Relative clauses in Wetan

Kathie Carpenter
University of Oregon

The goals of this paper are twofold; first, to demonstrate how the formally-defined category "relative clause"[1] appears to have little or no meaning in Wetan (although of course Wetan has ways to express all of the functions typically expressed by relative clauses in a language such as English) and, second, to present a heretofore unreported usage of reduplication as a fully grammaticalized subordinating device.

Wetan is an Austronesian language spoken in the far Southeast region of Maluku, a province of Eastern Indonesia. Like most Austronesian languages, Wetan makes extensive use of reduplication. Reported uses (de Josselin de Jong 1987) include the expression of iterativity, plurality, emphasis, durativeness and, interestingly, subordination.

Subordination by reduplication

Wetan's most intriguing use of reduplication is to signal subordinated clausal modification, as seen in the two examples below. In these and subsequent examples, the portion of the sentence analyzed as a relative clause is enclosed in brackets, and portions of interest, in these examples the reduplicated portion of the verb, are in boldface.

1 omo-prir-pi   mo-w-lar-pi   m-lia
  2.Sg.-rise-Prt 2.Sg.-Vol-flee-Prt. 2.Sg-go

  m-tutlie   tutti lilli ma   ao-mtatna
  2.Sg-reach-Prep   cape   corner Conj 1.Sg-sit

  le   [ajewta   oma-**ma**-mati-nana-le dine] tut-ni
  Prep [driftwood 2.Sg-**Dup**-die-Prf-Prep Dem] top-Poss

  "You must rise and go to the end of the cape and I remain sitting on top of [this log of driftwood where you have died]" (14.Updaola.34)[2]

2 R-wenen-nana   pipi rene pe   normede
  3.Pl-kill-Prf goat Dem   Prt thereupon

103

r-kaa	dudillirma	ra-ni	rur-ni
3.Pl-take	horn-Poss-Pl-Conj	chin-Poss	bone-Poss

pe	r-la-r-tuie-le	[Aikierna	n-**de**-dena
Prt	3.Pl-go-3.Pl-Prep	[Aikierna	2.Sg-**Dup**-stay

lien	dene]
cave	Dem]

"After killing those goats they took their horns and jawbones and laid them down in [the cave where Aikierna resided]" (2.Aikierna.16)

In sentences 1 and 2, the first consonant-vowel sequences of the subordinated verbs *mati* "die" and *dena* "stay" have been reduplicated and appear between the person/number prefixes and the full verb form.[3] In these sentences, the head nouns are locatives in the matrix sentence, referring to places whose identity is specified by entire clauses - "the driftwood where you died" and "the cave where Aikierna stayed" respectively. Interestingly, although there has been much acknowledgment that relativization on subjects is easier, more discourse-motivated or more frequent (Keenan and Comrie 1979, Fox 1987, Givon 1990) the majority of relative clauses in these texts had locative head nouns. Although of course mere frequency is neither a counterexample nor even particularly problematic, it is still deserving of explanation. In this case, the explanation is cultural - the crucial function of narratives and folktales throughout Maluku is to provide histories of places, in part as a way to legitimate claims to places.

Relativization of non-locative head nouns, while less frequent, were also well-represented in the texts, as shown in the following example, which shows two relativizations of a head noun *tnjeti-liai* "share" which functions as the direct object in the matrix sentence:

3	Pe	nimde	Romaljewan	ma	Kolilupni	ria
	Prt	then	Rumahlewang	Conj	Kolelupun	person

	lira-jati	pele	ra-poli	Iltjuwni-Worawera	pode
	feast	Fut.Cond	3.Pl-call	Jaltubun-Worawa	so.that

r-al'   wali   [tnjeti-liai   r-**ana**-ana-n'   le   uli-uli]
3.Pl-give again   [share   3.Pl-**Dup**-eat   prep   first-first]

[Iltjuwni-Worawera   r-a-r-ala-nana-le-ira]
[Jaltubun-Worawa   3.Pl-Dup-3.Pl-Prf-Prep-Pl]

*"So when Rumahlewang and Kolelupun made a feast they
would invite Jaltubun-Worawa and return [the share of
food which they had eaten formerly] [that had been given to
them by Jaltubun-Worawa]"* (56.Ruri and Narei.28)

Sentence 4 shows reduplication of the verb *lir* "to
cleave" to signal its status as a subordinated clausal modifier of
the head noun *ora* "bamboo" which is also the direct object in
the matrix clause:

