DISARMING A LOADED PATIENT

P. and V. Schlie
Summer Institute of Linguistics

This paper is a discussion of what could be called an 'antipassive' in the Kara language spoken in New Ireland. The primary purpose in its writing is to present data from a relatively obscure Austronesian language which reveals a systematic ability to manipulate "focus[1]" among the actants within a clause. The Kara language, as one which focuses heavily on the Patient has two means of making the Patient less prominent, even to the point of deletion. These are (1) through the use of a reflex of the POC **-aki(ni)* transitive suffix and (2) through object incorporation into the VP.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper has its genesis in two papers we have written concerning passive formation and verb classification in the Kara[2] language of New Ireland. The basic grammatical theory followed will be a 'lexicase' approach with its associated ramifications (see Starosta 1977). In the writing of the two papers referred to earlier we became aware of an apparent conflict with a fundamental lexicase tenet. This conflict revolves around the required presence of a Patient case relation (CR) in every string where an Agent is present. Speakers of Kara, an apparent Nominative-Accusative type language with an unmarked SVO surface construction, at times either deleted the a Patient-Object or absorbed it into the VP leaving what appeared to be an Agent as the only nuclear actant. This paper, then, is a further examination of that area of conflict.

2. PATIENT PROMINENCE, PATIENT CENTRALITY, PATIENT FOCUS

The basic transitive sentence in Kara consists of a Topic, a Subject marker, the Predicate plus an Object; i.e.

(1) Topic Subj Predicate Object

a mu rafulak ri taxa pit a bol
NM pl children 3pl is:ing hit NM ball
'The children are hitting the/a ball.'

In assigning the CR's[3] according to lexicase theory we have Topic-Agent-Predicate-Patient. The prime tenet of lexicase grammar is the centrality or primacy of the Patient. Starosta defines the Patient CR as "... the fundamental case relation. Depending on the verb class with which it co-occurs, this can mean (a) the entity which is viewed as affected by the action of the verb, (b) the entity which is viewed as moving or being located in (abstract or concrete) space, or (c) the entity which is viewed as existing in a state or whose state is changing" (Starosta 1977:472). In a subsequent article (1982:4) he also notes "The Patient is the perceived central participant in a state or event. Patient is obligatorily present in the case frames of all verbs and is the case relation of the grammatical subject for all intransitive verbs." Starosta's definition of Patient is developed in such a way as to put Patient in every possible frame whatever language you are dealing with making Patient the omnipresent actant.

Patient centrality appropriately describes the Kara situation. Consider the following examples:

(2) Topic AGT PAT PAT

a mu rafulak ri pit a bol e Ø fe -liu a vafa
NM pl children 3pl hit NM ball conj motion beyond NM fence
'The children hit the ball and (it) went beyond the fence.'

In the above sentence it is not the children who went beyond the fence but the ball. As the prime actant the Patient, ball, is deleted from the conjoined clause as being redundant. The same Patient deletion can be seen in the sentences:

(3) Topic AGT PAT PAT

na Pius a tuk tapin na Beno e Ø pile poxo
NM Pius SMp punch away NM Beno conj neg fall down
'Pius punched Beno and didn't fall down.'

(4) Topic AGT PAT PAT

a malu a fit a wai aapave e Ø ta -vuak
NM wind SMp blow NM tree deic conj stat break
'The wind blew that tree there and it broke.'

In each of these examples the Subject of the conjoined clause is the Patient:Object of the first; i.e. Beno is the one who did not fall down and the tree (obviously) is what had

to be broken. If we want to indicate that Pius is the one who didn't fall then we insert a pronoun or to be clearer still his name into the conjoined clause in place of the zero. If the conjoined clause is also a transitive one then the roles of the actants remain the same with only minimal marking (typically the object clitic, *-e*).

(5) Topic AGT PAT AGT PAT

na Kevin a seng na Beno e Ø pi'le xalum -e
NM Kevin SMp hunt NM Beno conj neg see 3s
'Kevin searched for Beno and/but didn't find/see him.'

