

Verb serialization in Fataluku¹
The case of ‘take’
Aone van Engelenhoven

1. introduction

Fataluku is spoken in the Lautém District², the easternmost district of the republic of East Timor. With about 30.000 speakers it is the fourth language in size in the country. Together with Makalero and Makasai that are spoken in the regions bordering on the Viqueque and Baucau districts, respectively, Fataluku is classified as a ‘Papuan’ or ‘non-Austronesian’ language from the Trans-New Guinea Phylum (Hull 2004 and the references therein). The tiny Makuva language spoken in the eastern Tutuala Subdistrict is the only Austronesian language (Engelenhoven and Valentim 2006 and the references therein). Hull (2001) distinguishes five dialects that are all mutually intelligible: Northwest, spoken on the border with Baucau District; North, spoken in and around Lautém; Central, spoken in on and west of the table-land; South, spoken in and around Loré, and East, which is spoken in the Tutuala Subdistrict.³ Examples in this paper are mainly from the Central dialect spoken in and around the capital Lospalos unless otherwise stated.

From a typological perspective, Fataluku morphology adheres to the general pattern found among Austronesian languages in the Timor Sprachbund, which in itself is part of the larger East Nusantara region (Klamer 2002). The main feature that distinguishes the non-Austronesian languages (NAN languages for short), and thus Fataluku, from their Austronesian neighbours on Timor is their verb final word order (Hull 2004). One of the features that Fataluku shares with all Timor languages and that interests us here is the phenomenon of long stretches of verbs, loosely identified in the literature as ‘verb serialisation’. Although there still is no consensus among linguists on verb serialisation⁴, Staden and Reesink (in press) provide an overview that is workable for Fataluku. They define serial verb constructions, or SVCs, very loosely as: “[c]onstructions in which two or more verbs occur in a single clause and none of the verbs is formally subordinated to the other.” In the following sections we will describe constructions in Fataluku that fulfil these requirements.

2. motions and aspects

The Austronesian languages in the region usually feature SVCs in which one of the verbs specify the direction (as in Waima’a, Hull 2002) or possessive constructions in which the possession noun refers to a location (as in Leti, Engelenhoven 2004). NAN languages from this pattern in that they prefer postpositions (as in Makasai, Huber 2005). In Fataluku, these postpositions may dock on the verb as a prefix, as is exemplified by *mica* ‘on top of’ and *hia* ‘up’ in the following sentence.

¹ The research underlying this paper has been conducted in the Fataluku Language Project within the Endangered Languages Programme, funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (project no. 256-70-560, 2005-2008). I like to thank Fr. Anibal Fernandes (Ossu), Zequito Oliveiro (Oxford) and Justino Valentim Cailoru (Titolari) for their advice. Special thanks to Jim Hewitt, Juliette Huber, Geoffrey Hull, Ruben Stoel and Hein Steinhauer, who generously allowed me to browse through their data and gave me additional information. Of course, I am the only one to blame for any mistake in this paper.

² Names of places are written in the official Portuguese spelling.

³ Hull’s (2001) dialect division is based on sound changes and lexical differences. Valentim 2001 provides a division that is based on folk perception, which seems to follow Hull’s division in great outline. However, it combines Hull’s north and northwest dialect into a single dialect and adds separate status to the isolect of Cacavem in the Lospalos Subdistrict.

⁴ Cf. Newmeyer 2004 for a discussion.

- (1) ... malai piti-ne le afa Ø mica-nat-e hia-moi ...
 foreigner white-VEB house [1plinc.S Ø on-stand-VEB]up-ascend
 “... a white stranger climbed the house we were standing on ...”

The example above shows a sequence of two verbs that, however, cannot be an SVC, because *micanate* ‘stand on’ is the predicate in a relative clause (marked with square brackets in the gloss), whereas *hiamoi* ‘ascend on to’ is the predicate in the main clause. There are no formal or prosodic clues, however, to distinguish the subordinated relative clause from the main clause. *Hiamoi* ‘ascend on to’ shows that Fataluku may encode motion towards a goal by means of a transitive verb. Alternatively, the motion may be encoded by an intransitive verb like *fulehe* ‘return’, in which case a second, transitive verb *mara* ‘go to’ is required whose object refers to the goal.

- (2) Tarute ivi fuleh-e Dili mara ?
 when DEM return-VEB Dili go
 “When does it go back to Dili?”

Hull (2005:45) reports that the direction verbs *la’a* ‘go’ and its counterpart *ma’u* ‘come’⁵ may also occur without *mara* ‘go to’: *Afa la’a Baukau ana up-e?* (1plinc.S go Baucau or NEG-VEB) ‘Are we going to Baucau (or not)?’⁶ *La’a* in example (3) shows that in Fataluku a direction verb may be used to indicate the beginning of the action referred to by the following verb.⁷ This use to signal an inchoative aspect is a typical feature of motion verbs in SVCs, according to Payne (2006:311).

- (3) Aleh-e la’a i hin=i fa’i.
 appear-VEB go POS possession=DEM do

“It turned out he began to do his (part).” (The Eagle and the Monkeys)

This sentence looks like a typical SVC where the motion element in the meaning of *la’a* seems either suppressed or bleached. One element that is absent in the definition of Staden and Reesink (in press) but is often mentioned as a feature of verb serialisation, is that all verbs share the same tense, aspect or modality markers.⁸ The Fataluku construction, then, does not fulfil the requirement of a true SVC, because here, both verbs can be marked independently for aspect. This is exemplified in (4) where *la’a* and the subsequent numeral verb *ta’an- ece* ‘twenty’ are marked for perfective aspect and future tense, respectively.

⁵ He analyses them, however, as adpositions rather than verbs (p. 45).

⁶ McWilliam (2005) considers the verb *la’a* ‘go’ to be derived from the Austronesian **lakaw* ‘go’. Klammer (in press) makes a similar suggestion for the Teiwa and Kaera cognates of the Fataluku *ma’u* ‘come’, which should be derived from the Austronesian **maRi* ‘come’. If both motion verbs actually are Austronesian loans, this would explain the aberrant constructions found in the Central dialect where *la’a* ‘go’ functions rather as a kind of preposition (example a), comparable to the constructions found in the Austronesian languages surrounding Fataluku (e.g. the Leti translation in example b). In fact, the target of the loan would have been the entire construction (verb + object) rather than the verb alone.

a) Lala ere prezente la’a a lanura ere.
 Thing PL present go 1sg friend.PL PL

“These things are presents for my friends.” (Hull 2005:45)

b) Samèka- Samèk=di hadia la talan-ku=ra.
 REP-thing=DEM present go friend-1sgP=PL

“These things are presents for my friends.” (Leti)

Hull (2004), however, who acknowledges the cognacy of *ma’u* with Teiwa *ma* (page 45), does not relate it to an Austronesian source.

⁷ This use has been attested only in a few instances with *ma’u* ‘come’.

⁸ See, for example, the definition in the SIL glossary of linguistic terms (<http://www.sil.org/linguistics/glossaryoflinguisticterms/WhatIsASerialVerbConstruction.htm>). Payne (2006:308) formulates it in a slightly different way but comes to a similar conclusion.

- (4) ... hai la'a kilumetru ula ta'an-ec-e ...
 PERF go kilometre FUT ten-two-VEB
 “(If we go down the road now) it will be twenty kilometres...”
 (The Monkey and the Crab)

Another feature that challenges the SVC character of constructions with initial direction verbs appears in formal discourse, which is often produced in a much slower pace or is written. Here, a coordination clitic /=*nu*~=*n*/ that signals simultaneous events intervenes between both verbs and restructures them as separate predicates rather than serialised verbs within a single clause. This is displayed in the answer to Question 133 in the Fataluku Catechism where *la'a* is separated from *mara* by the simultaneous coordination marker (SIM).

- (5) Uruvacu loi-nana rekis-e, huma'ara ere la'a=*n*
 God judge-NOM cut-VEB soul PL go=*SIM*
 Nelū,
 Heaven Purgatoriu ali Infernu mara.
 Purgatory again Hell go
 “When God passes His judgement, the souls go to Heaven, the Purgatory, or Hell.”
 (Question 133, Fataluku Catechism)

Constructions where the direction verb is the second verb are more in line with the idea of an SVC where the consecutive verbs are combined within one clause. These constructions occur in both formal and nonformal speech. Here, they indicate whether the movement profiled by the verb is toward the speaker (*ma'u*) or not (*la'a*). Both verbs can only share a single TAM marker and cannot be separated by a simultaneous coordination clitic. The following example contains two direction verbs in combination with the bound morpheme *pe*, translated here as ‘move’.⁹ *Ma'u* ‘come’ at the right side of *pe* signals that the movement is toward the speaker. *Ma'u* left of the object is the only alternative to mark the inchoative aspect with.

