CHAPTER 10

COMPLEX SENTENCES

The first sections of this chapter describe the various types of subordinate clause. Relative clauses, described in §10.1, provide information about a noun phrase in the main clause, or specify the temporal or logical conditions under which the main clause event occurs. That is, these clauses have both 'NP-relative' and 'T-relative' interpretations (Hale 1976a). Section 10.2 describes 'lest' clauses. These set forth the unfavourable consequences of a main clause event and involve verbs bearing a special lest inflection followed by either the accusative or locative complementising suffixes. Section 10.3 describes 'purpose' clauses, which depict an intended result of the event denoted by a main clause. Verbs in purpose clauses select one of a set of three inflections specifying coreference and necessary causal relationships between main and subordinate clause. Of all Martuthunira subordinate clause patterns, the system of purpose clause inflection most closely resembles canonical switch-reference. Section 10.4 then discusses the use of relative clauses and purpose clauses as sentential complements of predicates of cognition, perception and information transfer. All complex sentence constructions share the following general syntactic features:

1. Subordinate clauses are adjoined (rather than embedded, in the sense used by Hale 1976a) to the main clause and occur adjacent to it. Reduced (NP-)relative clauses may appear in an embedded position adjacent to the controlling noun phrase in the main clause.

2. Where the subordinate clause and the main clause share a noun phrase argument, this noun phrase is omitted from either the subordinate clause or the main clause, usually from whichever of the two clauses follows the other.

3. The head of the subordinate clause, the verb, typically bears a complementising nominal suffix indicating the relationship between the subject of the clause and an argument of the main clause, or a particular logico-temporal link between the two clauses. By the case-marking domain conventions described in §3.3.2 the complementising suffix is not distributed to constituents of the subordinate clause.

Martuthunira interclausal syntax is further complicated by the interaction of these patterns of multiclause sentence formation with the productive voice system. Section 10.5 describes the role of the passive in complex clause constructions. Section 10.6 once again considers the problems posed by double object constructions (§9.7); in this context the ambiguous control of accusative subordinate clauses. In conclusion, §10.7 presents a number of more complex examples involving multiple subordination.

10.1 RELATIVE CLAUSES

A number of types of relative clause can be recognised. 'Finite relative' clauses (§10.1.1) are defined by the presence on the subordinate clause verb of a regular main clause tense/aspect/mood inflection. 'Perfect relative' clauses (§10.1.2) involve an ablative complementising suffix attached to a finite verb form and describe a past event having some continuing relevance to a main clause event. In contrast to these two types, 'present relative' (§10.1.3), 'contemporaneous' (§10.1.4) and 'sequential' clauses (§10.1.5) are marked by special subordinate verb inflections.

10.1.1 FINITE RELATIVE CLAUSES

Verbs in finite relative clauses are most often inflected with either the past, passive perfective or habitual inflections. Examples involving the future inflection or the counterfactual inflection occur, but very rarely. Importantly, the main clause present tense inflection may not occur in finite relative clauses and this functional gap is filled by the present relative clause described in §10.1.3.

The subordinate clause verb is then further inflected either with the accusative suffix, indicating the coreference of the relative clause subject with an accusative argument of the main clause, or with the locative suffix. Although finite relative clauses marked with other case suffixes (in agreement with main clause arguments in other than accusative or locative case) are possible, they rarely occur in unelicited text. Finite relative clauses on subjects are effectively ruled out by the lack of a nominative complementiser. Clearly such clauses would be indistinguishable from finite main clauses.

Finite relative clauses marked in agreement with a controlling accusative noun phrase function to restrict the reference of that noun phrase. The temporal axis for the subordinate clause tense specification is the present of utterance or some established 'narrative present'.

(10.1)   *Ngayu   yanga-lalha-rru   ngurnu   pawulu-u   muyi-i*
          1SG.NOM chase-PAST-NOW that.ACC child-ACC dog-ACC

          thani-lalha-a.
          hit-PAST-AC
          I chased that kid who hit the dog. (trans.)

(10.2)   *Ngayu   nhawu-layi thanuwa-ngara-a-rru kampa-rnu-u*
          1SG.NOM see-FUT   food-PL-ACC-NOW cook-PASSP-ACC

          nganaju-wu-lu   wartirra-lu.
          1SG.OBL-GEN-EFF woman-EFF
          I'll see food that's been cooked by my wife. (trans.)