The Patient occupying such a strong position as the Direct Object should come as no surprise to those familiar with articles by Paz Naylor, Pawley, Reid and Starosta on focus systems in AN languages. Pawley and Reid (1977:110) in their discussion on the evolution of transitive constructions refer to the nonagent focus affixes as clearly Proto-Austronesian. Later after a discussion of the realignment of pronouns between PAN and POC they make this statement; "The focused nominal (direct object) must be specific if not definite" (p 116). Kara encodes both definite and indefinite under the same referential noun marker, *a*. The referent has an identity but it's not germane to the discussion so a simple referential marker is sufficient. Kara Direct Object:Patients are also marked by using the Topic pronouns as opposed to Subject pronouns.[5]

Verb choice is also dependent upon the Patient:DO of the clause at least in some semantic domains. Many languages, including English, have some similar Verb-Patient constraints. English, however, looks at the nature of the action while in Kara the choice is based on the manner in which the Patient is affected. Consider the various words for "cut" in the following examples which employ the frame 'I cut Patient NP with my knife.'

(6) *ne tei a wai pana naip si -ak*
1s cut:down NM tree INS knife POS 1st
'I cut down a tree with my knife.'

(7) *ne putuk a mataa pana naip si -ak*
1s cut NM man INS knife POS 1st
'I cut a man with my knife.'

(8) *ne lip a latan pana naip si -ak*
1s cut NM grass/bush INS knife POS 1st
'I cut the grass with my knife.'

(9) *ne rarak a kui pana naip si -ak*
1s cut:split NM firewood INS knife POS 1st
'I split the firewood with my knife.'

(10) *ne xatip a vana pana naip si -ak*
1s cut NM net INS knife POS 1st
'I cut the net with my knife.'

(11) *ne patel a din pana naip si -ak*
1s cut:across NM fish INS knife POS 1st
'I cut across the fish with my knife.'

(12) *ne sagal a din pana naip si -ak*
1s cut:lengthwise NM fish INS knife POS 1st
'I filleted the fish with my knife.'

(13) *ne sapiit a fui -ga pana naip si -ak*
1s cut NM hair 1st INS knife POS 1st
'I cut my hair with my knife.'

You may not ***rarak a mataa*** nor do you ***xatip a fui*** or ***lip a wai*** or ***a din***. The choice of cutting verb is limited by the recipient of the action and even further by the nature of its affect.

The realization of the saliency of the Patient NP and its role in the focus strategy is extremely valuable to a full appreciation of the structure of Kara.

3. OBJECT INCORPORATION

Syntactic object incorporation occurs when the Patient:DO is not especially prominent in the immediate discourse contexts regardless of its referentiality. This means that to be a candidate for Object Incorporation, nothing may come between the verb and its object except for the noun marker, ***a***. Object incorporation[6] is effected by simply deleting the NM between the verb and the Object noun. Material following the Object which is intrinsically part of the verb phrase, i.e. adverbial modifier (see 23, 24, 25 and 28) is

included in the object incorporation. Oblique phrases and adjuncts are not included. Modifiers relating to the noun remain as part of the NP when no other operation is initiated. The fact of object incorporation is demonstrated by various operations; mainly nominalization, possession and dislocation, which affect the newly formed unit as a whole. Operations to nominalize, possess and/or dislocate a verb phrase with an unincorporated object result in a gerund-like construction (see 18).

Object Incorporation Data

(14) *ne funa seng a vio la panen lolof*
1s usually hunt NM pig LOC morning early
'I usually hunt pigs in the early morning.'

(15) *ne funa seng vio la panen lolof*
1s usually hunt pig LOC morning early
'I usually pig-hunt in the early morning.'

(16) *lamina seng -an si -ak ne funa maagus*
after hunt NOM POS 1st 1s usually tired
'After my hunting I'm usually tired.'

(17) *lamina seng vio -yan si -ak ne funa maagus*
after hunt pig NOM POS 1st 1s usually tired
'After my pig-hunting I'm usually tired.'

(18) *lamina seng -aan -a[a] vio si -ak ne funa maagus*
after hunt GER 3s:NM pig POS 1st 1s usually tired
'After my hunting them/the pigs I'm usually tired.'