- (6) Ma'u her-ana// patut-ana hi'a-pe=*ma'u*.
 come dry-NOM// dry-NOM up-move=*come*

“They once began to arrive on the beach and the bank.” (South, Campagnolo 1973:189)

The construction in which aspectual *ma'u* was replaced by its counterpart *la'a* was unanimously rejected by all informants. However, we have not been able to pinpoint whether this was motivated by grammatical or stylistic considerations.¹⁰ As far as we know from our database, however, combinations of aspectual *ma'u* with its ‘directive’ *la'a* or aspectual *la'a* with ‘directive’ *ma'u* do not occur.

The other motion verb that combines into ‘verb strings’ is *nere* ‘follow’. As can be expected, it combines easily with the direction verbs, for example *nere=ma'u* (follow=come) ‘follow in the direction of the speaker’ or *la'a nere* (go follow) ‘begin to follow’. It can only occur as the first member in other combinations, as for example *nere lauh-e* (follow live-VEB).

⁹This gloss follows Campagnolo’s (1973:146) categorisation of *pe* as a verbal root (‘radical verbal’), meaning ‘to move (onself)’ (‘*se déplacer*’). Valentim (2002:70), acknowledges its verbal character by mentioning its allomorph *ape* (‘it.move’) where the initial vowel endophorically refers to an object in a previous clause. Nacher (2004:145), on the other hand, categorises this morpheme rather as ‘a ligature particle inserted between verbs of movement’. *Pe* is usually attested with a direction verb, except for *horu-pe* (with-move) ‘accompany’ and the fixed expression *mu'a futu-pe* (soil on-move) ‘walk on foot’. This suggests that the direction verbs profile the actual movement that is lacking in the semantic ‘make-up’ of *pe* itself. Hull (2005:32) prefers to analyse the segment *pe* as part of a bound allomorph of *la'a* ‘go’ or *ma'u* ‘come’: *-pela'a* and *-pema'u*.

¹⁰Fataluku speakers are obsessed with the correctness of their speech. The name Fataluku itself means ‘speaking correctly’. From a methodological point of view, therefore, it is often not clear whether a speaker’s assessment reflects ideas on grammar or style.

- (7) Jesus hin palu ho nalu i h-eluh-ana nere lauh-e.
 J. POS father and mother POS LNK-want-NOM follow live-VEB
 “Jesus lived according to the will of his father and mother.” (Question 63, Fataluku Catechism)

Observe in (8a), however, that ‘make’ uses its bound allomorph *pa’i* rather than its free form *fa’i* as in (8b). In (8a) *nere* is part of the predicate in the main clause, whereas in (8b) it is the predicate in the subordinated clause (marked in the glosses by square brackets).

- (8a) A hair i cal ta’a nere pa’i ...
 2sg.S IMP.INCH [2pl ancestor say] follow make
 “You must do as your grandfather says...” (Hull 2005:52)¹¹

- (8b) Eru bisikleta tu eme a nere fa’i ?
 2sg.EMP bike [SEQ it.take 1sg follow]make
 “Did you make the bike he is following me with?”

Campagnolo (1973: 110-116) observed a productive process of phoneme mutation in compounding where an initial labial fricative /f/ and dental occlusive /t/ are exchanged for their respective labial and palatal occlusive counterparts /p/ and /c/. Similarly, the palatal occlusive /c/ replaces respectively the glottal and alveolar fricatives /h/ and /s/ in morpheme-initial position. As such, *nere pa’i* (follow make) in (8a) is a compound rather than an SVC containing separate verbs.

To summarise, the only construction containing direction verbs that corresponds to an SVC is the one where the direction verb is in second position, as in example (6). Huber (2005:67) reports a similar construction in its cogener Makasai that is spoken to the West of the Fataluku region. Staden and Reesink (in press) identify this SVC type also in its Austronesian off-shore neighbour Leti in Southwest Maluku. The optional presence of a subject agreement marker enables the authors to identify this SVC type in Leti as dependent serialisation, which they define as a construction where only one verb carries all the inflections. Since Fataluku lacks inflection altogether, another feature that addresses better to Fataluku, is the fact that universally the verbs in dependent SVCs seem to share the subject argument (Staden and Reesink, paragraph 3.2). In Fataluku, the verbs in constructions with direction verbs in final position indeed share the same subject.

Staden and Reesink suggest that in dependent serialisation verb phrases can be conceived of as “[c]ontaining ... a (subordinated) adverbial”. Indeed, in (6) above *hi’a-pe* (up-move) modifies the main verb *ma’u* ‘come’. However, most deverbal adverbialisations in Fataluku require nominalisation. In the following example this is shown by the suffix *-nu* (NOM) on the verb *coto* (< *toto*) ‘see’.

- (9) Afa ... tour-u tu relijaun i telira nere me
 1plinc.S mass-NOM SEQ religion POS different follow take
 ranu (<rau-nu) coto ...
 good-NOM see
 “We ... look friendly to people that adhere to a different religion ...” (Question 118, Fataluku Catechism)

The final verb ‘see’ *coto* < *toto* displays a similar consonant mutation as ‘make’ *pa’i* < *fa’i* in (8a). This phenomenon enables an interpretation of *ranu* (< *rau-nu* ‘good-NOM’) as an incorporated object of ‘see’¹² rather than as a true adverb. Also, the constituent *tour-u tu relijaun i telira nere* (mass-NOM SEQ religion POS different follow) ‘people that adhere to a different religion’ is the object of the verb *me* ‘take’. This construction will be elaborated in paragraph 4 below.

¹¹ The orthography used in Hull’s example has been modified here.

¹² Compare the following sentence where *ranu* ‘goodness’ is a genuine object and the verb *toto* ‘see’ remain unchanged: *Ana e ranu toto* (1sg.S 2sg goodness see) “I see your goodness.”

3. modality and coordinations

Modal verbs appear in Fataluku in coordinations. Beside asyndetic coordination there are two clitics that function as conjunctions. =*tu~t* (SEQ) ‘and then’ signals that the events described in the coordinated clauses are consecutive in time, as for example in (10).

- (10) Ca’u-taka en tahin-e tu tava ica tutu.
 hat DEM beautiful-VEB SEQ 3sg heart like
 “It likes the hat, because it is beautiful.” (Cacavém, LDTC)

Although Fataluku does have a conjunction-like particle to encode the reason why the event referred to in a clause takes place (*hinua* (possession.NOM.ART) ‘because, for’), a sequential coordination as in (10) is still preferred. The conjunction =*nu~n* (SIM) ‘and’ signals that the events in the coordinated clauses take place simultaneously. This conjunction optionally occurs when direction verbs refer to the inchoative aspect as explained the paragraph above (see also example (5)). The following sentence displays an example where the events in the coordinated clauses clearly take place simultaneously.

- (11) Ana analyze fa’i=n Jim em Ingles mucu-pe=la’a.
 1sg.S analysis make=SIM J. it.take English in-move=go
 “I do the analysis and Jim puts it into English.”

With the modal verbs *eluh-e* ‘want-VEB’, *keluh-e* ‘refuse-VEB’¹³ and *uhul-e* ‘it.can-VEB’ the simultaneous and sequential conjunctions indicate that the subjects of the coordinated clauses are the same or not, respectively.¹⁴ In (12a) *tu* (SEQ) confirms that the subject in the second clause is different from the one in the first clause. In (12b) *nu* signals that the subjects in both clauses are the same, which is confirmed by its absence in the second clause.

- (12a) Ana eluh-e tu eru a navar-u navar-e.
 1sg.S want-VEB SEQ 2sg.EMP 1sg know-NOM know- VEB
 “I want you to know what I know.”
 (12b) Ana eluh-e=n e navar-u navar-e.
 1sg.S want-VEB=SIM 2sg know-NOM know-VEB
 “I want to know what you know.”

Keluh-e ‘refuse-VEB’ differs from the other modality verbs in that it requires the second clause to be negated as is exemplified in (13a). Observe in (13b) that only the modality verb *uhul-e* ‘it.can-VEB’ is negated. The negation marker *aka~ka* (NEG) is combined in these examples with the verb ‘take’.¹⁵ The discussion on this phenomenon will be taken up in paragraph 4.