(10.3)   *Ngayu   puni-lha nhawu-lu   ngurnu   kanyara-a ngaliwa-la*
          1SG.NOM go-PAST see-PURPss that.ACC man-ACC 1PL.INC-LOC

          puni-layi-i   wiruwanti.
          go-FUT-ACC morning
          I went to see that man who will be going with us tomorrow. (trans.)

(10.4)   *Ngayu   nhawu-lha ngurnu   kanyara-a nyina-marni-i*
          1SG.NOM see-PAST that.ACC man-ACC sit-CONTR-ACC

ngurnula-ngu-la   ngurra-ngka.
that.DEF-GEN-LOC camp-LOC
I saw that man who should be in his own camp. (trans.)

Finite relative clauses marked with a locative complementiser suffix have a number of functions. First, they may have an NP-relative function on a locative argument in the main clause (example (10.5)). However, they more often function as temporal adverbial clauses providing a setting for the events described by the main clause (10.6) and (10.7). In these cases the orienting tense axis for the subordinate clause is the time at which the main clause event is occurring.

(10.5) *Panyu-ngurni   ngaliwa   puni-layi kuyilwa-nnguli-yirri   kuyil-a*
        good-OBSCRD 1PL.INC go-FUT   make.bad-PASS-LEST bad-LOC

        kayulu-la   ngurnta kuyilwa-lwayara-la.
        water-LOC   style   make.bad-HABIT-LOC.
        We'll go carefully lest we get drowned (lit. badly affected) in this water which is generally treacherous.

(10.6) *Karlarra-npa-lha-la   paju-rru,   puwara-npa-lha-la   paju-rru,*
        hot-INCH-PAST-LOC REAL-NOW coals-INCH-PAST-LOC REAL-NOW

        ngarri-ngka kampa-rninyji-rru ngurnaa.
        ashes-LOC   cook-FUT-NOW that.ACC
        Once [the fire] has become really hot, burned right down to coals, cook that one in the ashes.

(10.7) *Ngunhaa pilakurta piyuwa-npa-lha-la   wii, nhurnti-npa-lha-la*
        that.NOM carpenter finish-INCH-PAST-LOC if   dead-INCH-PAST-LOC

        wii, ngana-rru   kana   yilhi, mir.ta wii murnta-lalha
        if   who-NOW   RHET chips not   if   take.from-PAST

        ngurnaa   pilakurta-a?
        that.ACC   carpenter-ACC
        If when that carpenter is finished, when he has died, who will have the chips (will have the skill to carve) if they didn't take them from that carpenter.

Locative-marked finite relative clauses have a further function. In each of the following examples the subordinate clause provides some additional information about a noun phrase argument of the main clause, but that argument is *not* the subject of the relative clause. In approximately half of the total sample of this kind of locative marked finite relative clause, the linking argument appears as a possessive modifier of the subordinate subject noun phrase. Such sentences are often translated as English possessive relative constructions (example (10.8)) or as simple conjoined constructions (10.9).

(10.8) *Ngayu   wangka-lha ngurnu   kanyara-a, murtiwarla ngurnula-ngu*
        1SG.NOM speak-PAST that.ACC man-ACC motor.car   that.DEF-GEN

        muya-rnu-la   pawulu-ngara-lu.
        steal-PASSP-LOC child-PL-EFF
        I spoke to that man whose car was stolen by the children. (trans.)

(10.9) *Ngayu   nyina-nguru kanyara-la,ngurnula-ngu   pawulu thani-lalha-la*
        1SG.NOM stay-PRES   man-LOC that.DEF-GEN child   hit-PAST-LOC

muyi-i   nganaju-u.
dog-ACC   1SG.GEN-ACC
I'm staying with this man and his child hit my dog. (trans.)

In example (10.10), the omitted subject of the main clause surfaces as a locative argument of the subordinate clause. In contrast to the case in (10.8) and (10.9) above, the relative clause in this example cannot be construed as a NP-relative on a main clause argument. Instead it describes a situation involving the common argument and which serves as an explanation of the state of affairs described in the main clause. Example (10.11) is similar, though here the shared argument does not appear in the relative clause.