(19) *na Djini a marala pana seng vio -yan si -ak*
NM Ginny SMp angry INS hunt pig NOM POS 1st
'Ginny is angry with my pig-hunting.'

(20) *a seng vio -yan si -ak a fa -marale -i na naasa -ak*
NM hunt pig NOM POS 1st SMp caus angry at NM wife 1st
'My pig-hunting angers my wife.'

Sentence (14) above illustrates the prime conditions for object incorporation and in (15) it has taken place. If any intervening material were present. For example, ***a saxa vio*** 'concerning a certain pig', the operation could not take place.

(21) *ne funa seng a saxa vio la maana panen*
1s usually hunt NM one pig LOC all morning
'I usually hunt for this one certain pig every morning.'

(22) **ne funa seng saxa vio la maana panen*

This situation violates the prerequisite condition since a certain pig is being singled out as the object and as a result there is some intervening material.

Example (16) illustrates the nominalization of a verb alone, using the ***-an*** suffix. Example (17), (19) and (20) demonstrate the nominalization of a verb phrase with its incorporated object. Note that the whole of the newly formed unit has been dislocated and that the nominalization ending is affixed to the unit's last element whether this be the noun or in later cases the verbal modifier (see 25). The sentence in example (18) shows a gerundial formation. This differs from object incorporation nominalization (i) by its vowel quality, (ii) its point of affixation (necessarily on the verb) and (iii) the possible use of a pronominal clitic (***-a***) in place of an NP. However as with object incorporation the whole of the unit can be dislocated and possessed.

Unaffixed verbal modifiers of manner in Kara obligatorily occur after the DO (23). When the conditions for object incor- poration are met the newly formed unit includes this modifier (24).

(23) *ne fo nus a sospan faagut pe la guun*
1s comp scrub NM saucepan strong PLC LOC sand
'I scrubbed the pot vigorously on the beach.'

(24) *ne fo nus sospan faagut pe la guun*
1s comp scrub saucepan strong PLC LOC sand
'I vigorously pot-scrubbed on the beach.'

The whole of this newly formed unit ***nus sospan faagut*** can now be nominalized, possessed and dislocated to the Subject position (or to most other NP positions for that matter), as in (25).

(25) *a nus sospan faagut -an si -ak, a fa -maagus -au*
NM scrub saucepan strong NOM POS 1st NM caus tired 1s
'My vigorous pot-scrubbing tired me.'

In the above sentence the Subject is clearly an Agent because it is the cause of my tiredness. The fact the nominal marker occurs on ***faagut*** demonstrates that the whole phrase operates as a unit. If ***faagut*** were deleted any subsequent dislocation after object incorporation would show the nominalization ending on ***sospan*** as in (26) and (27).

(26) *ne fe -maagus sena nus sospan -an si -ak*
1s inch tired REA scrub saucepan NOM POS 1st
'I became tired because of my pot-scrubbing.'

(27) *na -re re falim a nus sospan -an si -ak*
NM 3d 3d watch NM scrub saucepan NOM POS 1st
'The two of them watched my pot-scrubbing.'

(28) *re falim a nus sospan faagut -an si -ak*
3d watch NM scrub saucepan strong NOM POS 1st
'They (two) watched my vigorous pot-scrubbing.'

Nominalization, possession and dislocation have been illustrated in the above examples with the incorporated object appearing as Subject (20 and 25), Direct Object (27 and 28), and Oblique Objects of Instrument (19), Time (17) and Reason (26). The phrase with the incorporated object has been marked as an NP with the noun marker ***a*** and has undergone possession. The construct could also be used as a Locative to denote the site or place of pig-hunting and pot-scrubbing or in a Purpose oblique.

The question now arises as to what the CR assignments are in an Object incorporated clause. On the basis of morphophonemic evidence, this clause has to be classified as intransitive. There are two morphophonemics changes which correlate with the presence or absence of a Direct Object. Several verbs are /r/ initial (written as x) in

the transitive form but [q] (written k) initial when used intransitive. The other change is a variation in the vowel quality of the initial syllable in similar circumstances. Some verbs evidence both of the changes. When object incorporation occurs involving one of these verbs the intransitive form is consistently employed.