- (13a) Ma’ar keluh-e=n aka=m afi fihar-e.
 human refuse-VEB=SIM NEG=take 1plinc believe-VEB
 “People do not want to believe in us.”
 (13b) Ana ka=me uhul-e=n fanu vata ara lafai
 1sg.S NEG=take it.canVEB=SIM front coconut trunk big
 i hi’a-moi...
 DEM up-ascend
 “I cannot climb this coconut tree...” (PARADISEC)

¹³ Hull (2005:35) analyses *keluh-e* ‘refuse’ to have derived from *akam eluh-e* (NEG want-VEB) ‘not want’. The use of such an inherently negated verb is typical for the region and has been attested in the Austronesian neighbours of Fataluku Waima’a (cf. Belo et al. 2005) and Leti (Engelenhoven 2004) and in its non-Austronesian neighbours Makasai (Huber 2005) and Makalero (Juliette Huber, p.c.).

¹⁴ Donohue and Brown (1999) and Faust (2005) observed a similar construction in the closely related Oirata language spoken on the Southwest Malukan island of Kisar. Here, same subject (Donohue and Brown)/simultaneous action (Faust) is signalled by *le*, while different subject (Donohue and Brown)/ sequential action (Faust) is signalled by *to*.

¹⁵ Only in the East dialect the negator seems to occur frequently without ‘take’, see paragraph 5.

Fataluku does not have exclusive lexical morphemes that relate to the concepts ‘must’ and ‘may’. The deontic modality is signalled by means of the verb ‘send’, as in example (14a). As can be seen the first person exclusive pronoun uses the object/possessor allomorph *ini* rather than the subject allomorph *ina*.

(14a) ... *ini har ihir-e tu ula oras fat-e va’a-ne.*
 1plex send wait-VEB SEQ FUT hour four-VEB like-VEB

“(and then) we had to wait for four hours.” (Fataluku Speakers Website)

Example (14b) from the Fataluku Catechism shows that the scenario of sending something is metaphorically mapped on to the scenario of forcing somebody to do something. This is why the scene’s participant in both (14a) and (14b) are encoded as objects.¹⁶ Unlike the concepts of ‘wanting’ and ‘being able’, the participant is not in control and thus not a candidate for subjecthood.

(14b) ... *Uruvacu afi har ina fa’i?*
 God 1plinc send what make

“What does God order us to do ... ? (Question 364, Fataluku Catechism)

As can be seen from the examples, ‘send’ lacks a verbal suffix in this function, which suggests that it has entered a process of grammaticalisation. Hull (2005:35), for example, consequently renders the modal verb ‘must’ as *haru*. This suggests that his informants considered it as an adverbial derived through deverbal nominalisation (refer to example (9) above).¹⁷

A similar observation applies to the verb *tene* ‘may’, which we hypothesise to be derived from the verb *te’e-ne* ‘taste/try-VEB’. Again, pronouns are encoded as objects and the verb may occur without a final vowel. In explicit, written speech, it has been attested also with a nominalising vowel *-u*.¹⁸ The following example has been taken from Nacher’s Fataluku dictionary.

(15) *E tene po’ot-e, ana ?*¹⁹
 2sg may ill-VEB or

“Are you ill, perhaps?” (Nacher 2002/2003:155)

The constructions in which the verb ‘send’ appears in its deontic function correspond to what Staden and Reesink (in press, paragraph 3.3) call ‘co-dependent serialisation’ in which the object of the first clause is the subject in the second clause. Unlike the serialisation types mentioned in the previous paragraph, negation and aspect marking have not been attested with deontic *har-e~har* in our database, because of which they cannot be used as diagnostic instruments to identify ‘modal serialisation’. Deontic *har~har-e* is mutually exclusive with

¹⁶ Hence, *afi* ‘1plinc’, instead of the subject allomorph *afa* ‘1plinc.S’.

¹⁷ Hull (2005) has an appendix containing the parable of the Lost Son (Luke 15), where ‘must’ is written as *haru*. Since Hull (2005) acknowledges that his informants are from Lautém and Lospalos, we suppose the addition of the *-u* to be a hypercorrection in the Central dialect that is known for its preference of deleting final vowels. In a personal communication, Geoffrey Hull points at Nacher’s (2002/2003:165) lemma *haru~har* translated as ‘linking particle of obligation...’ (my translation of the Portuguese original) and proposes it to have derived from the Indonesian *harus* ‘must’. This proposal, however, does not explain the use of ‘non-subject’ pronouns with *haru~har*. Nacher’s example under the same entry rather supports the analysis proposed in this paper:

Ocava tu afi har umu.
 Lord SEQ 1plinc send die

‘It is God who orders us to die.’

¹⁸ Cf. *Afi tenu hul-ana fa’i=n afi Ocava i fanav-ana*
 1plinc may power-NOM make=SIM 1plinc Lord POS teach-NOM
navar-e.
 Know-VEB

“We must try to know the teaching of our Lord.” (Hewitt and Oliveira, ms)

¹⁹ In the printed text a comma was added after *e* ‘2sg’. My attention was directed to this typographic error by one of the contributors to the manuscript who said that in case of a comma intonation the emphatic pronoun *eru* ‘2sg.EMP’ should have been used.

the vetative marker *tapa* (VET) that signals negative obligation ('must not') and with the imperative inchoative marker *hair* (IMP.INCH)²⁰ (see example (8a) above).

Similar observations can be made for *tene* 'may', which because of its use of object pronouns is here analysed as a transitive verb. It always occurs directly after the subject where it signals an irrealis mode. Negation and aspect, however, are rather marked after and never before *tene*, as in example (16). This suggests that its process of grammaticalisation has progressed even further progressed than *har~har-e*, making it into a function word rather than a true verb.

- (16) A luku-luku-n ica tene aka=m mais-e ...
 1sg RED-speak-NOM some may NEG=take right-VEB
 "If some of my words may not be right ..."

4. locations, directions and adpositions

Most discussions on verb serialisation in Southeast Asian and Oceanic languages pay much attention to constructions where verbs have taken over the function of what adpositions do in other language types. In the Austronesian languages in the larger Timor region²¹, locations are generally referred to by means of 'locational nouns' that are encoded as possessions in possessive constructions. These constructions themselves are then the object of a directional verb, which may be grammaticalised or not.²² In Fataluku, however, locations are rather referred to by a verb, for example *mucu-ne* 'be.inside-VEB', *mica-ne* 'be.on.top-VEB', *malu-ne* 'be.outside-VEB'. The only locative construction we know of that compares to its Austronesian fellows in the Sprachbund is 'in front of', which uses the noun 'face' as a locational noun: *Tupur eni le fanu mir-e* (woman DEM house face sit-VEB) 'This woman sits in front of the house.' However, it is rather the locative verb *na'-e* (LOC-VEB) 'be (somewhere)' that is a candidate for an SVC.

- (17a) I ta i nar nop afa e na'-e
 DEM SEQ DEM if morning 1plinc.S DEM LOC-VEB
 kalus-e.
 race-VEB

"In that case we race here tomorrow." (The Monkey and the Crab)

Fataluku diverges from the general pattern in the region that it seems to mark location more frequently than for example the Austronesian Tetum (Timor) or Leti (Southwest Maluku). The reason for this may be that in Fataluku 'adpositional' morphemes may occur prefixed on the verb, creating transitive constructions with a locational object. These are single phrase constructions whereas the locative constructions in Leti, for example, are complex phrases containing a possessor phrase referring to an entity ('whole') and the possession phrase referring to a part on that entity. In (17b), an allomorph of the locative morpheme *na'* 'LOC' that was used verbally in (17a) now occurs prefixed on the verb 'make'. The f>p change discussed above confirms the morphological unity of the adpositional prefix and the verb.

²⁰ The vetative and imperative inchoative marker have been attested together:

A tapa hair capaku cere.
 2sg.S VET IMP.INCH tobacco smoke
 "You must not smoke from now on." (Hull 2005:40).

²¹ Although he confined himself rather to the Austronesian languages on the island, Hull (2001b) defined a 'Timor Sprachbund' where the languages show a similar morphological make-up declining towards an isolative type. Later on (Hull 2004), he found that also the non-Austronesian languages on the island were part of the 'Timor Sprachbund'. Whereas Southwest Maluku is clearly included in the Sprachbund (Engelenhoven 2003, 2004 and the references therein), it is still not clear where the boundaries of the larger 'Timor Sprachbund' may be within the East Nusantara region (Steinhauer 1996, Engelenhoven 2006).