(10.10)   *Wiyaa yilarla   thungkara-ngurni wanti-nguru, mir.ta nhawu-ngu-layi*
            maybe   here.NV dirt-OBSCRD   lie-PRES   not   see-PASS-FUT

            ngartil. Yimpalaa pala, nhiyu   kanyara nyina-lha-la   kurlany-tha.
            again   like.that IT   this.NOM man   sit-PAST-LOC knife-LOC
            Maybe it's lying under the dirt here out of sight, and won't be seen again. That's how it is, this man was sitting on that knife.

(10.11)   *Ngayu   wurnta-lalha-rru   ngurnu   kalyarran-ku muyi-i*
            1SG.NOM break-PAST-NOW that.ACC stick-ACC   dog-ACC

            thani-lalha-a.   ngana thani-lalha-la?
            hit-PAST-ACC   who   hit-PAST-LOC
            I broke that stick which hit the dog. But who hit [him with it]?

In (10.11), 'the stick' is inferred as an instrument in the relative clause. This instrument provides a link between the event described in the accusative marked relative clause modifying 'that stick', and a question about the identity of an implied agent in that event.

The degree of syntactic linkage between main clause and subordinate clause in this type of construction is clearly quite low. While the two clauses share an argument there are no apparent constraints on what roles that argument may fulfil in either clause. Also, as examples (10.10) and (10.11) illustrate, the argument need not be made explicit in both clauses. Rather, the locative complementiser indicates a relationship between two clauses. The identity of the linking argument is generally inferred from context.

10.1.2 PERFECT RELATIVE CLAUSES

The perfect relative clause can be recognised as a specialised finite relative clause involving an ablative complementiser added to a verb inflected with either the past or passive perfective suffixes. It describes a completed event which has some continuing relevance to the action described in the main clause, usually precedes the main clause, and shares the same subject. The difference between the perfect relative construction and a simple past tense relative clause is the strong sense of completion of the subordinate clause event. Perfect relative clauses figure prominently in programmatic discourse. In many such texts the various participants maintain the same roles throughout and so a sequence of clauses may consist solely of verbs. Where the perfect relative clause follows the main clause there is a strong implication that the main clause event is a direct result of the situation described in the subordinate clause. For example:

(10.12)　　*Ngayu　　jina-rru　　malyarra-rnuru puni-lha-nguru jurrwalyi-la.*
　　　　　　1SG.NOM foot-NOW sore-PRES　　go-PAST-ABL heat-LOC
　　　　　　My foot is sore from having gone in the heat.

　　Perfect relative clauses occasionally occur as NP-relatives on non-subject arguments of a controlling clause, in which case the appropriate case suffix follows the ablative inflection on the subordinate clause verb (examples (10.13) and (4.178)).

(10.13)　　*Ngaliwa withawitha-ma-rninyji-rru　thurlanyarrara-a*
　　　　　　1PL.INC covered-CAUS-FUT-NOW poor.fellow-ACC

　　　　　　wantha-lalha-nguru-u-rru　　ngaliwa-a.
　　　　　　leave-PAST-ABL-ACC-NOW 1PL.INC-ACC
　　　　　　We'll bury the poor fellow who has now left us.

10.1.3 PRESENT RELATIVE CLAUSES

　　Present relative clauses, marked by a special verbal inflection, have very similar functions to finite relatives: they fill a gap left by the non-occurrence of the present tense inflection in such clauses. Their most important function is as NP-relatives restricting reference by describing the role of a person or object in some currently occurring activity. Like finite relatives, present relatives may not be controlled by nominative subjects.

(10.14)　　*Ngali　　nyina-layi wawayi-l.yarra　kampa-nyila-a.*
　　　　　　1DU.INC sit-FUT　　wait.for-CTEMP cook-PrREL-ACC
　　　　　　We'll sit waiting for the one that is cooking.

(10.15)　　*Ngayu　　nhawu-ngu-layi kanyara-lu　jalyuru-ma-rnura-lu.*
　　　　　　1SG.NOM see-PASS-FUT man-FUT　　hole-CAUS-PrREL-EFF
　　　　　　I'll be seen by the man who is digging a hole. (trans.)

(10.16)　　*Ngayu　　ngurnu　　muyi-i　　parla-marta pariingku-lha,*
　　　　　　1SG.NOM that.ACC dog-ACC stone-PROP hit-PAST

　　　　　　yirna-marta　　thungkara-la wanti-nyila-marta.
　　　　　　this.OBL-PROP ground-LOC lie-PrREL-PROP
　　　　　　I hit that dog with a stone, with this one lying on the ground. (trans.)