4   Noremde   r-kaa   [ora   r-**li**-lir-nan-dene]
    thereupon 3.Pl-take   [bamboo   3.Pl-**Dup**-cleave-Dem]

    pe   r-la-r-tuje   le   liene   ida   ma
    Prt   3.Pl-go-3.Pl-put Prep   cave   one   Conj

    toll-er-ene-mde   patrene   nodierpe
    leaf.rib-Pl-Dem-then   woman-Dem   3.Sg-carry-Prt

    n-la-n-tujer-le   luwia-ni   keper-ni
    3.Sg-go-3.Sg-put-Prep   clothes.chest-Poss   deep-Poss

*"After that they took [the bamboo that had been cleft] and
put it in a cave and the woman took the leaf ribs along and
put them on the bottom of her clothes chest"*
(12.Women.17)

The next example shows relativization on a head noun
that functions as an indirect object, again achieved by
reduplication of the subordinated verb, in this case *kota* "say":

5   Taamma   [**na**-na-kot-nan-le]   rie
    then   [**Dup**-3.Sg-say-Prf-Prep]   person

    idde   nanni   Maimuti
    one   name   Maimuti

*"And the name of [the man to whom he had spoken] was
Maimuti"*

Use of reduplication as a subordinating device has not before been reported, and thus it is appropriate to consider whether these are truly best analyzed as relative clauses or whether alternative analyses are more insightful. Are these really just simple attributives or nominalizations, for instance, rather than subordinated clausal modifiers? Following are several lines of reasoning that all, I believe, support my contention that these are best analyzed as relative clauses.

The first piece of evidence is the fact that the head noun is often present along with the reduplicated phrase, although headless relatives are also possible. In the next example, the head noun *iwi* "fowl" is accompanied by two conjoined relative clauses.

6   [Iwi   **mak**-dena[4]   joore   rene
     [fowl   **mak**-stay   pole   Dem

     woite-r-emde   radiena] jennira   ma
     seven-3.Pl-be.present Dem]   place-Pl Conj

     [**ra**-r-akar-nan-le
     [**Dup**-3.Pl-distribute-Prf-Prep

     ot-ni-mat-ni-ren-emde
     head-Poss-eye-PossPl-Dem-be.present

     mak-opaklake   rene] ra-woka-r-pe
     mak-perform.rites Dem] 3.Pl-collect-Pl.Obj-Prt

     r-alle   r-temen-la   [jaanaj-emni
     3.Pl-from   3.Pl-put.away-Prep [provisions

     ro-r-odi   rene]
     Dup-3.Pl-bring Dem]

"[(The body parts of) the hen which were on the seven pointed sticks] were left there and [those which had been distributed among the chiefs] were collected by those acting as priests and put with [the provisions that had been brought.]" (15.Koe.24)

Headless relative clauses do not occur with locative head nouns - instead, if a location such as "the cave" or "the

driftwood" is not specified, a locative pronoun *loa* "place" functions as the head noun, as shown in the next example:

7   Taamma   na-k-war-nana   pidpi   n-mai
    then   3.Sg-Caus-carry-Prf   then   3.Sg-come

    [am-ni   n-**de**-dena   loa   dene]   pidpi
    [father-Poss 3.Sg-**Dup**-stay   Loc   Dem]   then

    an-ni   n-iwre:
    father-Poss 3.Sg-say:

"So he carried him to [the place where his father was] and his father said:"

8   "m-kja-nina   le   [mo-**ni**-ninna-loe   dene]"
    2.Sg-take-sleep   Prep   [2.Sg-**Dup**-sleep-Loc   Dem]

"Put him to sleep in [the place where you have slept]." *(14.44)*

The second argument that these are subordinated clauses rather than nominalizations hinges on the fact that the full complement of verbal morphology, including person/number prefixes, is present. In fact, as all of the preceding examples have shown, not only is the person/number morphology present, but it itself often participates in the reduplication. In the next example, for instance, a portion of the verb *rariai* "they cook" has been repeated.

9   R-al-tari   pipi   wawi   rene   pe   noremde
    3.Pl-give-Pft   goat   pig   Dem   Prt   thereupon

    rakroka   [jaana   **ra**-ra-riai]
    3.Pl-distribute-again   [rice   **Dup**-3.Pl-cook]

"After offering those goats and pigs they also offered that [rice that had been cooked] for them to eat." *(1.Creation.45)[5]*

The next example shows *nana*, a tense/aspect marker (usually glossed as "perfective") suffixed onto the reduplicated verb *dena* "stay," again suggesting that reduplicated verbs have not lost the privileges of occurrence of unsubordinated verbs.