Sample verbs

<Intransitive>		<transitive>	
kuus	'say'	*xuus*	'tell a person about something'
kaapis	'plant'	*xapis*	'plant corn/a garden'
taangiis	'cry/weep'	*tangiis*	'mourn someone'
kaalum	'see/look'	*xalum*	'look at something'
kaaf	'dig/play in the send'	*xaaf*	'dig a hole'

(29) *ri faxuvul xena xapas a vio*
3p assemble PUR buy NM pig
'They gathered together to buy/pay for a pig.'

(30) *ri faxuvul xena kaapas vio*
3p assemble PUR buy pig
'They gathered together to pig-buy.'

(31) *a kaapas vio -yan si -ri a falet fa -roxo*
NM buy pig NOM POS 3p SMp run caus good
'Their pig-buying went well.'

(32) *a tefin si -ak i taa fe xatip a vai pe la vi*
NM female POS 1st SMi IRR go cut NM green leaves PLC LOC sago swamp
'My wife will go collect the green leaves (for a mumu) in the sago swamp.'

(33) *a tefin si -ak i taa fe kaatip vai pe la vi*
NM female POS 1st SMi IRR go cut green leaves PLC LOC sago:swamp
'My wife will go green leaf-collecting in the sago swamp.'

(34) *a kaatip vai -an si -na a faisok 3lagaf*
NM cut green leaf NOM POS 3s SMp work hard
'Her green leaf-collecting is hard work.'

The morphophonemic evidence then implies that object incorporation is a device which detransitivizes the predicate. The semantic basis which triggers this operation appears to be the desire on the part of the speaker to reduce the amount of attention being directed toward the Direct Object nominal. In (14) above 'pig' as the target animal of my search is the focused information. Other target animals would have to be noted and general hunting would require a slightly different verb form.

On the surface, recoverability of the DO in object incorporation appears to constitute a problem for the lexicase model. Reclassifying ***ne*** as the Patient in examples (15) and (24) appears to be contrary to logic because I, the referent of ***ne***, am still doing something. However by reapplying Starosta's definition of Patient and in the light of (16) and (26), we can see that while the pot is affected by scrubbing or the pig by being hunted, I am the one who is affected by pot-scrubbing and pig-hunting and am therefore the Patient.

While object incorporation does serve to generate NP material amenable to subsequent dislocation I believe its main function is to operate within the focus system so that the new/derived Patient, as the central participant of the predication, is highlighted. The object incorporation device then is a means of removing the DO nominal from center stage and instead focusing on the Subject nominal. This function equates to passivization in reverse, or antipassivization. Passivization topicalizes the DO nominal by demoting/removing the Agent/Subject. Here we see the focus recentralizing[7] to the Subject position as that nominal becomes the new Patient as the result of the former DO being incorporated into the predicate. The reason such a device is necessary is because of the normal prominence of the Patient case relation. The speaker simply takes advantage of this systematic prominence.

4. A REFLEX OF THE POC *-*aki(ni)* TRANSITIVITY MARKER

The second strategy for defocusing/disarming a Patient in the Object position employs the verbal suffix ***-ai***, a member of the class which Grimes (1975) has called "pesky particles". I believe this suffix is a reflex of the POC *-***aki(ni)** transitive suffix witnessed by so many researchers in Austronesian languages. POC forms with intervocalic -k- tend

to lose those 'k' in the transition to modern Kara. Thus ***paka-*** 'causative prefix' becomes ***fa-*** or ***faa-*** and ****matakut*** 'fear' becomes ***mataut*** in the language as spoken today.

In our earlier work with the Kara we frequently encountered verbs ending in ***-ai*** either as part of the stem or as an affix, but the contexts seemed to vary considerably. The affixed variety usually occurred in some situation where it was convenient or desirable to have no particular referent as the Patient:DO. Several verbs, particularly those of the affect/effect variety, have two possible forms; one form ending in ***-ai*** and one in ***-an***. The consistent portion of the stem, if it has any meaning at all, may not necessarily evidence any semantic connection at all with the affixed forms. The implication is that a lexicalizing process has taken place some time in the past.

