

Pronouns, Clitics, Orders and Grammaticalization: Theoretical Issues in *Tukang Besi*

Mark Donohue

National University of Singapore

Tukang Besi, an Austronesian language from central Indonesia (Donohue 1999), does not have strict ordering of its independent pronominals, unlike many of its Austronesian relatives:

- (1) No-'ita='e na 'obu te amai.
3R-see=3P NOM dog CORE 3PL

'They saw the dog.'

- (2) No'ita'e te amai na 'obu.

The order of bound elements is, however, fixed: for all main verbs S, A prefixes are obligatory, while P enclitics are optional. In both (3) and (4) the prefix *ku-* and the clitic *=e* are shown in the only possible order in which they may appear.

- (3) Ku-'ita='e na 'obu.
1SG-see=3P NOM dog

'I saw the dog.'

- (4) Ku-'ita te 'obu.
1SG-see CORE dog

'I saw the dog.'

On these verbs the post-root enclitics resemble the independent forms more than do the prefixes, as seen through a comparison of the first person verbal forms in (5). There are two prefixal forms for all but the 1sg, marking realis and irrealis.

	Independent	Post-root (P) enclitic	Pre-root prefix (S,A)
(5) 1singular	<i>iaku</i>	=aku	<i>ku-</i>
1paucal	<i>ikami</i>	=kami	<i>ko- / ka-</i>
1plural	<i>ikita</i>	=kita	<i>to- / ta-</i>

Models of grammaticalization model the appearance of agreement as being the cliticization, and later affixation, of pronominals, which lose phonological material and independent (and sometimes pronominal) status (Givón 1976, Bresnan and Mchombo 1987, among others). The more divergent the bound form is from the independent form, the greater the time depth of its binding, and so the less independent the form (Harris and Campbell 1995). By this model the prefixal forms would count as more highly grammaticalized than the enclitic forms.

I argue that the pre-root set is in fact less tightly bound to the verb than the post-root set, and that the apparent freedom of pronominals in (1) and (2) is epiphenomenal, relying on the misinterpretation of words such as *amai* (and *iaku*, *ikami*, *ikita* etc.) as pronouns. The evidence presented comes from a variety of modules of grammar:

- prosodic: the prefixes may be separated from the verb they appear with by a hesitation pause (not possible for the enclitics)
- morphological: *Tukang Besi* reflects the infix *-um-*. This infix appears before the first vowel of a root, but prefixes do not count as part of the relevant domain.
- semantic: the prefixes mark the realis/irrealis distinction, a grammatical feature normally associated with high scope.
- acquisitional: the enclitics are acquired earlier than the prefixes.

Completing the picture of pronominals and grammaticalization, I argue that the independent pronominals are not pronouns at all, but rather discourse-variable nouns.

ABBREVIATIONS

1, (2), 3: first, second and third person; SG, PL: singular, plural; A, S, and P: following Comrie (1978); R: realis; NOM: nominative, the most grammatically privileged argument in the clause; CORE: an argument that is not nominative, but still not oblique.

REFERENCES

- Bresnan, Joan, and Sam Mchombo. 1987. Topic, pronoun, and agreement in Chichewa. *Language* 63(4): 741-782.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1978. Ergativity. In *Syntactic typology: Studies in the phenomenology of language*, ed. by Winifred P. Lehmann, ed., 329-394. Sussex: The Harvester Press.
- Donohue, Mark. 1999. *A grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Givón, Talmy. 1976. Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement. In *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 149-188. New York: Academic Press.
- Harris, Alice C., and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.