10 [Lawotti n-**de**-den-nana   loe-nana] n-mati
   [Lawotti 3.Sg-**Dup**-stay-Prf Loc-Prf] 3.Sg-die

"Where Lawotti lived until he died" (3 Lawotti 2)

In contrast to these reduplicated forms, simple nominalizations derived via reduplication do not have verbal morphology. The following example shows two deverbal nominalizations - *tultulla* and *rerele*, both meaning "assistance", and both formed from verbs that mean "to help", as well as one nominalization *pespes* "goodness" formed from an adjective *pesa* "good":[6]

11 R-er-pipi   r-waana   wappi   r-laa-pe
   3.Pl-tend-goat 3.Pl-feed pig   3.Pl-go-Prt

   ta-n-ala   raawaana-mde   ra-poli   leta
   Neg-3.Sg-give   blessing-then   3.Pl-call village

   winiot-ni   pe   ra-wok-pode
   contents-Poss   Prt.   3.Pl-be.together-so.that

   r-la-ra-waka   **tul**-tulla   **re**-rele   Aikierna
   3.Pl-go-3.Pl-ask   **Dup**-help   **Dup**-help   Aikierna

   pode   n-ala   raawaana   **pes**-pes-ni
   so.that   3.Sg-give   blessing   **Dup**-good-Poss

   le   mak-eri-mak-lai ...
   Prep   mak-tend-mak-look.after...

"When he did not give his blessing with regard to the caring of the goats and the pigs the village population was called together in order to implore Aikerina for help that he would give his generous blessing to those who were looking after the animals ..." (2 Aikierna 5)

Furthermore, there is no need to reduplicate a fully-affixed verb to form nominalized or attributive forms, because the verb stem alone can be used in this way, suggesting that there is a difference in meaning or function between the plain unaffixed nominal form, and the reduplicated subordinated form. The following pair of examples demonstrates how the

same root, *aklir*, can be used verbally to mean "commit adultery" if prefixed with verbal morphology, but can be used nominally, with a demonstrative, to mean "the adultery" if used with no person/number prefix:

12 Taamma   lere   ida   Dawone   n-aklir-le
   thereupon   day   one   Dawone   3.Sg-adultery-Prep

   Kurmae   pidpi   Rilma Wonere   r-ora
   Kurmae   then   Rilma Wonere   3.Pl-be.together

   Erelein-er-pe   ra-wenna.
   Erelei-Pl-Prt   3.Pl-quarrel

"Once it happened that Dawone committed adultery with Kurmae and then Rumahlewang Besar quarrelled with the Herlei people."

13 Aklir-dene   le ler-dene   de   r-wenen-nana
   adultery-Dem   Prep   Prt   3.Pl-kill-Prf

   pipmi   wappi   terampoiti.
   goat   pig   seventy

"On the day of the adultery they killed seventy goats and pigs." (45.Larmjoka.30)

   The next example also shows how an unadorned and unreduplicated verb can be used attributively, again suggesting that the reduplications contrast in function from simple attributives:

14 Taamma   n-laa-pe   n-kaa-na   jer   le
   thereupon   3.Sg-go-Prt   3.Sg-take-Asp   water   Prep

   toke   id   ma   sop   lie   potli   ida,
   tube   one   Conj   liquor Prep   bottle one

   wetra-njeker   le   manki   ida   ma   rane
   maize-fry   Prep   basket one   Conj   pot

   ida   ma   wut liawne   ida ...
   one   Conj   headband-big   one ...

"Then he took one bamboo vessal of water, one bottle of liquor, one basket of fried corn, one cooking pot, and one large head band ..." (58.Dailjora.13)

A circumstantial but suggestive kind of evidence is that actual text counts show that other functions of reduplication are rare, suggesting that in the grammaticalization process, reduplication has been co-opted to mark subordination at the expense of other functions. Although de Josselin de Jong provides examples of verb reduplication to indicate iterative and durative aspect, as well as emphasis, in the texts the incidence of all of these is actually quite low.