Examples of Lexicalization

<Vstm + Ø>	<Vstm + *an*>	<Vstm + *ai*>
ves - no meaning	*vesan* - make or build something	*vesai* - do or make the necessary but unspecified things
xaaf - dig a hole	*xaafan* - bury a person	*xaafai* - perform the customs appropriate for burial
tok - no meaning	*toxan* - possess or have something	*toxai* - generally possess, the term is nonreferential
parok - incest	*paroxan* - spy on someone	*paroxai* - observe (people) from hiding
lis - having to do with waiting for a member of the opposite sex	*lisan* - bring or take something	*lisai* - take or deliver in the sense of accompany
fi - weave a basket	*fin* - ask someone about something	*fiai* - generally voice a question

These lexicalized verb stems, as well as those verbs which have undergone the productive process of affixation by ***-an*** or ***-ai***, have some common characteristics. Those ending in ***-an*** must have an overt Patient:DO referent which in first or third person singular may consist of a simple pronominal clitic. The ***-ai*** affixed or lexically derived verbs may not have an object NP; however the Patient's identity may be recoverable due to object incorporation or to a previous reference. Thus the ***-ai*** suffix may be said to be marking the place held by the Patient whose identity is somewhat or totally suppressed.

Verbs with an ***-an*** suffix do not participate in object incorporation. Lexicalized ***-an*** verbs may but the occurrence is very rare, ***maran tefin***, 'bride-price paying' is one of the few examples.

As far as the ***-an*** affixed verbs are concerned the probable reason for their nonoccurrence in object incorporation is that ***-an*** typically signals a promotion to the role of Patient from an oblique NP. To follow this promotion with an operation which strips the actant of its newly acquired identity is counterproductive. A further difference between the ***-an*** and ***-ai*** is one which relates very closely to this promotion idea. One reason for promoting an NP from an oblique phrase to Patient:DO is to make it eligible for further manipulation, e.g. passivization. The following examples trace this process:

(35) *nani faigot pana fanganan*
3s prepare INS food
'She prepared with food.'

(36) *nani faigot -an a fanganan*
3s prepare Prm NM food
'She prepared the food.'

(37) *A fanganan fo faigot -an -an*
NM food comp prepare Prm Prm
'The food was prepared.'

Notice in sentence (37) that the former object of the oblique, now the Subject, has both its promotions marked on the verb. Unfortunately this progression is not demonstrable with every verb in the lexicon. On the other hand verbs affixed with ***-ai*** need no additional affixation to be used as the Subject of a passive construction (40).

(38) *ri fo xaafan a mamaat lanef*
3p comp bury NM body yesterday
'They buried the body yesterday.'

(39) *ri fo xaafai lanef*
3p comp bury yesterday
'They buried (understood object) yesterday.'

(40) *A mamaat fo xaafai lanef*
NM body comp bury yesterday
'The body was buried yesterday.'

This particular progression contributes a great deal to our understanding of the ***-ai*** affix. In example (39) the Patient is omitted with no loss of intelligibility so the ***-ai*** is somehow holding its place and representing it. The phonology of the verb indicates it is transitive (see x/k variation page 9, ***kaafan/ai*** is not acceptable in any of these sentence). On the semantic side, sentence (38) expresses a known event; the ***-ai*** ending in both (39) and (40) express some doubt either as to the reality of the event or in the timing; there is something the speaker is not sure of. Usage of the verb ***xaafai*** also indicates there has been some previous reference/discussion about the topic and that the participants' identities have been clearly established. On this basis, sentence (39) illustrates a form of Patient suppression so that the time frame assumes added importance. The main difficulty with this interpretation is that the surface structure shows no indication that (39) and (40) are any different. Yet the insistence on the part of the native speakers is that, while (38) and (39) are roughly equivalent, sentence (40) equates to:

(41) *a mamaat fo xaafan -an lanef*
NM body comp bury Prm yesterday
'The body was buried yesterday.'

which is a very clear passive construction. Therefore (39) represents active/transitive clause while (40) represents a passive and yet their surface structure is almost identical.

