Kambera quotes are not syntactic complements of the quotative verb.

In sum, we analyze the Kambera quote verb wà as an intransitive verb. This converges with the crosslinguistic observations about ‘say’ verbs of Munro (1982) and the typological findings reported by De Roeck (1994). Indeed, intransitive quote verbs are very common crosslinguistically: 37,5 % of the verbs of De Roeck’s sample behave intransitively, and 10 % behave transitively only with an Addressee argument (like Kambera wà-ng). Only 47,5 % allow for the quote to be treated as the verbal complement. In other words, Kambera is very common in this respect.

Interestingly, there are indications that wà with a third person singular genitive marker may become reanalyzed as a monomorphemic verbal root. The motivation for this reanalysis comes from the prosodic structure of the verbal root wà. Phonologically, this root does not comply with the minimal word requirements of Kambera, which state that the roots of content words must be bimoraic feet. The sequence wà-na, however, is a bimoraic foot, and is therefore a good candidate to become analyzed as a verbal root. In this reanalysis, the genitive clitic loses its referential function, so the subject must be marked otherwise. What we find is that the nominative may take over the job:

(30) Ba na- wàna -nya i Zacharia ama-na...
when 3sN- report -3sD ART Zacharias father-3sG
‘When he told his father Zacharias...’
Evidence that wà-na is treated as a morphological unit comes from the relative position of emphatic clitics and adverbs. Normally, emphatic clitics such as -ma and -du must precede the genitive clitic, see (33) (and (19)-(20)). With wà, however, the order is obligatorily reversed, as the grammaticality contrast in (34a,b) shows:

(31) E, ba namu -ma -na -nya na ana njara
    EXC as remember -MOD-3sG-3sD ART child horse
    ‘Hey, he loves the foal’

(32) a. “Na-palu-ka i Ina” nda wà -na -ma -nya -i
    3sN-hit-PRF ART mother NEG report-3sG-MOD-3sD-ASP
    ‘He never tells him that his mum hit him again’

b. * “Na-palu-ka i Ina” nda wà –na –ma –nya -i
    3sN-hit-PRF ART mother NEG report-3sG-MOD-3sD-ASP

Normally, adverbs appear directly adjacent to the verb, interfering between the verb and the clitic cluster, see the position of mema ‘immediately’ in (33). With wà, however, the adverb must appear to the right of the clitic, as in (34):

(33) Ngandi mema -na -nggai
    take immediately -3sG -2sD
    ‘He brought it to you (pl) immediately’

(34) ‘U’ wà -na mema -nggai
    yes report -3sG immediately -2pD
    ‘He agreed with you (pl) immediately’

Other evidence comes from speech errors. Strictly speaking, sentence (30) is ungrammatical because it contains two subject markers, one genitive and one nominative. Similarly, sentences may contain two genitive markers: *

(35) “Ndia ná” wà -na -ma -du -na -nya-ka ní
    NEG.EMP DEI report -3sG -MOD-MOD -3sG-3sD-PRF DEI
    ‘No way!’, he said to him

These are all indications that the quotative verb wà plus the subject marking – na may be developing into a monomorphemic verb wàna. Note however that the reanalysis only concerns forms with a third person singular subject. In general, then, wà is still seen as the root form.

3. The variable nature of the Kambera ‘quote’
In this section I discuss the various functions of the Kambera quote. We will see that there is no syntactic distinction between direct and indirect speech, and that the quotative construction is also used to report thoughts, intentions, and even physical perceptions. The latter is done by quotative constructions with ideophonic roots.

Let us first consider the direct-indirect speech distinction. In Kambera this distinction is not expressed syntactically. Instead, the language uses pronominal reference strategies and the semantic embedding of quotes to indicate distinct speaker perspectives. A simple illustration is (36). (36a) is a direct quote, because the speaker is expressed in the quote by the first person singular ku-. In (36b) the subject pronominal in the quote is third person singular na-, and this makes it an indirect speech report.