Instead, though, many adjectives are reduplicated, and close examination reveals an interesting pattern. The adjectives most likely to be reduplicated are also those referring to qualities that are most extrinsic, rather than intrinsic, to the noun's referent. For example, colors are usually used in a reduplicated form, as in the following examples:

pipi pon-ponna	jan-wa-ware
goat Dup-grey	rice-Dup-white
"grey goat"	"white rice"
iwi me-metme	wap mer-mere
fowl Dup-black	pig Dup-red
"black chicken"	"red pig"

Color is virtually never a defining attribute of categories, and it is a dimension along which individuals may vary enormously. Similarly, "sacred" is an extremely external characteristic, since it is something that must be conferred by humans rather than inhering in an object automatically. The adjective "sacred" is also most commonly used in its reduplicated form:

rom-lu-luli	prai lu-lulie
house-Dup-sacred	drum Dup-sacred
"sacred house"	"sacred drum"

In contrast, size, sex and material are more internal qualities of objects, and the adjectives referring to them are never reduplicated:

nia lawne	pipi miani	roma papne
snake big	goat male	house board
"big snake"	"male goat"	"wooden house"

If we visualize a continuum of modification referring to qualities that range from very internal to very external, color and sanctity would be grouped together closer to the external end of the continuum than the more internal characteristics size, sex and material. Restrictive clausal modifications,such as "the driftwood where you died" and "the cave where he stayed" are even more external, since they refer to relations between entities that are temporally bounded. Non-restrictive relative clauses, such as "Aikierna, who I saw once" or "Ikleri Paileri, who eats only red fowl" are the most external, as they refer to temporally bounded relations that are not criterial for identification. Thus, the reduplication of relatively extrinsic qualities like color and sanctity provides a conceptual bridge between simple attributives and use of reduplication for relativization.

Many uses of reduplication in the texts seem to be quite idiomatic, as the following example, suggesting again that the most productive uses of reduplication today are for subordination, and that many other uses may be frozen idioms.

15 N-mai-die   n-dena   mel-melli-kal-kalaw-ni
    3.Sg-Prt   3.Sg-stay   Dup-dark-Dup-gill.cover-Poss

"When coming, he was living in darkness" (1.Creation.11)

Subordination by prefixation

Reduplication can only be used to form subordinated modifying clauses if the head noun is a non-actor. When the head noun to be identified is an actor, an entirely different device is used, namely, prefixation with the prefix *mak-*, as shown in the next example:

16 Taamma   ta-naloon-nteramma   [Nojat-era
    then   Neg-long-before   [Nusiata-Pl

    ta-**mak**-warurni-ra]   r-mai-pi   ra-itiana
    Neg-**mak**-fight-3.Pl]   3.Pl-come-Prt   3.Pl-ask

    rierke-dene   ankee-ni-roro   r-iwre:
    old.man-Dem   child-Poss-two   3.Pl-say

"Not long after that [the Nusiata people who had not taken part in the fighting] came and asked the old man's two sons:" (14.Updaola.60)

This example illustrates the basic pattern of *mak*-prefixation. In contrast to reduplication, the verb prefixed with *mak*- does not have any person/number prefixation. There are occasional sporadic uses of person/number suffixes, as shown in this example, but they are quite rare and I am unable to specify the constraints on their use at this time.[7]

As with the reduplications, the question naturally arises as to whether the verbs prefixed with *mak*- are best analyzed as subordinated clauses or as simple nominalized agents or instruments. Many of the arguments are the same, but I will repeat them here with additional examples as bolstering support for the analysis.

Firstly, like reduplicated forms, *mak*- prefixed forms are often used in the presence of the head noun, although headless relatives are also possible.

17 Tut-riene   de   [kala   **mak**-mol-diene]   ed-loa
cape-Dem   Prt   [spear   **mak**-disappear-Dem]   Cop-Loc

"There on that cape is [the spear that has gone]"
(20.Majo.50)

Secondly, although it is true that most of the time the person/number affixation is absent, *mak*- prefixation co-occurs with other verbal morphology, especially tense/aspect marking,

18 [awatwata   ta-**maka**-tuti-ka-jori-de][8]
[woman   Neg-**mak**-arrive-Caus-give.birth-Prt]

ra-japi   adena   pode   n-ala
3.Pl-make   Dem   so.that   3.Sg-give

upaan-le   pode   na-tuti-na-jori.
descendent-Prep   so.that   3.Sg-reach-3.Sg-give.birth

"[Women who have no children] make that in order to be able to bear children." (1.Creation.7)

Like the reduplicated forms, the *mak*- prefixed forms contrast in meaning and function with other kinds of nominalizations. For example, *mak*- prefixed to the verb *dena* "stay" yields *makdena* "the one(s) who stayed", a form frequently used to refer to the inhabitants of a village.