Considering the data given above we can piece together the following picture of the ***-ai*** morpheme. It functions to suppress the identity of the Patient but at the same time maintains the active status of the verb. In other words, the degree of transitivity of the clause may be diminished because of the deindividuation of the Patient but this devaluation is not as extensive as in detransitivization. An ***-ai*** verb, whether lexicalized or affixed, can also function in passive constructions but whenever used the semantics indicate a nebulous quality, a degree of uncertainty.

While the Patient of an ***-ai*** affixed verb may be recoverable from the context or from an oblique within the clause itself, the primary function of this suffix appears to be Patient De-focusing. This has ramifications for the Lexicase model since the ***-ai*** suffix makes

possible sentences with only an Agent in the surface structure. In essence the suffix indicates that we must direct our attention elsewhere (to an NP other that Patient) in order to find the perceptual center of the proposition. For instance in the sentence:

(42) *ne bit -ai xulu Beno*
1s lie PDf on Beno
'I lied about something that Beno did or didn't do.'

The Patient in this frame is not specified so that the Object of the Oblique, Beno, becomes the most salient NP; answering the question "What were you lying to/kidding him (any third person) about?" A sentence composed of a Subject NP plus an *-ai* verb and no other components is, depending on the verb used, marginally acceptable at best.

(43) **ne bit -ai*
1s lie PDF

(44) *?ne pa yot -ai* (In certain contexts this statement
1s walk carry PDF is acceptable.)
'I walked carrying (these things).'

(45) *ne fi -ai mon*
1s ask PDF only
'I only/just asked.'

The fact that oblique phrases or incorporated objects are almost always required with an *-ai* lexicalized or affixed verb is seen as further evidence of the focus shifting function of the *-ai* suffix.

Object incorporation can combine with *-ai* lexicalization/ affixation to shift the focus back to the Subject NP giving greater control of the system to the speaker.

(46) *a ro mataa ve re paroxan a tefin pana galaas*
NM 3d man deic 3d spy NM woman INS glass
'Those two men, they spied on the woman with a mirror.'

(47) *a ro mataa ve re paroxai pana galaas*
NM 3d man deic 3d spy INS glass
'Those two men, they spied (on someone) with a mirror.'

(48) *a ro mataa ve re paroxai tefin pana galaas*
NM 3d man deic 3d spy woman INS glass
'Those two men, they girl-watched with a mirror.

The first sentence of these three (46), illustrates the prototypical transitive clause with Patient focus. It answers the question "What were they spying on/watching (in the mirror)?" The second sentence illustrates the Patient de-focusing aspect of the ***-ai*** suffix with the Oblique Object being the focal NP. This sentence answers the questions, "What were they doing?/ What were they spying with?" The third of these sentences (48) shows object incorporation with the ***-ai*** suffix which recentralizes the focus onto the Subject nominal. This answers the question "Who was spying on the woman/women?" Use of the ***-ai*** then alerts the hearer to the unusual circumstance of non-Patient focus and helps to direct his attention toward the most prominent NP.

5. ANTIPASSIVIZATION

Kara object incorporation fits very easily into Heath's (1976) typology for antipassivization (ANTI) under the heading of 'compounding', although the noun stem is not actually joined to the verb. A second type of ANTI found in Kara is the deletion/omission of an obvious transitive Object (TO) correlating to Heath's 'indefinite' category. Various Kara verbs, mainly having to do with fishing, may omit the TO since fish are the only possible Objects. Affixation/ Lexicalization by ***-ai***, as a Patient suppressing device, is a third Kara strategy which comes under the loose title of ANTI even though the transitive subject is not necessarily the recipient of increased prominence. The syntactic operations of passivization and antipassivization are both tied into the focus system giving added prominence to a selected NP.