²² Sometimes there may be a genuine locative marker, for example *lo* in Leti.

- (17b) A le, ana eme nu Dili na-pa'i (< fa'i).
 1sg house 1sg.S it.take SIM D. LOC-make
 "My house, I build it in Dili."²³ (Valentim 2001b)

The morphological integrity of the adpositional prefix and the verb is syntactically confirmed by the placement of the perfective *hai* (PERF) particle that directly precedes the verb and as such can intervene between the verb and the object. This is shown in the following example where *hai* (PERF) (underlined in the text) is placed between the adpositional prefix *horu* 'with'²⁴ and the comitative object *Uruvacu* 'God'.

- (18) ... ivi hinua tavaru aka=m uhul-e=n
 DEM possession.NOM.ART 3pl NEG=take it.can-VEB=SIM
 Uruvacu hai horu-lauh-e.
 God PERF with-live-VEB
 "... therefore they could not live with God." (Question 269, Fataluku Catechism)

Fataluku lacks a lexical morpheme to indicate an ablative motion like its non-Austronesian neighbours Makasai and Makalero (Juliette Huber, p.c.) to the west, and its Austronesian neighbours to the east in Southwest Maluku. However, whereas its neighbours use a construction in which a sequential marker (underlined in example(19a)) combines two clauses, Fataluku rather uses a simultaneous coordination marker (underlined in example 19b) that signals that the events in both clauses take place at the same time.

- (19a) Ani Dili isi'i ini ma'u.
 3sg Dili be.at SEQ come
 "I come from Dili." (Makalero, Juliette Huber p.c.)
 (19b) Thomas Tutuala na'e=n hai ma'u.
 Thomas Tutuala LOC-VEB=SIM PERF come
 "Thomas came from Tutuala."

Oco 'hit' and *la'a* 'go' are both attested functioning as 'adpositional' verbs (after Klinken 2000) meaning 'about, concerning'. The first occurs in the Fataluku Catechism (example 20) and equals the use of *meng-ena-i* (ACT-hit-APPL) 'concern' in Indonesian and 'touch' in Timorese languages²⁵.

- (20) ... utu'e nu emer-e Uruvacu oco,
 three-VEB SIM first-VEB God hit
 i tour-u fitu ma'ar lauh-ana oco.
 POS mass-NOM seven man live-NOM hit
 "... the first three are about God, the remaining seven are about Man." (Question 296, Fataluku Catechism)

However, as observed by Hull (2005), especially in the Central dialect *la'a* is more and more preferred to indicate this meaning. This use of 'go' has been attested as a marginal strategy in Southwest Malukan languages like Leti for which there is no alternative construction. Since it

²³ A literal translation is: "My house, I take it and build it in Dili." This use of the 'implied object allomorph' of 'take' is discussed in paragraph 6.

²⁴ Cf. *horu-ne* (with-VEB) 'be with'.

²⁵ Cf. The Tetum version of Wikipedia provides the following definition of the Declaration of Human Rights:

Deklarasaun	kona	Ema	tomak	nia	direitu,				
Declaration	touch	man	all	POS	right				
Lia	ne'e	fo	tada	kona	Ema	tomak	nia	Direitu, iha	mundu raiklaran.
Word	DEM	give	sign	touch	man	all	POS	right	LOC world world

"Declaration of Human Rights: these words define the rights of all people in the world."

(http://tet.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deklarasaun_Univers%C3%A1l_Direitus_Umanus_Nian)

In colloquial Tetum and in Waima'a (Baucau District), which is the nearest Austronesian language to Fataluku, 'touch' and 'go' are usually combined, e.g. *kona-ba* (touch-go) and *gene-la* (touch-go), respectively (Belo et al. 2005). The use of the dash here is based on the East Timorese national orthography and does not reflect whether these combinations are SVCs or not.

does not occur either in the other languages of Timor as far as we know, this suggests that this use of *la'a* is exclusive to Fataluku.

(21) Aci-ta'a-n la'a rata hin=i, sosiolinguistika ho
 see-say-NOM go past possession=DEM sociolinguistics and
 gramatika i na-na'-ana, afa uhul-e=n eler-e:..
 grammar POS RED-LOC-NOM 1plinc.S it.can-VEB it.read-VEB
 “We can read information about its history, sociolinguistics and the condition of the
 grammar in: ...” (Tekeni na-kakre makuvo?, page 7)²⁶

The word meaning ‘information’ in (21) shows another verb with an ‘adpositional’ function. It is a nominalisation of the verbs *aci* ‘see’ and *ta'a* ‘say’. The object *hopon=i* (inform=DEM) ‘the information’ in (22a) separates *ta'a* ‘say’ from *e n-aci* (2sg LNK-see) ‘see you/to you’, suggesting that both verbs establish two asyndetically coordinated clauses.

(22a) Ana ma'u e n-aci hopon=i ta'a.
 1sg.S come 2sg LNK-see inform=DEM say
 “I come to tell you the information.” (Nacher 2002/2003:141)²⁷

In paragraph 2 above, it was explained that the motion verbs *la'a* ‘go’ and *ma'u* ‘come’ can mark aspect in the first of two combined clauses. The coordination could be unmarked, as in example (3) above, or optionally be marked by means of the enclitic =*n~nu* (SIM), which signals that the events profiled in both clauses take place simultaneously, as in example (5) above. In the sentence in example (22a), then, the segment *Ana ma'u* (1sg.S come) ‘I come’ is asyndetically coordinated to the ‘clause series’ *e n-aci hopon=i ta'a* (2sg LNK-see inform=DEM say) ‘tell you the information’. The combination of these latter two verbs conforms more to the idea of an SVC, because they cannot be separated from each other by a coordinator. Example (22b) shows that the perfective marker *hai* (PERF) (underlined in the text) is added to *aci* ‘see’ and not to *ta'a* ‘say’.

(22b) Tapi fa'i=n lu'a en-en la'a le mara
 true make=SIM monkey RED-DEM go house go
 nita hai n-aci ta'a.
 REC PERF LNK-see say.

“That’s what they did and the monkeys went home and spoke with each other.” (The Eagle and the Monkeys)

Otherwise formulated, the meaning of *ta'a* ‘say’ makes it a candidate for ‘main verb-hood’, because it carries the main semantic load of the construction. The verb *aci* ‘see’, however, carries the aspect marker, because of which the construction can be defined as a dependent SVC in Staden’s and Reesink’s definition. The series cannot be analysed as a compound, because then *ta'a* would have displayed a dental-to-palatal mutation /t/ > /c/, as in *tatan-u ca'a* (against-NOM say) ‘oppose, contradict’, or *nere-ca'a* (follow-say) ‘imitate in speaking’.

5. ‘Take’ 1: causative constructions and negation

Thus far, the verb ‘take’ has appeared in many examples above for which no explanation has been given yet. ‘Take’, very generally, profiles a scene in which an entity, prototypically a human, grasps another entity, prototypically not human, and transfers it to another location. It has two major allomorphs, *eme* and *me*. *Eme* never occurs with an object, but signals that it has been mentioned in a previous clause. *Me* always occurs with an object and often reduces to /m/ after a noun that ends in a vowel. Unlike English and many other languages, Fataluku

²⁶ The Fataluku text was translated from the Tetum original printed on page 6 in the booklet, which actually translates as: “Information about the history, sociolinguistic situation and grammar of the Makuva language can be read in the articles: ...”.

²⁷ The original Portuguese translation is slightly different: “vim dizer-te meu pensamento”: “I came to tell you my thoughts.”

does not lexically distinguish between ‘taking (away from someone or some place)’ and ‘bringing (or taking to someone or some place)’. Like in most other languages on Timor and in Southwest Maluku the direction of the transfer is indicated by a separate verb, in Fataluku by *la’a* ‘go’ or *ma’u* ‘come’. Hull (2005:32) proposes that *eme* ‘(it.)take’ be a prefix that changes intransitive verbs into transitive verbs. His analysis does not distinguish vowel-initial allomorphs having ‘implied objects’ that are seemingly used intransitively from allomorphs with initial consonants in transitive constructions with objects. Consequently, he considers the combination *eme* ‘it.take’ + *oto’e* ‘it.enter’ to be a derivation *em-oto’e* ‘insert’ rather than a SVC *em oto’e* as we analyse it here. The following sentence shows that (*e*)*me* ‘(it) take’ plus verb constitutes rather a causative construction that can be a co-dependent SVC if one considers the object of ‘take’, *fanu* ‘face’, to be co-referentially deleted as the subject of ‘go’ (indicated in the text by \emptyset). Alternatively, if one considers the subject of ‘take’, *Fataluku ho Makuva moco-r* ‘Fatalukus and Makuvas’, to be co-referentially deleted as subject of ‘go’, then the construction should be analysed as a dependent SVC.²⁸

- (23) Fataluku ho Makuva moco-r fanu vari me \emptyset ²⁹ la’a.
 Fataluku and Makuva child-PL face always take \emptyset go
 “Fatalukus and Makuvas are always straightforward (lit. always show their face).”