19 Ma   r-ka-wali   wawi   id-pode   r-alle
    Conj   3.Pl-take-again   pig   one-so.that   3.Pl-give

    [luli   **mak**-dena   lete   lettiar-ni   dene]   na-ana
    [sacred   **mak**-stay   village   middle-Poss   Dem]   3.Sg-eat

*"And again they took one pig and gave it to eat to [the
sacred being dwelling in the center of the village.]"
(14.Updaola.102)*

There are, however, two other ways to form
nominalizations with the same meaning, although a different
emphasis. The name of a village, for instance, can simply
receive plural morphology to yield the meaning "the villagers"
or "the people of that village":

20 N-alle   iltuwenpe   nmai   Wnowui
    3.Sg-originate   Jeltubun   3.Sg-come   Manoqui

    taamma   **Wnowui-ra**   ra-mena
    thereupon   **Manowui-Pl**   3.Pl-refuse

    r-poli-r-wake   taamma   walpi   n-mai
    3.Pl-call-3.Pl-ask thereupon   again   3.Sg-come

    Watrupni   taamma   **Watrupni-ra**   ra-mena
    Watrupun   thereupon   **Watrupun-Pl**   3.Pl-refuse

    r-poli-r-waka   pede   n-mai   Inlettiara
    3.pl-call-3.Pl-ask   then   3.Sg-come   Letsiara

*"From Jeltubun she arrived at Manoqui, but **the people
of Manowui** were not willing to invite her; then again she
went to Watrupun, but **the people of Watrupun** were
not willing to invite her, so then she went to Letsiara."
(10.Dormasa.15)*

Alternatively, a possessive marker can be added to the
noun *winiot* "contents" to give a meaning of "the villagers,"
literally "the village's contents."

21 R-eka-le   lere   woiti   mele   woiti   pode
    3.Pl-dance-Prep   day   seven   night   seven   so.that

r-tuni	waw-diene	pe	lete	winiot-ni
3.Pl-roast	pig-Dem	Prt.	village	contents-Poss

ra-ana	ma	r-kaa	lai-ni	id-pe	r-wairie
3.Pl-eat	Conj	3.Pl-take	part-Poss	one-Prt	3.Pl-hang

le	nuun-dene	anni
Prep	banyan-Dem	top

"After dancing seven days and seven nights and then roasted the pig for the villagers to eat and hung part of it up on the banyan tree." (16.Wuriaiki ma Surniatri.34)

Highlighting an entity's simple *placement* in a location can be achieved by using a simple prepositional phrase, and it contrasts with the *mak-* prefixed form, which conveys a more active emphasis on an entity *staying* in a location, as in the following pair of examples:

22
Pidpi	na-ann-em-ennek-ma	adene	pe
then	3.Sg-eat-drink-already-alone	Dem	Prt

jere-jaan-raimu	rene	le	toki-toki	rene
water-rice-hundred	Dem	Prep	store-store	Dem

r-ori.
3.Pl-gone

"Then it ate, all by itself, all the food in the shops."

23
Pidpi	ta-omo-wewle-amma	[orlaa	**mak**-dena
then	Neg-2.Sg-take-but	[goods	**mak**-stay

toki	rene	ralam-nir-a.]
store	Dem	inside-Poss-Pl]

"After that it owned all [the things that were in the shops]." (26.Putra.62,65)

An unadorned verb can be used as a nominal form, suggesting that *mak-* prefixation must carry an additional meaning or function that contrasts with simple nominalization. The following sentences show, for instance, how the word *ejane* can be used to mean either "witch" or "be a witch" because

the same form can be used with person/number morphology or with a demonstrative.