(36) a. \(Ku_-\) lua haromu \(\rightarrow\) na- ngga,
   \(\text{1sN}-\) go tomorrow \(\rightarrow\) 3sG -1sD
   ‘I am leaving tomorrow’, she told me

   b. \(Na_-\) lua haromu \(\rightarrow\) na- ngga,
   \(\text{3sN}-\) go tomorrow \(\rightarrow\) 3sG -1sD
   ‘She told me that she is leaving tomorrow’

The following example illustrates how indirect quotations may be embedded into another quote:

(37) Kambi \(\rightarrow\) da \(\rightarrow\) nju -nya
   \(\text{bean}-\) report \(-\text{3pG}\) \(-\text{report}\) \(-\text{2sG}-\text{3sD}\)
   ‘Tell her that they want beans’ (Lit. ‘“They said “beans””, you tell her’)

Embedding is often used in combination with pronominal reference strategies. This is illustrated in the following sentence, where a man instructs someone else to tell his future father-in-law about his ability to pay a dowry:

(38) “Na tanda-na na mila-nggu,” \(\rightarrow\) ka w\(\text{a-}\) mu-nya, \(\text{i Amu-}\),
   \(\text{ART sign-3sG ART be poor-1sG so report-2sG-3sD ART father}\)
   \(\text{w\(\text{a-}\)}\) nggu\(\text{a-}\), \(\text{ngga-}\) ka \(\text{nju, w\(\text{a-}\)}\) na-\(\text{nya}\),
   \(\text{report-1sG -2sG -PRF DEI report-3sG-3sD}\)
   ‘I ask you, to inform Father, about my poverty’, he said to him
   (Lit. ‘‘The evidence of my poverty’, you tell Father, I say to you, he said to him’)

The embedding of quotes may become rather complex. The following piece of narrative is itself a quote: the narrator quotes someone who is warning the main character of the story, Prince Ndilu, to be aware that he’ll need to pay a dowry to get a bride. This is done by quoting a future bride’s reaction to his proposal: “If you want it, I’ll be your wife – but first get me some dowry”:

(39) a. Napa na-pa\(\text{a-}\)ra-nya \(-\text{ka nyuna lai nju:}\)
   \(\text{later 3sN-ask-3sD -PRF her LOC DEI}\)
‘When he’ll propose over there, (she’ll say:)

b. ““tunú” wà-nggu ba wà-mu
   like this report-1sG as report-2sG
   “if you want it,

c. kalembi-ya wà-nggu -ma-nggau -ka úna ná
   family-3sA report-1sG -EMP-2sD -PRF DEI.3s DEI
   I’ll be your wife (Lit. “He’s family”, I’ll say to you)

d. nanyuna, ngání -ngga bùdi banda”.
   but take to -1sG firstly cattle
   but first get me some dowry”,

e. wà -na -nya -ka nú i Umbu Ndilu.
   report -3sG -3sD -PRF DEI ART Lord Ndilu
   she’ll say to Prince Ndilu.

The fact that it is the future bride who says the words in (39b-d) is evident from (39e), where Prince Ndilu is the addressee. The woman’s quote contains two more embedded quotes. The first of those is in (39b), where she expresses Ndilu’s intentions by entering him verbally (““like this” I want”, you say). The second is in (39c), where she expresses her own intentions by quoting the words she would use to him in the future (““He’s family’ I’ll say to you”, i.e., “I’ll be your wife”).

Note that the latter quotation expresses an intention, but is also a naming strategy. In general, Kambera quotative constructions are regularly used for both of these purposes. The following sentences are additional illustrations of naming constructions:

(40) Laku pa- peknik ba wà-da
   go CTR- picnic as report-3pG
   “‘Go for a picnic’, as they call it’

(41) Nyumu Peteru-kau, Peteru wà-nggu-ka nàhu,
    you Peter-2sA Peter report-1sG-PRF now
    “You (are) Peter, I’ll say Peter now,
    nyumu nàhu Peteru wà-nggu-nggau,
    you now Peter report-1sG-2sD
    I call you Peter now,
    Peteru ba wà-na, watu wà-na.
    Peter as report-3sG rock report-3sG
    ‘Peter’ means ‘rock’.” (Lit. ‘when one says ‘Peter’ one says ‘rock’”)

And the following quotative constructions express intentions and thoughts:

(42) Tobu-nya na ana njara wà-nggu ba wà-mi nú
    slaughter-3sD ART child horse report-1sG as report-2pG DEI
    ‘You wanted to kill the foal’
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(43) Nggiki wà-nggu ba ku- wua -nggau?
how report-1sG as 1sN- give -2sD
‘How should I give it to you?’