(10.17)　　*Ngayu　　ngurnu　　murla-a　　wantha-rralhangulangu,*
　　　　　　1SG.NOM that.ACC meat-ACC place-PAST　there

　　　　　　murtiwarla-lakarri-nyila-la　　pal.yarra-la.
　　　　　　car-LOC　　stand-PrREL-LOC plain-LOC
　　　　　　I put that meat there, in the car which is standing on the flat. (trans.)

　　In examples (10.18) and (10.19), the present tense relative clause functions as a temporal adverbial clause. The subordinate clause verb bears the expected locative complementiser.

(10.18)　　*Ngayu　　wawayi-lha　　jartuntarra-a,　　yarta ngunhu*
　　　　　　1SG.NOM look.for-PAST rock.wallaby-ACC　other that.NOM

　　　　　　wawayi-rnura-la　　tharnta-a-lpurtu.
　　　　　　look.for-PrREL-LOC euro-ACC-COMP
　　　　　　I looked for wallabies while that other man was looking for euros. (trans.)

(10.19) *Kampa-nyila-la-rru   karla, nyina-layi thuulwa-l.yarra*
burn-PrREL-LOC-NOW fire   sit-FUT   pull.out-CTEMP

mirntirimarta-apunga-a.
goanna-ACC   guts-ACC
While the fire is burning, sit and pull out the goanna's guts.

Present relative clauses also occur without a complementising case suffix. Examples of this kind most often occur in narrative text where they provide some parenthetical comment on events or situations which are occurring or obtain at the same time, and incidental to, the events described in the main event line. For example, (10.20) below is a portion of a narrative describing how a wicked uncle eats a whole emu after sending his two nephews to get a stone knife from a distant quarry. The audience is reminded of the current circumstances of the two nephews in the (underlined) present relative clause.

(10.20) *Ngunhu   kampa-lalha jankurna-a, thaapuwa. Wanthanha-rru kana?*
that.NOM cook-PAST emu-ACC   big.man   which-NOW   RHET

Thuulwa-rninyji mirntiwul-yu, thuulwa-rninyji kampa-lha-a.
pull.out-FUT   all-ACC   pull.out-FUT   cook-PAST-ACC

Ngunhu-rru   puni-nyila, wirta-tharra, puu-rru,
that.NOM-NOW go-PrREL youth-DU   far.NOM-NOW

puyila-rru.   Thaapuwa   mungka-rninyji. Ngunhaa
far.LOC-NOW big.man   eat-FUT   that.NOM

manurri-yaangu-rru.   minthal jankurna-a ngurnu
hold.back-UNREAL-NOW alone   emu-ACC   that.ACC

kalyaalya-ma-lalha.
feast-CAUS-PAST
He cooked the emu, the big man. What now? [He] pulled it all out, pulled out that thing which was cooked. [In the meantime] they were travelling, the two youths, far away, they were at some far away place. The big man ate it. He ought to have held back. He made a feast of that emu on his own now.

Example (10.21), from the same text, is very similar. Here the two brothers set out to spear an emu. However, one of the two holds back and lets his brother make the shot.

(10.21) *Jirruna-npa-layi ngurnaa wanti-nyila-a, jankurna-a miyara-la-a,*
sneak-INCH-FUT that.ACC lie-PrREL-ACC emu-ACC   egg-LOC-ACC

nhuwa-rninyji. Yarta warra, yarta ngunhu   karri-nyila,
spear-FUT   other CONT other that.NOM stand-PrREL

marryara-wuyu   nyartu-wuyu.   Karri-nyila   ngunhu
young.brother-SIDE left.handed-SIDE stand-PrREL that.NOM

wartawirrinpa-rra. Nhiyu   mirtali-wuyu kaya-wuyu
wait-CTEMP   this.NOM big-SIDE   older.brother-SIDE

nhuwa-lalha ngurnaa   wanti-nyila-a.
spear-PAST that.ACC lie-PrREL-ACC

[They] sneak up on that one lying down, an emu on [its] eggs, and spear it. One stays, the younger brother, the left-handed one, he stands waiting. This big one [of the two], the older brother, spears that [emu] lying down.

Example (10.22) is taken from a narrative describing events in the mythical past. A group of devils have stolen a hill from a rival group who live on an island and are carrying it, across sea and land, to its current resting place. The present relative clause provides the background information that the sea was shallow at this time.