An even more literal translation of the verb series in the example above would be ‘let (one’s face) go’. Otherwise formulated, ‘take’ plus an intransitive verb combine into a causative construction where the second verb refers to the implemented or enforced action.

Hull (2005:31) uses the term ‘causative verb’ for combinations of the verb *fa’i* ‘make’ plus state verbs (‘basic adjectival verbs’ in his terminology). One of the examples Hull (2005:31) mentions is *kapar-pa’i* (bad-make) ‘damage’, which is a compound of the intransitive state verb *kapar* ‘bad’ and the transitive verb *fa’i* ‘make’. In (24a) *nacun-u* ‘thing-NOM’ directly precedes the verb *kapar-pa’i* and as such can be acknowledged as its object. Observe in (24b), however, that when the perfective aspect marker *hai* (PERF) is added, the patient- in this example *afi* ‘1plinc’ (underlined in the text)- is encoded rather as the object of *me* ‘take’.

- (24a) Tapa o’os-e, tapa ma’ar i nacun-u kapar-pa’i.
 VET steal-VEB VET human POS thing-NOM bad-make
 “Do not steal, do not damage people’s property.” (Fataluku Catechism, Question 346)

- (24b) ... ma’ar tu afi hai=m kapar-pa’i afi=t tavaru ali=m
 human SEQ 1plinc PERF=take bad-make 1plinc=SEQ 3pl again=take
 rau.
 good

“... we reconcile with people who have hurt us.” (English-Fataluku Wordlist).³⁰

Many state verbs like *kapar* ‘bad’ above combine directly into transitive verbs. Other state verbs are nominalised before they are combined with ‘make’, achieving intransitive combinations where the nominalised verb seems to function as an incorporated object. This is exemplified in (24c) where the NP projecting the patient participant in the scene, *e mani* ‘your

²⁸ This complicated description seems warranted since Fataluku does not have subject agreement. In its Austronesian neighbour Leti, for example, the same agreement markers on both verbs would signal that both verbs share the same subject and as such confirm the dependent character of the SVC:

Mü-ele iaklu m~müai=o.
 2sg-take playing-top 2sg~come=IND

“Give me the playing-top.” (Leti, Engelenhoven 2004)

²⁹ This sentence has been taken out of an email correspondence. If spoken, *la’a* ‘go’ would enclitise to *me* ‘take’, exactly as in examples (6) and (11) with *pe* ‘move’.

³⁰ It must be stressed here, that this is the only example found in our database where an aspect marker occurred together with a *pa’i* compound that without aspect marker would constitute a transitive construction and as such it may not be representative for Fataluku speech.

neck', is encoded as the object of the verb 'take' rather than of the verb *piti-n pa'i* (white-NOM make) 'white'.

(24c) E ta emer-e la'a e mani hai=m piti-n pa'i.
 2sg SEQ first-VEB go 2sg neck PERF=take white-NOM make
 "You go whiten your neck first." (The Eagle and the Monkeys)

This resembles the phenomenon attested in example (9) in paragraph 2 above, where a state verb *rau* 'good' was nominalised in to the adverbial *ranu* (< *rau* 'good'+ *-nu* 'NOM'). Here too, the theme participant (the one(s) being seen) was encoded as the object of 'take', whereas the adverbial *ranu* was analysed as an incorporated object. The morphological unity of the verb and the 'adverbial noun' hich was confirmed by the /t/ > /c/ mutation of the initial consonant in 'see'. The aspect markers *vari* 'always' in (23) and *hai* (PERF) immediately precede *me~m* 'take' and as such confirm its verbal status. Taking into account example (24b) where it was inserted in order to enable perfective aspect marking, *me~m* 'take' corresponds to what Payne (1997:84) defines as auxiliaries:

"[t]hey satisfy the morphosyntactic definition of verbs ... they occur in the position of verbs and carry at least some of the inflectional information (... tense/aspect/mode marking) normally associated with verbs. ... they do not embody the major conceptual relation, state, or activity expressed by the clause. They are often semantically "empty" (e.g. *do* in English *He does go to school*), or express 'auxiliary' information such as tense, aspect or mode..."

Payne's reference to the auxiliary character of *do* in English specifically applies to 'take' in Fataluku negation. Hull (2004:78) observes that all non-Austronesian languages except Bunaq adhere to the Timor Sprachbund and as such have a negator that is preposed to the verb as in their Austronesian neighbours. The cogeners of Fataluku in the Pantar-Alor archipelago (Hein Steinhauer p.c.) and its close relative on Kisar Island, Oirata (Faust 2005), still have clause final negation, which conforms to the typology of non-Austronesian SOV languages (Klamer 2002:375). Fataluku has a predicate initial negator *aka* (NEG), which is still very salient in East dialect. Hull (2005) provides an example in the Central dialect with the verb *aca-ne* (DIR-VEB) 'sufficient', repeated below in (25a). However, most examples in his text contain a negator with a final /m/. There seems not to be a lexical or grammatical-phonological motive that either imposes or bars the occurrence of the final /m/. This is exemplified by (25b) that is taken from Nacher's dictionary where the negator has a final /m/ in a context that is almost completely similar with to the one in (25a).

(25a) Ira aka aca-ne.
 water NEG DIR-VEB
 "The water is not sufficient."
 (Hull 2005:11)

(25b) Lavan aka=m aca-ne.
 money NEG=take DIR-VEB
 "There is not enough money."
 (Nacher 2002/3:140)

It was Mr. Justino Valentim who in a personal communication in 2006 pointed out to me that the /m/ at the end of the negator was actually the truncated allomorph of *me* 'take', although younger speakers would no longer recognise it as such. All our informants, irrespective of their age, however, acknowledged the form *akame* (NEG.take) when reading Mr. Valentim's monolingual dictionary, of which (25c) provides an example.

(25c) **lafan-e** – ... nacun-u i hine-ana³¹ tu aka=me serika
 much-VEB thing-NOM POS possession-NOM SEQ NEG=take few
 taa.
 say
 “**much** – says ... of the condition of something that it is not being few.” (Valentim 2002:35)

Whereas Fataluku ‘take’ compares to the English auxiliary *do* in that the negator can only co-occur with this verb, the comparison goes wrong when aspect marking is taken into account. Whereas aspect and tense are directly inflected on the verb in English, in Fataluku they are rather added in the clause as clitic morphemes. In (23), (24b) and (24c), the preverbal aspect markers *vari* ‘always’, *ali* ‘again’ and *hai* (PERF), respectively, confirm its verbal status by directly preceding ‘take’. In negated clauses, these markers rather precede the following verb and do not separate ‘take’ from the negator. In the following example this is displayed by *hai*(PERF) that collocates to *horu-luku* (with-speak) ‘talk with’ rather than to ‘take’. This suggests that the combination NEG + ‘take’ has grammaticalised into a negative marker in which the ‘take’ allomorph has lost its verbal character all together and now is considered to be an inseparable element of the negator.³²

(25d) Tavar aka=m nita hai horu-luku.
 3pl NEG=take REC PERF with-speak
 “They did not greet each other.” (Hull 2005:11)

In the other combinations discussed in this paragraph ‘take’ has still its verbal character and is analysed as the first verb in a series. As with the case of *aci* ‘see’ (example 22b) in paragraph 4 above, ‘take’ combines with aspectual markers and cannot be separated by means of a coordinator from the second verb (*la’a* ‘go’ in (3), *kapar-pa’i* (bad-make) ‘damage’ and *rau* ‘good’ in (24b), and *piti-n pa’i* (white-NOM make) ‘whiten’ in (24c)). Following Staden’s and Reesink’s typology, causative constructions in which V1 is ‘take’ and V2 is an intransitive verb, as in example (23), may either be co-dependent SVCs in which the referent of the object of ‘take’ is also the referent of the co-deleted subject of V2, or alternatively, be dependent SVCs in which the referent of the subject of ‘take’ is also the referent of the co-deleted subject of V2. Causative constructions that contain a combination of ‘make’ plus a nominalised state verb as a V2 (example 24c) are dependent SVCs in which the ‘causee’ (after Kemmer and Verhagen 1994) is encoded as the object of the V1 ‘take’. This use of ‘take’ is elaborated in the next paragraph.