(44) Nda na-tanda -a-ya una na bai tau...
NEG 3sN-know -MOD-3sA DEL.3s ART real man
‘She didn’t recognize him, that man...

(45) "Banda -nggu nda ningu-a”
cattle -1sG NEG be-MOD
wà-na-ka neg dá la eti -na i Ndilu
report-3sG-PRF DEI inside LOC liver -3sG ART Ndilu
‘I don’t have property, thought Ndilu’

Finally, to express physical perceptions of motions, sounds and visions, quotative constructions are used in combination with ideophonic roots that express such notions. Illustrations:

(46) pòk ‘grunt’
ngürü ‘murmur’
hērì ‘tearing noise’
tôrì ‘rattle’
mìbùtu ‘thud’
pàña ‘smack’
mìbùkù ‘snap/tap’

Unlike what the English gloss suggests, these are not verbs but sound-symbolic roots. (To be used as verbs they must undergo circumfixation first). The ideophones constitute a separate lexical category with its own formal characteristics: ideophones use special, low vowels (ò, è, à, ù), and they are the only Kambera roots that undergo circumfixation with ka—k, for example, mìbùtu ‘thud’ > ka-mìbùtu-k ‘fall with a thud’. In quotative constructions the roots occur as they are, but in order to be used verbally, they must be morphologically derived: circumfixed, or reduplicated:

(47) a. Mìbùtu wà-na tu-na nú
thud report-3sG put-3s DEI
‘Thud!, it did’

b. Hìlì odah -ya na hapapa
again stroke -3sA ART side
‘Again (he) stroke the (horse’s) side, ka-mìbùtu-k – danya da marara
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fall.thudding -3p ART gold thudding the gold fell out’

‘(He) rubbed... amazing!, ‘thud!’ fell the horses’

Additional illustrations of ideophonic roots in quotative constructions are (50) and (51). The subject of the sentence is marked by the genitive clitic attached to wà. The ideophonic root itself expresses the perceived state of affairs and is found in the position that would otherwise be occupied by a quote. In this way, the perception of states of affairs is given a vivid, lively and direct sense.

There is one other class of roots that appear in quotative constructions: roots derived with the prefix ha-:

The derived forms with ha- and their roots have distinct functional and distributional characteristics. This is illustrated for the verb ha-likir ‘tilt, lean away’ in (53). The verb can be used as a normal predicate, but the root likir can only appear in a quotative construction. A full verb cannot appear in such a context.

(51) a. Ha-likir -ki -nya!

lean away -MOD -3sD
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‘Lean away from it a bit!’

b. **Likir**

    wà-na- *bia* - *ka*

    tilted (of head) report-3sG -MOD -PRF

‘He just tilted his head’

In other words, quotative constructions appear with roots from two different categories. The roots of the derivations with *ka-, pa-, la-, ma-, ta-* never appear in quotative constructions, but *ha-* roots do. In this respect, they behave like ideophonic roots, though they do not share the other structural characteristics of the ideophones. The explanation for the partly similar behavior of ideophones and *ha-* roots is found in their similar semantics: both types describe physically and mentally perceived states or actions. And the quotative construction is used to report on these perceptions.

We conclude that the quotative construction is used to report perceived events that can be mentally or physically perceived. Speech acts belong to the physically perceived events; thoughts and intentions are mentally perceived. The naming function of the quotative construction is clearly related to its function to report speech acts. This is to say that, though *wà* may be used as a speech verb, its semantics does not necessarily include the notion of a speech act. Rather, the common denominator of the various uses of *wà* seems to be that it always reports something – words, thoughts or perceptions. Therefore, the semantics of *wà* must be [REPORT] rather than, for example, [SAY]. In such an analysis, ‘real’ quotes are a subclass of the set of physically perceived events that speakers may report on using the verb *wà.* I will return to this in section 4, after discussing some derived functions of the quotative construction.

4. Derived functions of the Kambera report construction

The Kambera quotative verb has developed a secondary function as a discourse particle with two related, but distinct functions. Firstly, it is commonly used in questions concerning a wish, an intention or a guess; i.e. something that has not (yet) taken place. In this sense, it is a type of irrealis marker. Of course, this function of *wà* is derived from its function to express intentions or wishes, discussed in the previous section. Illustrations are (52)-(55).