(10.22) *Kanarri-lha-nu,   nhiingara, puni-lha-nguru thanarti-la. Warutharra*
come-PAST-QUOT this.PL   go-PAST-ABL sea-LOC   marsh

kayulu ngunhu   yirla-l,   wanti-nyila mir.ta purnta paju.
water   that.NOM only-THEN lie-PrREL not   deep   very

ngunhu-ngara puni-lha   kanarri-lu.
that.NOM-PL go-PAST come-PURPss
It's said they came [this way], these people, having travelled through the sea. It was only marsh water then, wasn't very deep. They travelled [through it] to come [this way].

In examples of this kind it is not immediately clear that the present relative clauses are subordinate clauses. Apart from the fact that they involve a verbal inflection not usually found in main clauses (and here the argument can very easily become circular), they bear none of the general formal characteristics of Martuthunira subordinate clauses. There is no complementising case suffix and no obvious syntactic relationship between arguments of this and any adjacent clause. Nor is it obvious that present relative clauses of this kind are, in more subtle ways, semantically dependent on an adjacent clause, although it is quite clear that they are in some way 'subordinate' to the main event line of the narrative.

However, similar examples do occur, albeit rarely, in general conversational discourse, and in such cases the unmarked present relative clause is semantically dependent on an adjacent main clause. As the following examples illustrate, the present relative clause typically conveys something of the speaker's own opinions, inferences, explanations or evidence for the state of affairs described in the main clause.

(10.23) *Ngayu   wayangka-lha   ngurnu   muyi-i,   nganaju   marryara*
1SG.NOM frightened-PAST that.ACC dog-ACC 1SG.GEN young.brother

wayangka-nyila   ngurnu.
frightened-PrREL that.ACC
I was frightened of that dog [because] my brother is frightened of it.

(10.24) *Nganarna waruul piya-rnuru nhuwana-la nhuura-npa-nyila-la   kana.*
1PL.EXC still   sing-PRES 2PL-LOC   know-INCH-PrREL-LOC RHET

Jalya waruul-wa-rru nyina-nyila. Mir.ta nhuura   manku-layi jalurra-a.
bad   still-Ø-NOW sit-PrREL   not   knowing get-FUT   song-ACC
We're still singing while you are learning. [Yet] you're still useless. You don't know how to perform (lit. grasp) the songs.

(10.25) *Kartu-wi   wuraal nhuwa-rninyji tharnta-a, ngayu*
2SG.NOM-VOC all.right spear-FUT   euro-ACC 1SG.NOM

> *kamungu-npa-nyila,*   *murla-a*   *wiru-npa-nyila.*
> hungry-INCH-PrREL   meat-ACC   wanting-INCH-PrREL
> You'll spear euros (so you say), [yet] I'm getting hungry, wanting meat.

(10.26)   *Thawu! Karla* <u>*kampa-nyila,*</u> *nhuwana*   *murna-ngka-rru.*
            good   fire   burn-PrREL   2PL.NOM   close-LOC-NOW
            Good! There's a fire burning (which I assume you have lit), you are close by now.

To some extent, examples of this kind resemble locative marked finite relative clauses of the type illustrated in examples (10.8) to (10.11) above. In each case it is possible to infer some link, in the form of a common participant, between the situations described in the main and subordinate clauses.

10.1.4 CONTEMPORANEOUS CLAUSES

Subordinate contemporaneous clauses are marked by a special verbal inflection and typically have the same subject as the controlling clause. The events described in the two clauses are temporally co-extensive and are often causally interdependent. Contemporaneous clauses are non-finite; they assume the tense, aspect and mood specification of the controlling clause.

(10.27)   *Ngayu*   *karlarra-npa-nguru-rru yakarrangu-lanyina-rra.*
            1SG.NOM hot-INCH-PRES-NOW   sun-LOC   sit-CTEMP
            I'm getting hot sitting in the sun.

(10.28)   *Ngayu*   *puni-nguru-rru kalyaran-ngara-apukarti-ngara-a*
            1SG.NOM go-PRES-NOW stick-PL-ACC   snakewood-PL-ACC

            wawayi-l.yarra.
            look.for-CTEMP
            I'm going along looking for snakewood sticks. (trans.)