24 Rie   rine   rora   r-ejana
    person   Dem   two   3.Pl-witch

"These two people were witches."   *(43.Tonara ma Pasare.33)*

25 Taamma   mak-wenen-nana   **ejane**   rene
    thereupon mak-kill-Prf   **witch**   Dem

    rakarnana   norni-len-ni-ra.
    3.Pl-divide-Prf   plantation-Poss-Pl

"Then the people who had killed the witches divided their plantations." (43.Tonara ma Pasare.60)

However, *ejane* can also be prefixed with *mak-*, with a sense more appropriately glossed as "those who are witches" rather than "witch"

26 Pidpi   r-i-neke-ra   noa-dene   pe   re-wenna
    then   3.Pl-do-like-Pl   as-Dem   Prt   3.Pl-kill

    ori   [ria   **mak**-ejane   rene]   le
    gone [person **mak**-witch   Dem]   Prep

    Rilma Wonera   nanni.
    Rumahlewang Besar   underneath

"Then, by acting like this, they killed all [the men who were witches] underneath Rumahlewang Besar." (43.Tonara ma Pasare.49)

Similarly, *mati* "die" can be used nominally to mean "the dead one":

27 N-taman-tarie   pe   n-ori   lete-runa   mak-dena
    3.Sg-bury-Prf Prt   3.Sg-gone   village-village mak-stay

    papra   liw-ni   dine   winiot-ni-ra   ra-tlina
    Babar   reef-Poss   Dem   contents-Poss-Pl   3.Pl-hear

mat-riene pede r-ma-ra-itinana.
die-Dem Prt 3.Pl-come-3.Pl-inquire

"When he had buried him the inhabitants of the villages all over Wetan heard about the dead man and came to inquire." (50.Kati ma Sokati.37)

This contrasts with the *mak-* prefixed form, which conveys the more complex meaning of "the one who is dead":

28 Pidpi ta-naloonamma in-ni-nar-ni-ra
then Neg-long.time mother-Poss-relative-Poss-Pl

r-laa-wa Nojata pe ra-itiana akkeena
3.Pl-go-Dxn Nusiata Prt 3.Pl-inquire child

mak-mat-riene
mak-die-Dem

"Then her relatives soon went to Nusiata and asked about [the child that was dead]." (48.Kaukeliai.25)

Mak- forms were not used in simple predication or equational statements, so that sentences such as "Aikierni was a priest" or "Then she saw a sailor" did not ever occur in the texts. Rather than being a general agent or instrument marker, the uses of *mak-* seemed to indicate individuation for purposes of identification only.

Mak- prefixation and reduplication are used only to mark restrictive relative clauses, that is, clausal modifications used to specify the identity of the head noun, rather than to add additional, but non-essential information about it. Clauses that would be best presented in English as non-restrictive, or appositive, relative clauses appear in Wetan marked with a variety of unrelated formal devices, including causal and temporal connectors. In many cases they are conjoined rather than subordinated.

The *mak-*/reduplication - actor/non-actor distinction is entirely different from the passive/active distinction seen in matrix clauses. Wetan makes use of the third person plural prefix to form an impersonal passive, to effectively "truncate" the mention of the agent, which otherwise would be obligatory because person/number prefixation on the verb is obligatory. The following three examples show how such prefixation functions as an impersonal passive, even when the actual actor

would require a different form of prefix. In the first example, the man who burned the village is also the one who killed the villagers, but the plural rather than the singular form of prefix is used, to place emphasis on the completed effects of the acts of death and destruction:

29 Na-eti-ede   let-rene   **winiot-ni-ra**
    3.Sg-perceive-so.that village-Dem   **contents-Poss-Pl**

    r-or-tiamma   n-olle   let-rene   pe
    3.Pl-hunt-thereupon 3.Sg-burn   village-Dem   Prt

    ai   nandpoinie   pidpi   en-walie   le   Tela
    wood 3.Sg-consume   then   3.Sg-again Prep   Tela

    ma   Imraonini
    Conj   Imraoini

"When he perceived that the inhabitants had been killed he put fire to the village so that it was consumed by the fire and then he returned to Tela and Imraoini." (24.Pai.17)

In the next two examples, the agent in both cases is also singular, although the morphology on the verb is plural, and no subject noun is explicitly mentioned in the sentence:

30 Na-wak-ter-de   **ta-r-ala-mma**   le
    3.Sg-ask-Cont-Prt **Neg-3.Pl-give-anyway**   Prep

    taamma   n-waale   ma   n-tiklie.
    thereupon   3.Sg-hit   Conj   3.Sg-kick

*"He kept asking but **nothing was given to him**, so he hit and kicked." (23.Loe nora Lokme.37) (monkey requesting bananas from a resin human figurine)*

31 Taamma   **ra-polie**   pidpi   na-raa
    thereupon   **3.Pl-call**   then   3.Sg-land

"Then he was invited and came ashore" (68.Siska.22) (by one woman)

Conclusion

The category "relative clause" as a constellation of functionally related uses marked by the same formal device appears to have no relevance for Wetan. Although of course Wetan has a variety of different ways to achieve the functions of relative clauses, that is, modification by entire clauses in contrast to single adjectives, the formally coherent category we find in English splits into two in Wetan, each marked by a formally distinct device, depending on whether the head noun in the matrix clause is an actor or non-actor. Furthermore, although most languages treat restrictive and non-restrictive clausal modification as formally identical, and indeed the line between them is often unclear, Wetan separates them completely.