6. ‘Take’ 2: instrument, product and theme objects

Hull (2005:48) reports an instrumental suffix *-m*, which he links to a postposition *ma~m* meaning ‘with’ or ‘by means of’ (p.46), of which he writes: ‘[t]his suffix is added to the direct object of any verb indicating some action performed by hand...’ (p.48). Elsewhere (Hull 2004:96), he acknowledges the existence of a comparable morpheme *ma* in its cogener neighbour Makasai. Huber (2005), however, rather analyses this morpheme as a direct object marker. Whereas we have not attested any instance of *ma* in our database, the instances of *~m* are quite many. Contrary to Hull (2004, 2005), we analyse this morpheme as an allomorph of *eme~me~m* ‘take’. One of Hull’s (2005:48) examples that he provides to show the

³¹ Valentim 2002 does not acknowledge the nominalising and verbalising suffixes *-(n)u* and *-(n)e*, respectively, but rather considers them to be the final segment of the morpheme’s root that is not pronounced when a suffix like *-ana* (NOM) is added (Valentim 2002:iii). As such, he considers *hine* to be the root of the possessive particle. In our analysis of example (25c) *hine-ana* ‘condition’ would rather be glossed as the possessive particle *hin* (POS) plus the nominal suffix *-ana* (NOM).

³² This is why during the second Fataluku Orthography Workshop in Lospalos on January 23d 2007 it was decided not to distinguish the final /m/ in writing as a separate verb.

instrumentality notion of his suffix *-m* is re-analysed here in (26a) as a combination of ‘take’ and the intransitive *kere-kere* ‘write’ where the instrument ‘pen’ is encoded as the object of ‘take’.

(26a) Ana a kanita=*m* kere-kere.
 1sg.S 1sg pen=take RED-write
 “I write with my pen.” (Hull 2005:48).

This use of ‘take’ or a comparable verb has been attested in many Austronesian languages of Timor.³³ It also occurs in the Austronesian languages in Southwest Maluku, for example Leti, where, however, these instrumental constructions are coordinated clauses (Engelenhoven 2004). In Fataluku, these constructions are rather dependent SVCs. Perfectivity can only be marked on ‘take’ (as in example (24c)). Typical for SVCs, *A kanita=*m** (1sg pen=take) and the intransitive *kere-kere* (RED-write) cannot be separated from each other by a conjunction and therefore are not independent clauses. Another example on the same page in Hull (2005) contains an SVC in which the second verb has an adpositional prefix *apa* (DIR), which encodes the patient referent ‘pig’ as a goal object of the verb ‘thrust’.

(26b) Tava coro=*m* pai apa-sono.
 3sg spear=take pig DIR-thrust
 “He stuck the pig with a spear.” (Hull 2005:48).

This use of adpositional prefixes on verbs was mentioned above in paragraph 4 where it enabled a location to be encoded as an object, while the product of the event was referred to by the object of ‘take’ (example 17b). Sentence (26c) displays another example where the object of ‘take’ *sorot-u* ‘letter-NOM’ refers to the product in a writing-scene, while the object of the postposition *hau* ‘for’ refers to the beneficent or recipient participant in the scene.³⁴ Observe that the perfective marker *hai* (PERF) collocates with ‘take’ and not with *kere-kere* ‘write’.

(26c) Tava sorot-u hai=*m* a hau kere-kere.
 3sg letter-NOM PERF=take 1sg for RED-write
 “He wrote a letter for/to me.”

The construction *a hau kere-kere* (1sg for RED-write) equals *pai apa-sono* (pig DIR-thrust) in (26b) and *Dili na-pa’i* (Dili LOC-make) in (17b) in that it has an adpositional object.³⁵ These sentences suggest the Fataluku clause allows only one object constituent and does not have a productive system of adpositions to mark the semantic role of NPs with. The semantics of the

³³ Cf. Klinken’s (2000) report on *hodi* in Tetum, translated by her as ‘bring’.

³⁴ To unambiguously signal the recipient in this scene, the sentence needs to be rephrased in such a way that the first person singular is the object of the verb ‘give’ (example a) or the object of the ‘prepositional’ verb ‘go’ (example b). Example (a) was generally rejected by informants as ‘ugly’, although grammatically correct.

(a) Tava sorot-u kere-kere tu ahar em a n-ina
 3sg letter-NOM RED-write SEQ it.send it.take 1sg LNK-give
 “He writes a letter and sends it to me.”

Some informants preferred example (b) as a ‘better’ alternative where the recipient is encoded as the object of ‘go’. However, this construction is equally ambiguous in comparison with (26c), in that the object here may alternatively also signal the theme the letter is about (see also the discussion about example (21) in paragraph 4). Interestingly, only the emphatic pronoun could be used here. (see also footnote 10 on the Fataluku speaker’s obsession for correct speech). Observe that the ‘object implied’ allomorph of ‘take’ does have an initial vowel, but lacks a final vowel. This final vowel drop is typical for the Central dialect and occurs especially when the next morpheme begins in a vowel. The absence of a verbal suffix *-e* on *ahar* ‘it.send’ can be explained accordingly.

(b) Tava sorot-u kere-kere la’a *ani/anir=i.
 3sg letter-NOM RED-write go 1sg/1sg.EMPH=DEM
 “He writes a letter to/about me.”

³⁵ The reason not to add *hau* ‘for’ to *kere-kere* ‘RED-write’ as a prefix is related to the fact that the verb, which is loaned from Tetum *hakerek* ‘write’, lacks initial consonant mutation to confirm its morphological unity with the adposition, as in *hau-pa’i* (<fa’i) ‘for-make’.

main verb, which is in final position of the clause, determines the semantic role of its object: a goal in (26b), a beneficiary in (26c) and a location in (17b). Whereas in (26a) and (b) the object of ‘take’ refers indeed to an instrument, in (c) and (e) it rather refers to a product. This ‘one-object-constraint’ predicts that in a prototypical trivalent scene with a ‘giver’, a theme and a recipient participant, Fataluku will encode one of the latter two as the object of ‘take’. This is confirmed in (26d) where the object of *ina* ‘give’ refers to the recipient and the objects of *eme* ‘it.take’ and *me* ‘take’ refer to the entity that is written and given, respectively: *e sorot-u i* (2sg letter-NOM DEM) “your letter”.

(26d) E sorot-u i tu a eme a hau kere-kere,
 [[2sg letter-NOM DEM]_{ecc1} [SEQ 2sg it.take 1sg for RED-write]]_{ecc2}
 La’i Aderito ... a hai me a n-ina.
 [Sir Adérito ART PERF take 1sg LNK-give]_{main clause}
 “Your letter that you wrote to me, Mr. Adérito has given it to me ...”

This sentence has two extra-clausal constituents or ECCs (after Dik 1997:401). The larger ECC (labeled ECC2 in the gloss line) co-refers with the article *a* (ART) to the theme object of *me* ‘take’ in the main clause. Inside ECC2 there is another ECC (labeled ECC1) that refers to the product entity in the writing-scene. The verb *eme* ‘it.take’ has a double function here. Because of the presence of the adpositional object *a* ‘1sg’, the product referent in the profiled event (the letter) cannot be encoded as the prototypical object of ‘write’. The first function of *eme* then, is to enable the reference to the product by encoding it as its object. Its second function is signalled by its bisyllabic vowel-initial ‘object implied’ allomorph, which endophorically identifies ECC1, *e sorot-u i* (2sg letter-NOM DEM) “your letter” as the referent of the object of ‘take’.

The verbs *me* ‘take’ and *ina* ‘give’ in the main clause are readily recognisable as a dependent SVC in which the verbs share the same subject, Mr. Adérito. *Me* ‘take’ and *ina* ‘give’ cannot be separated from each other by a conjunction, while *me* is marked for perfectivity like an auxiliary (refer to Payne’s definition of auxiliaries quoted in paragraph 5). Very important to note here is that perfective aspect marking cannot collocate to the ‘implied object’ allomorph *eme*. The endophoric reference to the object of ‘take’ in this context is rather handled by the article *a* preceding *hai* (PERF). *Eme* in ECC2 endophorically refers to its object in the same way. The perfectivity constraint described above legitimises the question whether combinations with *eme* too are dependent SVCs, or whether the construction in ECC2 in (26d) rather displays a asyndetic coordination? This question is taken up in the following paragraph.