As such, the clause *kama-nya* ‘try it’ in (52a,b) could also be used as an imperative, as could *karia-ngga* ‘accompany me’ in (54). However, (52b) does not have an imperative reading, and the use of *unung* ‘drink’ in (53), an uninflected verb form with an implied object, shows that imperative constructions are not obligatory when *wà* is used in a question context. Sentence (54) shows that *kama-nya, karia-
ngga and unung are not actual quotes either: to be a ‘real’ quote, karia-ngga ‘(you) come with me’ should have been karia-nggau ‘(I) come with you’. Given the question contexts, it is not surprising that the subject of wà is mostly a second person singular, but (55) shows that this is not an obligatory feature of wà as question particle.

(52) a. Kama -nya wà -mu?
    try -3sD report -2sG
    ‘Wanna try it?’

b. M, kama -nya wà-nggu-ńi lāti
    yes try -3sD report-1sG-MOD in.fact
    ‘OK, let me try it’

(53) Unung wà -mu?
    drink report -2sG
    ‘Do you want a drink?’

(54) Karia -ngga wà -mu?
    accompany -1sD report -2sG
    ‘Are you coming with me?’ / ‘Want to come with me?’

(55) Màla la Umalulu na-mbana wà-nggu?
    well  LOC Melolo 3sN-be hot report-1sG
    ‘Well, I guess it’s hot in Melolo?’

In contrast to the analysis I proposed in Klamer (1998:351), wà-mu does not seem to be a question tag: it is not literally a tag because it is not preceded by an intonational break, and it occurs in contexts other than questions – in (52b) it expresses an intention.

The other discourse function of the element wà is as an interjection that adds vividness to the discourse. Though its exact function is still unclear, it seems to draw the attention of the listener, especially in contexts where something unexpected happens. The following piece of discourse comes from a conversation between three women about pictures that they considered hilarious. One woman tells about a picture taken of M., while she was preparing food on an open fire in the field, for the workers who were harvesting there. She uses wà-mu three times:

(56) Hâla-i-ka  unità i M.  unità wà-mu,
    finish-again-PRF  ART  M.(name)  ART  wà-mu,
    ‘And then that M., oh no!'

    ba  padâkul -na-nya  na  bai  tulur,
    when lighten -3sG-3sD ART  real  stone
    when she was lighting the fire,

    bai  wuru  bâhi  unità  wà-mu,
    real  pot  iron  ART  wà-mu,
    (handling) that iron pot, you know,
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ka tiri mānu-ma-nanya-ka úna nāhu wà-mu,
so capsize always-EMP-3s-PRF DEI.3s now report-2sG
and she capsizing there (crouching, turned away from photographer),
ba na- yutu -ya na wuru bôhî!
when 3sN- hold -3sA ART pot iron
when she held the iron pot!'

The following illustrations come from different narratives, where wà-mu signals a peak in the narrative:

(57) Ka da- puru-ka uđa nì wà-mu,
    CNJ 3pN- descend -PRF EMP.3p DEI report-2sG
    ‘So they got down, man!
ngandi-danya bi kabela bi nîmhu du-ka nì wà-mu...
    take -3p real machete real spear-EMP-PRF DEI report-2sG
they (were) all bringing along machetes and spears, you know!’

(58) Njadi na- pàda -nya -ka una nì wà-mu,
    so 3sN- feel -3sD -PRF EMP.3s DEI report-2sG,
    ‘She knew it was him, you know!,
na ma- kaliti njara miting!
    ART RMS-ride horse be.black
the one riding the black horse!’

This function of wà-mu as an interjection calling for the listener’s involvement in the story would be comparable to the form and function of English interjections like you know! and what d’you say!

5. The grammaticalization of the Kambera report construction

In the preceding sections we have seen the following evidence for the idea that wà is not a canonical Kambera verbal root: (1) wà is smaller than the minimal prosodic word in Kambera, (2) wà has limited argument-marking possibilities (subjects are always genitive), (3) wà has limited morphological possibilities (it allows no causative derivation), (4) wà cannot occur in an object-relative clause (a passive-like structure), (5) wà has a very general semantics: [REPORT], and (6) wà has two distinct non-verbal discourse functions. The reduced structural properties and multifunctionality of wà suggest that it is grammaticalized to a certain extent.