Subordination has apparently not before been listed as a function of reduplication. However, it is certainly consonant with other more commonly acknowledged functions. Nominalization and participial formation are both common functions of reduplication (Zack this volume, also Gonda 1949, Naylor 1986), and the affinity of subordination with nominalization is well known (O'Dowd 1992) as is the affinity of relativization with participial phrases (Comrie 1981). Thus, the surprise is perhaps not that Wetan uses reduplication to mark subordination, but rather that it has not been noticed before. There are probably two reasons for this - one is that the languages of Eastern Indonesia remain woefully underdescribed, and the second is that the assumption that reduplication is "iconic" and therefore "marginal" probably prejudices us to not see the evidence when it is there before us. Reduplication is an integral part of the morphological repertoire of Austronesian languages, though, and it is not surprising that they use it where other languages might use other things.

Notes

1 In this paper, "relative clause" will mean modification of a noun by a subordinated clause.

2 Examples in this paper all come from the 68 Wetan texts collected in the 1930's by J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong, a Dutch anthropologist. The collection was published posthumously along with a short grammatical sketch and glossary. The translations are all those provided by de Josselin de Jong, although in some cases I amend them to make them more

consistent with the information provided elsewhere. Any changes from the original translations will be noted.

³ The precise allomorphic patterns of reduplication remain somewhat elusive. The dominant tendency is to repeat a consonant-vowel sequence between the verb and the person/number prefix. If the verb begins with a consonant, the first consonant-vowel sequence is reduplicated. If the verb begins with a vowel, the person/number prefix and the first vowel of the verb are repeated. If the verb begins with the same consonant as the person/number prefix, then the vowel *a*, together with the person/number prefix, are repeated. However, apparently idiosyncratic counterexamples exist - among them the verb *ana* "eat" (sentence 3) and *kota* "say" (sentence 5). The picture is further clouded by the large amount of metathesis and assimilation present in Wetan.

⁴ In this example, I have also bracketed and boldfaced another type of relativizing device, *mak-* prefixation, which is not pertinent to the present discussion but will be discussed in the next section.

⁵ In this example, my translation departs from that of de Josselin de Jong, who translated the modifying phrase as a simple participial "cooked rice" rather than "rice that had been cooked." My analysis is, however, supported by the fact that a lexicalized form *niairiai* "cooked rice" (from *riai* "cook") already exists, since Wetan, in an area where rice is an important luxury food, has many lexical items to refer to different kinds of rice in different stages of preparation.

⁶ The boundary between verbs and adjectives in Wetan is not very clear, and *pesa* could equally well have been called a verb and glossed as "to be good".

⁷ De Josselin de Jong writes that suffixes, in contrast to prefixes, are used "without any regularity" (p.188); thus, their usage awaits further elucidation.

⁸ Frequently, but not always, an a appears between *mak-* and verbs beginning with a consonant.

References

Comrie, Bernard (1981) *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

De Josselin de Jong, J.P.B. (1987) *Wetan Fieldnotes*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris Publications.

120

Fox, Barbara (1987) The Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy revisited. *Language 63*:856-870.

Givon, Tom (1990) *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction, Vol. II.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gonda, J. (1949) The functions of word duplication in Indonesian languages. *Lingua 2*:170-197.

Keenan, Edward and Bernard Comrie (1979) Data on the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy. *Language 55*:333-51.

Naylor, Paz (1986) On the semantics of reduplication. In L. Carrington & S.A. Wurm (eds.) *Focal 1: Papers from the 4th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics* (Pacific Linguistics, C-93), 175-85. Canberra, Australia: Department of Linguistics, Australian National University.

O'Dowd, Elizabeth (1992) The syntactic metaphor of subordination: a typological study. *Lingua 86*: 47-80.

Zack, Ronald (1992) Reduplication in Hiligaynon. This volume.