(10.29)   *Nganamarnu wii pithirri-npa-rra*   *wii, ngurnaa*
            anyone   if   chill-INCH-CTEMP   if   that.ACC

            paya-rninyji jami-i.
            drink-FUT   medicine-ACC
            If anyone has a chill, they drink that medicine.

In a few rare cases, the subject of the contemporaneous clause is not coreferential with the subject of the main clause. In example (10.30), the subject of the subordinate clause is coreferential with the matrix accusative object. Notice that there is no complementising suffix on the subordinate verb.

(10.30)   *Ngartil wii nhuwana*   *puni-rra*   *thawun-mulyarra, ngartil waruul*
            again   if   2PL.NOM   go-CTEMP   town-ALL   again   still

            ngayu   *yungku-layi nhuwana-a warnmalyi-i.*
            1SG.NOM give-FUT   2PL-ACC   money-ACC
            If you go to town again, I'll give you money yet again.

Extended sequences of verbs bearing the contemporaneous inflection occasionally occur in text. In example (10.31), a sequence of contemporaneous verbs describes the melting of coagulated fish fat into a gravy as it warms in hot sand.

(10.31) *Wantha-rninyji ... ngurnu   kampa-waa-rru,*
         put-FUT   that.ACC   cook-PURPs=o-NOW

         wirlukuru-npa-rra   panyu-npa-rra   karlarra-npa-rra.
         gravy-INCH-CTEMP good-INCH-CTEMP   hot-INCH-CTEMP
         Put that [fish fat in hot sand] to cook, turn into gravy, become good,
         become hot.

While it is perfectly possible to describe such sequences of contemporaneous clauses as chains of subordination (with, say, each successive clause subordinate to its predecessor) this seems quite inappropriate here. Rather, the set of predicates functions as a composite describing essentially one event.

Similarly in example (10.32), a group of devils undergo a transformation into the human state. The contemporaneous predicates clustered together here are 'become human', 'become good' and the motion verb *puni-Ø* 'go', which functions as a copula (§9.3.3) emphasising the gradual nature of the change and implying that it occurs throughout (and ultimately perhaps due to) the performance of a number of activities to be detailed later in the narrative.

(10.32) *Pintirrijila ngunhu-ngara nyina-lha, ngartil panyu-rri-rra-rru,*
         scattered   that.NOM-PL be-PAST   next   good-INV-CTEMP-NOW

         panyu-rri-rra-rru   kanyara-npa-rra-rru   puni-rra.
         good-INV-CTEMP-NOW human-INCH-CTEMP-NOW go-CTEMP

         Warruwa-ngara-lwa,warruwa-ngara   panyu-npa-rra-rru
         devil-PL-ID   devil-PL   good-INCH-CTEMP-NOW

         puni-rra   kanyara-npa-rra-rru.
         go-CTEMP   human-INCH-CTEMP-NOW
         They were scattered about. Then [they] became good, became good, gradually
         became human. The devils that is, the devils gradually became good, became
         human.

However, there is a subtle difference between the sequences of predicates illustrated here and that exemplified in example (10.31). In (10.32), the verbs 'become good' and 'become human' bear the temporal clitic *-rru*, and this effectively marks the two as making separate assertions. The devils became good and also became human; the two resulting states are not necessarily interdependent. While examples like (10.31) suggest that the overlap between a contemporaneous clause and some other clause extends as far as verb serialisation, it would be a mistake to view this as the cardinal function of the contemporaneous verbal inflection. Although the inflection indicates that the verb has the same tense, mood and aspect as the verb in some controlling clause, it does not require that the two verbs have the same set of core arguments.

10.1.5 SEQUENTIAL CLAUSES

Sequential clauses describe an event which follows the main clause event, often as an immediate consequence of that event. Sequential clauses are marked by a special subordinate

clause inflection involving an increment, *-waara*, to the contemporaneous verb inflection. Like contemporaneous clauses, sequential clauses typically have the same subject as the main clause and so do not take complementising case suffixes, as in examples (10.33) to (10.35), (4.69), (4.106), (7.49) and (9.78).

(10.33)   *Ngunhaa punga pangkira-rri-lha   parntayarri-rrawaara.*
           that.NOM guts   bulging-INV-PAST explode-SEQ
           His guts swelled up and then exploded.

(10.34)   *Nhuwa-ru   puni-layi murla-a.   Nhuwa-rninyji ngurnaa,*
           spear-PURPss go-FUT   meat-ACC spear-FUT   that.ACC

           manku-rrawaarajimpu-ngara-a.
           grab-SEQ   egg-PL-ACC
           Go and spear that emu (lit. meat). Spear it and then grab the eggs.