ANTI in general does not create a problem for the Lexicase model since the basic definition of ANTI includes the idea of transitive subject (Agent) becoming an intransitive subject (Patient). The specifics of Kara object incorporation, as I have interpreted them, also support this idea of a change in case relation. The Kara affix ***ai*** does present a problem in as much as the model's pre-eminent CR is being

suppressed/de-emphasized in favor of another without a concurrent recentralization of the Patient CR. The Patient is simply obscured either partially or totally so that another NP can be emphasized. Given a language with a highly prominent Patient CR it seems perfectly logical that a strategy should evolve to disarm that prominence if and where desirable. The *-ai* never denies the existence of a Patient. It merely emphasizes the idea that while a Patient does exist it is not of importance in the given predication.

NOTES

1. Linguists in the Philippines typically use the term 'focus' to refer to a system of nominal markings and verbal affixes used to indicate the case relation of the Subject of a sentence (Starosta, Pawley and Reid 1981; Naylor 1975). My suggestion, although it is beyond the scope of this paper, is that all Austronesian languages have some 'focus' marking system which denotes the NP of particular interest.
2. Kara is an Austronesian language spoken by approximately 2,500 people in the northern part of New Ireland. It is a member of the Tolai-Patpatar family and is most closely related to its neighboring languages; Nalik, Tiang and Tigak. The dialect of the data presented in this paper is spoken in the area of Lemakot and Fangalava, two large villages approximately 60 kilometers south of Kavieng (page 1).
3. Chart of CRs by syntactic position (page 1)

NUCLEAR			
Prominent			
Subject	Object	Oblique	
Agent (AGT)	Correspondent (Recipient)	Locus(LCS)	Location(LOC)
Correspondent (COR) (Experiencer)	Patient	Source(SOR)	Comparison(CPN)
Patient (PAT)		Goal(GOL)	With-accompany (WTH)
		Place(PLC)	
		Means(MNS)	Benefit(BNF)
		Instrument (INS)	Possession(POS)
		Position(ON)	
		Inside(IN)	
		Indirect Cause(IDC)	
		Reason(REA)	
		Purpose(PUR)	

4. Goal/Object focus is found in various other AN languages, Tagalog (Naylor 1975:17-8) and Fijian (Wolff 1980:156) to name two. We heartily endorse Naylor's (1978) conclusion that focus is a prime factor in the genius of Austronesian languages (page 3).
5. Pronominal Forms

Subject Pronouns

	Singular	Dual	Trial	Plural
1st	*ne*	inc: *taare* exc: *maame*	*taatul* *maatul*	*taara* *maam/maa*
2nd	*no*	*me*	*mutul*	*mi*
3rd	*i* imperfective *a*perfective	re	rutul	ri

Topic/Object Pronouns

1st (Obj. only *-au*)	*nenia*	inc: *netaare* exc: *nemaame*	*netaatul* *nemaatul*	*netaara* *nemaam*
2nd	*nano*	*name*	*namutul*	*nami*
3rd (obj. only *-e*)	*nani*	*nare*	*narutul*	*nari*

Possessive markers

Singular		Non-singular	Alienable
Free	Affixed		
		Free: *i* + subj form	
1st *iga*	*-ak*		*si* + the affixed subj form
2nd *ima*	*-am/-m*		
		Affixed: -subj form	
3rd *ina*	*-na*		

6. Because it is a simple juxtaposition with little (*-ai*) or no change to either word stem we have labelled this operation as object incorporation keying on the syntactic relations. Mithun (1984) considers the identical operation as a form of noun incorporation. In any event the overall effect, in Kara, is that the DO nominal is being included in the Predicate as a modifier, so that one is not just hunting but pig-hunting.

In agreement with this Mithun says, "IN's lose their syntactic status as argument of the clause; and they are unmarked for definiteness, number or case..." thus permitting another argument of the clause to occupy the case role vacated by the IN, "... a lexical device for manipulating case relations within clauses (1983:859)."

7. Recentralization means there has been a change in perspective in which a new participant is chosen to be the perceptual center of the sentence (Starosta 1984:2).