The grammaticalization of wà involves a network of related functions that can be represented as in Figure 1. (See Güldemann (this volume) for another proposal where the grammaticalization of an item involves a network of
The element that lies at the heart of the wà network is a [REPORT] verb, which reports about events perceived by the speaker, either physically or mentally. The shaded circle in the center of Figure 1 indicates this central meaning of the verb.

Figure 1 also indicates that there are three types of reports: of audibly, visibly and mentally perceived events. The audibly perceived events include perceptions of all sounds: sounds expressed by ideophonic roots, but also speech sounds. In Kambera, quotes are thus treated as a subtype of perceived events. In this function, wà developed secondary functions as the predicate of a naming construction (‘we report on it as X’ = ‘we call it X’) and as a discourse particle calling for the listeners involvement (‘you report!’ = ‘you know!’). The visible events reported on by wà include the visible characteristics as they are expressed by ideophonic roots and roots of ha-verbs. The mentally perceived events are thoughts, intentions and wishes. In this function, wà developed a secondary use as a discourse particle expressing irrealis modality, to be used in questions.
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When we came across such sentences during text transcription, my consultant initially did not consider them illformed, but after thinking about them for a while he explained that the first –na should better not be there.

‘Na mila-nggu ‘my poverty’ is idiomatic for ‘my wealth’.

Common roots may be prefixed, suffixed, or reduplicated, but not circumfixed.

This is the same quotative construction as (29); here it is idiomatic for ‘Wow! Gee! Amazing!’

Not all the roots of ha-verbs can occur in the quotative construction. The following classes are the major exceptions: (1) the roots of fully lexicalized ha-derivations that do no longer function as independent words, (2) ‘roots’ with a foreign origin, for instance in phonotactically adapted loans from Indonesian (se- > ha-).

In their contributions to this volume, Güldemann and Meyerhoff discuss other cases where quotative verbs/markers do not derive from a speech verb: olesem in Bislama (a SW Pacific creole) and the element ti in Shona (a Bantu language) are both originally deictic elements meaning something like ‘thus, like’.

See also Klamer (1999), where the Kambera quotative construction is compared to similar constructions in two other Austronesian languages (Buru and Tukang Besi), and which contains a proposal for the lexical representation and grammaticalisation of [REPORT] verbs.

Alternatively, the emphatic negation ndia can be used:

(1) Māla la Umalulu na-mhana ndia?
   well LOC Melolo 3sN-be hot NEG.EMP
   ‘Well, it’s hot in Melolo, isn’t it?’

The notion of unexpectedness is also be found in the Dutch translations of wà-mu; it would often translate as man!, but also as toch ‘yet, still, nevertheless’ or immers ‘after all’, adverbials expressing contrast to expectation:

(1) Kwam hij (toch) ineens naar beneden met een mes, man!
   came he yet suddenly to downstairs with a knife man
   ‘Man! He came down carrying a knife!’

(2) Hij zat toch te liegen!
   he sat yet to lie
   ‘Boy, was he lying!’

(3) Wàröm deed ze het, ze kende immers de gevaren?
   why did she it she knew after.all the dangers
   ‘Why did she do it, while she knew about the dangers?’

Pictures of Sumbanese people in working clothes, engaged in every-day activities are a source of fun because the costs involved in picture-taking make it a serious event for which many Sumbanese dress up and adopt a solemn posture.
The advantage of a network representation is that items are allowed more interconnections than when the relation between them is assumed to be linear (a>b>c).
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Abbreviations
A Accusative
ART Article \((na = \text{singular}, da = \text{plural}, i \text{ proper noun})\)
CAU Causative
CNJ Conjunction
CTR Marker of controlled complement clause
D Dative
DEI Deictic element (space/time/discourse)
DEM Demonstrative
DIM Diminutive
EMP Emphasis
EMP.2s: 2nd person sg. emphatic pronoun,
EMP.3s: 3rd person sg. emphatic pronoun, etc.
EXC Exclamation
G Genitive
HORT Hortative particle
IMPF Imperfective marker \((-pa)\)
LOC Locative preposition
MOD Mood marker
N Nominative
NEG Negator
p plural
PRF Perfective marker \((-ka)\)
RM Marker of relativization
RMO: relativization of object
RMS: relativization of subject
RDP Reduplication
s singular
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