7. ‘Take’3: coordination and semantic bleaching

In paragraph 6 it was observed that in (26a) through (d) *me~m* ‘take’ cannot be separated from the following verb by means of a conjunction. Adding a simultaneous coordination marker implies that ‘take’ is a separate clause and profiles its own event. This is exemplified in sentence (27), which is taken from the Fataluku translation of the Gospel of St. Luke.

(27) ... ana ono mu’a tu minin-e na’u uku atar-e nu
 1sg.S still soil SEQ sacrifice-VEB really all split-VEB SIM
 lolos me nu em ane.
 grease take SIM it.take ART-VEB
 “... I’ll dig around it and put some manure on it to make it grow.” (Gospel of St. Luke 13:8)

The Fataluku translator used *me* ‘take’ to transfer the Indonesian verb *menaruh* ‘put’ in the text. ‘Take’ is here a lexical verb and as such allows the presence of the simultaneous coordination marker. The initial vowel of the allomorph of ‘take’ that occurs after the conjunction signals an implied object: the fig tree that did not grow in the parable. The fig tree is construed as a ‘causee’ (and therefore encoded as the (implied) object of ‘take’) that is

forced to grow. As such, it is also the co-referentially deleted subject of *a-ne* (ART-VEB) ‘exist’.³⁶ The meaning of *em* is bleached: it does not profile a transfer-scene like its lexical verb counterpart left of *nu* (SIM). *Em* and *a-ne* make up a co-dependent SVC in which the referent of the object of the first is also the subject of the latter. Consequently, a conjunction between them is not possible.

In the previous paragraph it was elaborated that multi-verb constructions with *eme*³⁷ are restricted in comparison with *me~m* constructions in that the first mentioned cannot encode perfective aspect. The absence of a conjunction and its similar function of signalling a product referent as an implied object in example (26d) suggests that *eme* in this sentence is also bleached. However, example (17b) in paragraph 4 displays *eme* with a simultaneous coordination marker *nu* (SIM). For convenience, this example is repeated below here as (28).

- (28) A le, ana eme nu Dili na-pa’i.
 1sg house 1sg.S it.take SIM D. LOC-make
 “My house, I build it in Dili.” (Valentim 2001b)

The presence of the simultaneous coordination marker identifies this verb sequence as two separate clauses: *ana eme* (1sg.S it.take) and *Dili na-pa’i* (Dili LOC-make) whose profiled events are construed as taking place simultaneously. This optionality of the simultaneous marker has also been observed with the direction verbs *la’a* ‘go’ and *ma’u* ‘come’ when signalling the inchoative aspect (paragraph 2). As such, *eme* constructions cannot be categorised as SVCs. However, the *eme* construction is still comparable to *me* SVCs in that its (implied) object profiles the product entity in the scene of making and as such bleaches the semantics of ‘take’. This is exemplified in the following example taken from the Fataluku Catechism.

- (29) ... kurus-u na’e=n eme Apostulu João aci ta’a: ...
 cross-NOM LOC-VEB=SIM it.take apostle John see say
 “(He) said from the cross to the Apostle John: ...” (Fataluku Chatechism, Question 37)

In example (22a) in paragraph 4 the ‘thing said’ (the information) was readily encoded as the object of *ta’a* ‘say’. In (29), however, the implied object of ‘take’ rather cataphorically refers to what is said to the Apostle John. The ‘grammaticalisation’ of *eme* into a kind of obligatory empty object is especially evident in explanations as they are found in Valentim’s (2002) dictionary where it co-occurs with *me*, but without conjunction, as in (30a).

- (30a) **fa’n-e** – ... mace-nu me eme ina tu una.
 feed-VEB eat.intr.-NOM take it.take give SEQ eat.tr
 “**feed** – ... give food to eat.” (Valentim 2002:13)

In fact, *eme* is superfluous here and can be deleted without distorting the overall meaning of the sentence. It does support Hull’s (2005) proposal that *me* seems to evolve into an instrumental/dative case marker. In the following example from a language resources booklet the verb ‘take’ is encoded three times in a sequentially coordinated clause (labeled A), a simultaneously coordinated clause (labeled B) and dependent SVC (labeled C).

Notwithstanding its grammatical superfluity, the triple appearance of ‘take’ functions as a stylistic means to support the explanatory force of the sentence.

- (30b) ... tolun-ana i h-emer-ana=m ta eme=n
 [help-NOM POS LNK-first-NOM=take]_A [SEQ it.take]_B[=SIM
 em Makuva lata hau-pa’i.
 it.take Makuva village for-make]_C
 “... the first resource that is made for the Makuva people.” (Tekeni na-kakre Makuvo?)

³⁶ Expected here would be *kokot-e* (grow.of.plants-VEB) in the construction *em(e) kokot-e* ‘let grow’.

³⁷ In the Central dialect *eme* is preferably realised as *em* (see note 17).

Another reason to double ‘take’ may be the aspect marking constraint of its ‘implied object’ allomorph. As an alternative to the use of the article as the object of ‘take’ in example (26d) above, *eme* also occurs added after *me* being marked for perfective aspect.

(30c) ...tu hai=me eme Boletim mica-pa’i.
 SEQ PERF=take it.take bulletin on-make
 “... and we put it already on the Bulletin’s (website).”

Sentence (30d) is taken from a narrative where *eme* also seems superfluous. Also the double use of inchoative *la’a* ‘go’ seems too much. Nevertheless, they are necessary from the narrator’s point of view in order to sketch the nervous action described in the scene.

(30d) Kicu fa’i hai n-umu=t hai la’a eme la’a
 shriek make PERF LNK-die=SEQ PERF go it.take go
 em pet to’e.
 it.take mat put

“When it shrieked it immediately died and then he hid it in the mat. (The Eagle and the Monkeys)

We saw in paragraph 5 that *me*’s collocation to the negator *aka* has been grammaticalised to such an extent that younger speakers no longer can distinguish the *m* allomorph of take and consider *akam* to be a free variant of *aka*. Another example of this grammatical bleaching has been attested with the reflexive pronoun *ni* that always occurs in combination with *me*.³⁸ As with the negation, *me* cannot be separated from *ni* and thus seems to more and more grammaticalised as a full reflexive pronoun.

(31) ... tu afa ni=me santu fa’i...
 SEQ 1plinc.S REFL=take saint make
 “... (The Holy Spirit will help us that) we sanctify ourselves...” (Fataluku Catechism, Question 92)

8. Summary and conclusion

Fataluku is a language that features extensive clause combining, but also uses serial verb constructions. Fataluku uses SVCs with motion verbs as V2 to signal the direction of the movement profiled in the clause. These SVCs are clearly dependent serialisations in which the verbs share the same subject (paragraph 2). Only causative construction with ‘take’ are ambiguous in that they can also be analysed as co-dependent SVCs where the object’s referent of ‘take’ co-refers to the subject of the motion verb (paragraph 5). Also the locative verb *na’-e* (LOC-VEB) triggers an SVC as does the verb *aci* ‘see’ whose object refers to the addressee (paragraph 4).

Normally, however, locations are indicated by adpositions that often attach to the main verb as prefixes and as such create transitive constructions in which the location or goal constituent becomes the object of the main verb. Instruments, products and themes are then profiled by the object of ‘take’. These too are SVCs.

Modal verbs (paragraph 3) and lexical verbs signalling the inchoative aspect (paragraph 2) are rather placed in simultaneous or sequential coordinated clauses, depending on whether or not the subjects in both clauses are the same.

The verb *har-e* ‘send’ and its allomorphs are used also to encode the deontic modality. In this function, however, it more and more is grammaticalised and loses its verbal characteristics.

This grammaticalisation process seems most advanced with ‘may’, which we hypothesised to have derived from *te’e-ne* ‘try-VEB’. Also the *m* allomorph of ‘take’ has been fully grammaticalised and no longer seems distinguishable for younger generation speakers on the negator and the reflexive pronoun. The ‘implied object’ allomorph of ‘take’ is also in the

³⁸ In Makasai, however, reflexive *ni* occurs without ‘take’ with other verbs (Huber 2005).

process of grammaticalisation and more and more becomes a ‘dummy object’ that seems superfluous from a grammatical perspective, but nevertheless is very salient in explanatory discourse.

Figure 1 provides a summary of possible combinations. Lexical verbs may always combine with either a sequential or simultaneous coordination marker. ‘Auxiliaries’, or bleached verbs either pick or reject a coordination marker based on the function of the verb and the shared reference of their subject arguments.