ABBREVIATIONS

AGT	Agent
ANTI	Antipassivization
BNF	Benefix (*xaa*)
caus	Causative (*fa-*)
CPN	Comparison (*malaan*)
comp	Completive aspect (*fo*)
conj	Conjunction (*e*)
COR	Correspondent
CR	Case Relation
deic	Deictic
d	Dual
exc	Exclusive
1	First person
1st	First person possession
GER	Gerund
GOL	Goal case marker (*xe*)
IDC	Indirect cause
IN	Inside case marker (*lana*)
inc	Inclusive
inch	Inchoative (*fe-*)
INS	Instrument case marker (*mana*)
IRR	Irrealis (*taa*)
LCS	Locus (Oblique) case marker
LOC	Location case marker (*la*)
MNS	Means (Oblique) case marker
neg	Negation (*pi*)
NM	Noun marker
NOM	Nominalizer
Obj	Object
Obl	Oblique
On	Position case marker (*xulu-*)
PAT	Patient
PDf	Patient De-focusing (*-ai*)
perm	Permissive (*saa/su*)

p	Plural
PLC	Place case marker (*pe*)
POS	Possessive case marker, alienable (*si*)
Prm	Promotional marker (*-an*)
PUR	Purpose case marker (*xena*)
REA	Reason case marker (*sena*)
recp	Reciprocity
s	Singular
2	Second person
2nd	Second person possessive
SMi	Subject marker imperfective (*i*)
SMp	Subject marker perfective (*a*)
SOR	Source case marker (*ti*)
stat	Stative (*ta-*, *tala-*)
Subj	Subject
3	Third person
3rd	Third person possessive
TOP	Topic
WTH	With-accompany

REFERENCES

Abraham, W. (ed.). 1978. Valence, semantic case and grammatical relations. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1978. "Ergativity". Language 55: 59-138.

Hattori, S.; Inoue, K.; Shimomiya, T.; and Y. Nagashima (eds.). 1983. Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Linguists. Tokyo.

Heath, J. 1976. "Antipassivization; a functional typology". Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society 202-211. Berkeley: University of California.

Milner, G. 1976. "Ergative and passive in Basque and Polynesian". Oceanic Linguistics 15: 93-106.

------. 1979. "On the centrality of Austronesian syntax". In: Naylor, Paz B. (ed.) 1979: 1-17.

Mithun, M. 1983. "The evolution of noun incorporation". Language 60:847-94.

Naylor, Paz B. (ed.). 1975. "Topic, focus and emphasis in the Tagalog verbal clause". Oceanic Linguistics 14: 12-79.

——————. 1978. "Toward focus in Austronesian". In: Wurm and Carrington (eds.) 1978: 395-442.

——————. 1979. Austronesian Studies: papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Linguistics [Michigan Papers on Southeast Asia vol. 15].

Pawley, A. and Reid, L. 1979. "The evolution of transitive constructions in Austronesian". In: Naylor, Paz B. (ed.) 1979: 103-128.

Schlie, P. 1983. "Actor volitionality and Kara verb semantics". Unpublished paper.

Schlie, V. 1983. "Topicality and Individuation as indices of transitivity: the Kara passive". Unpublished paper.

Starosta, S. 1978. "The one per cent solution". In: Abraham (ed.) 1978: 459-576.

——————. 1982. "Case relations perspective and patient centrality". University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 14: 1-34.

——————. 1983. "Patient centrality and English verbal derivation". In: Hattori, S.; Inoue, K.; Shimomiya, T.; and Nagashima, Y. (eds.) 1983: 489-92.

Starosta, S.; Pawley, A.; and Reid, L. 1982. "The evolution of focus in Austronesian". In: Wurm and Carrington (eds.) 1982: 145-70.

Tchekhoff, C. 1981. Simple sentences in Tongan [Pacific Linguistics B.81].

Van Valin, R.D. 1980. "On the distribution of passive and antipassive constructions in universal grammar". Lingua 50: 303-28.

Wolff, J. 1979. "Verbal morphology and verbal sentences in Proto- Austronesian". In: Naylor, Paz B. (ed.) 1979: 153-67.

Wurm, S.A.; and Carrington, L. (eds.). 1978. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics. Fascicle one: Western Austronesia [Pacific Linguistics C.61].

——————. 1982. Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian vol. 2: Tracking the Travellers [Pacific Linguistics C.75].