Figure 1 serial verbs in Fataluku

Lexical verb			SEQ (S1≠S2, S1=S2) SIM (S1≠S2, S1=S2)
‘Auxiliary’	Modal verbs	can, want, not want	SEQ (S1≠S2) SIM (S1=S2)
	Aspectual verbs	go, come	SIM (S1=S2) (O = S2)
	Instrumental object Product object Theme object	take	∅ (O = S2)

Used abbreviations:

ECC	Extra Clausal Constituent
EMPH	Emphatic pronoun
FUT	Future tense marker
IMP.INCH	Imperative inchoative marker
Intr	Intransitive
LNK	Linking prefix
NOM	Nominalising suffix
PERF	Perfective aspect marker
PL	Plural marker
POS	Possessive marker
S	Subject pronoun
SEQ	Sequential coordination marker
SIM	Simultaneous coordination marker
SVC	Serial Verb Construction
TAM	Tense Aspect Mode
Tr	Transitive
VEB	Verbalising suffix

References:

- Belo, Maurício da C.A. et al., 2005, *Glosáriu Waima’a Caisido*, Baucau: Publicações Matebian.
- Campagnolo, Henri, 1973, *La Langue des Fataluku de Lórehe (Timor Portugais)*, PhD Thesis at Université René Descartes, Paris.
- Dik, Simon C., 1997, *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Part 2 : Complex and Derived Constructions*, edited by Kees Hengeveld, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Donohue, Mark and Lea Brown, 1999, 'Ergativity: some additions from Indonesia', *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 19(1):57-76.
- Engelenhoven, Aone van, 2003, 'Language endangerment in Indonesia: The incipient obsolescence and acute death of Teun, Nila and Serua (Central and Southwest Maluku)'. In Janse, M. & Tol, S. (Ed.), *Language Death and Language Maintenance: Theoretical, practical and descriptive approaches*. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 240, pp. 49-80). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Engelenhoven, Aone van, 2004, *Leti, a language of Southwest Maluku*, VKI 211, Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Engelenhoven, Aone van, 2006, *Ita-nia nasaun oin-ida, ita-nia dalen sira oin-seluk* "Our Nation is One, Our Languages Are Different". Language Policy in East Timor. In P. Castro Seixas & A. van Engelenhoven (Eds.), *Diversidade Cultural na Construção da Nação e do Estado em Timor-Leste* (pp. 106-131). Porto: Universidade Fernando Pessoa.
- Engelenhoven, Aone van & Justino Valentim Cailoru, 2006, The Makuva Enigma: Locating a Hidden Language in East Timor, paper presented at the 2nd Conference on Austronesian Languages and Linguistics, St. Catherine's College, Oxford, June 2-3, 2006.
- Faust, Vera, 2005, *Oirata, a language of Kisar. 1 Grammatical sketch, 2. Myth of Creation (glossed text)*. MA Thesis at Leiden University.
- Huber, Juliette, 2005, *First steps towards a grammar of Makasae*, MA Thesis at Zürich University.
- Hull, Geoffrey, 2001a, 'O Mapa Linguístico de Timor Leste: Uma Orientação Dialectológica', *Estudos de Línguas e Culturas de Timor-Leste* 4:1-19.
- Hull, Geoffrey, 2001b, 'A Morphological Overview of the Timoric Sprachbund', *Estudos de Línguas e Culturas de Timor-Leste* 4: 98-205.
- Hull, Geoffrey, 2002, *Waimaha (Waima'a)*, East Timor Language Profiles 2, Dili: Instituto Nacional de Linguística/Universidade Nacional de Timor Lorosa'e.
- Hull, Geoffrey 2004, 'The Papuan Languages of Timor', *Estudos de Línguas e Culturas de Timor-Leste* 6:23-99.
- Hull, Geoffrey 2005, *Fataluku*, East Timor Language Profiles 7, Dili: Instituto Nacional de Linguística/Universidade Nacional de Timor-Leste.
- Kemmer, Suzanne and Arie Verhagen, 1994, 'The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events', *Cognitive Linguistics* 5:115-156.
- Klamer, Marian, 2002, "Typical Features of Austronesian Languages in Central/Eastern Indonesia". *Oceanic Linguistics* 41(2):363-383.
- Klinken, Catherina Lumien van, 2000, 'From Verb to Coordinator in Tetun', *Oceanic Linguistics* 39(2):350-363.
- McWilliam, Andrew, 2005, *Austronesians in Linguistic Disguise. Fataluku cultural blending in East Timor*, lecture at the International Institute of Asian Studies, Leiden University.
- Nacher, Alfonso Maria, NSB, 2002/2003, 'Léxico Fataluco-Português (primeira parte)', *Estudos de Línguas e Culturas de Timor-Leste* 5:135-196.
- Nacher, Alfonso Maria, NSB, 2004, 'Léxico Fataluco-Português (secunda parte)', *Estudos de Línguas e Culturas de Timor-Leste* 6:119-177.
- Newmeyer, Frederick, 2004, *Some Thoughts on the Serial Verb Construction*, Actes de l'atelier du 9 décembre 2004: *La notion de « construction verbale en série » est-elle opératoire ?*, Paris: EHESS, Fédération TUL, retrievable at <http://www.typoe.logie.cnrs.fr/fr/gabarits/TUL%20Newmeyer.pdf>
- Payne, Thomas, 2006 (1997), *Describing Morphosyntax, a guide for field linguists*, Cambridge University Press.

Staden, Miriam van and Ger Reesink, in press, 'Serial verb constructions in a linguistic area', in: Gunter Senft (ed.) *Serial Verb Constructions in Austronesian and Papuan languages*, Pacific Linguistics: ANU, Canberra.

Steinhauer, Hein, 1996, 'Synchronic metathesis and apocope in three Austronesian languages of the Timor area', in: Suwilai Premasri (ed.) *Pan-Asiatic Linguistics, Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Language and Linguistics January 8-10, 1996*, Volume II. Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development Mahidol University at Salaya Thailand: 471-92.

Valentim, Justino, 2001a, 'Lia Fataluk iha Lautem', Hakerek Kona Ba Timor Loro Sa'e 3, retrievable at: http://www.geocities.jp/hkbtls/hakerek/Hakerek03/lia_tetun.htm

Valentim Cailoru, Justino, 2002, *Fata-Lukunu i Disionariu*, Dili : Timor Loro Sa'e- Nippon Culture Center.

Used texts :

Boon, Danielle et al., ms, *Fanu ci'ele, ma'ar ere lisaun ere me elerana o'o kere-kerenu apanave*, adult literacy course in Fataluku, developed by UNDP, INL and FLP, Dili/Leiden.

Capell, Arthur, 1962, 'The Boys and The Coconuts', item TFATA102, PARADISEC, retrievable at: http://paradisec.org.au/fieldnotes/image_viewer.htm?TFATA102,15,13,L

Hewitt, James, Ezequiel Oliveira et al., ms, *English-Fataluku Wordlist, Luku-lukun i lista Ingeris-Fataluku*, Oxford, retrievable at <http://www.fataluku.com>

Katesismo sarani (Fataluku) (Fataluku Catholic Catechism), Lospalos: Roman Catholic Church.

'Lu'a ho capuku', (The Monkey and the Crab) (told by Manuel da Costa), retrievable at: <http://www.fataluku.com/text1.html>.

Lukas i hopon tahine i (The Gospel according to Luke), 2005-2007, Lospalos: Fataluku translation team. The English translations are taken from the Holy Bible Contemporary Version, 2000, New York: American Bible Society.

"Bird Story", Fataluku text from the Language Documentation Training Center (LDTC), University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. Retrievable at http://www.ling.hawaii.edu/%7Euhdoc/website/websiteF05/projectsF05/Fataluku_Documentation/bird_story.html

'Mai ho lu'a' ('The Eagle and the Monkeys') (told by Angelina Sanchez), retrievable at: <http://www.fataluku.com/text2.html>.

"Sore tooth", text no longer available at the Fataluku Speakers Website at <http://www.fataluku.org>.

Tekeni na-kakre makuvo? (Who Speaks Makuva?), 2005, Makuva grammar sketch in Fataluku, retrievable at: <http://makuva.fataluku.com/tekeni01.html>

Messages from the Fataluku Speakers Website at <http://www.fataluku.org>

Valentim, Justino, 2001b, 'Konversasaun iha Fataluku', Hakerek Kona Ba Timor Loro Sa'e 4, retrievable at : <http://www.geocities.jp/hkbtls/hakerek/Hakerek04/konversasaun.htm>