(10.35)   *Winya-ma-lalha   nhumira-a-rru   ... tharrwi-lalha jarraa-l.yarrawaara*
           full-CAUS-PAST penis-ACC-NOW   put.in-PAST tie.up-SEQ

           nhawani-i, pirriyarta-a pinyjulu-u ngurnu,   pungka-wirri-la ngunhu.
           thing-ACC own-ACC   rope-ACC that.ACC fall-LEST-LOC that.NOM
           He filled his penis [with the emu eggs]...put them in and then tied up that thing, his own rope, lest they fall out.

10.2 LEST CLAUSES

    Lest clauses describe a state of affairs considered unpleasant by the speaker and which could be expected to occur as a result of the situation described by an adjacent and usually controlling clause. The verb in the lest clause bears a special verbal inflection which may then be further inflected with an accusative or a locative complementising suffix. There are separate active and passive forms of the lest inflection (§6.1.4) even though the active inflection freely occurs on derived passive verbs. There is no obvious difference in meaning between the two patterns of inflection.

    Examples (10.36) and (10.37) illustrate lest clauses which have the same subject as the controlling clause. No complementising case suffix is appropriate here. An accusative complementiser indicates that the subject of the lest clause is coreferential with an object of the main clause (10.38) and (10.39).

(10.36)   *Ngayu   wangka-layi mir.ta-rru yinka-rninyji wirra-a   ngartil*
           1SG.NOM say-FUT   not-NOW chisel-FUT   boomerang-ACC again

           yarna-rniyangu.   Ngayu   kuntirri-nguru-rru. Nhartu-npa-lha
           dissatisfied-PASS.LEST 1SG.NOM give.up-PRES-NOW what-INCH-PAST

           kuntirri-nguru? Waruul-wa-rru ngartil yarna-nnguli-yirri   kartungku.
            give.up-PRES   still-Ø-NOW   again dissatisfied-PASS-LEST 2SG.EFF
           I'll say that I won't chisel a boomerang again in case [he's] dissatisfied with me. I'm giving up now. Why am I giving up? Lest you be dissatisfied with me again.

(10.37)   *Ngayu   puni-layi-rru   nyina-wirri manhamanha-ma-l.yarra nhuwala-a.*
           1SG.NOM go-FUT-NOW be-LEST   awkward-CAUS-CTEMP 2DU-ACC
           I'll go now lest I be making it awkward for you.

(10.38) *Mir.ta wantha-rninyji murla-a   yakarrangu-la puwa-npa-wirri-i.*
         not   leave-FUT   meat-ACC sun-LOC   rotten-INCH-LEST-ACC
         Don't leave the meat in the sun or it'll go rotten.

(10.39) *Kartu   kangku-layi yirnaa   pawulu-u panyu paju.*
         2SG.NOM carry-FUT   this.ACC child-ACC good   REAL

         Mir.ta wilawila-ma-rninyji   thurla-npa-wirri-i.
         not   shake-CAUS-FUT   eye-INCH-LEST-ACC
         You carry this child very carefully. Don't shake him or he'll wake up. (trans.)

A locative complementiser indicates that the subject of the clause is not coreferential with either the subject or an accusative marked object of the controlling clause. Instead, the subject may be coreferential with some other non-core participant of the main clause (10.40), or may introduce a new participant (10.41).

(10.40) *Nyina-Ø nganaju-wu-la   ngurriny-tha martama-l.yarra*
         sit-IMP   1SG.OBL-GEN-LOC swag-LOC   press.on-CTEMP

         puni-wirri-la karra-ngka-a-rru   kurti-l.yarra, kanarra-lu
         go-LEST-LOC scrub-LOC-ACC-NOW collect-CTEMP wind-EFF

         kuyilwa-rnu-u   pintirrijila-rru.
         spoilt-PASSP-ACC   scattered-NOW
         Sit on my swag, hold it down, or I'll have to go collecting the things that are
         in the scrub, that have been spoilt and scattered about by the wind.

(10.41) *Kartu   wankuma-lalha paju, walyi-lalha   ngurnu punkurrimarnu-u*
         2SG.NOM check-PAST   REAL uncover-PAST that.ACC blanket-ACC

         purntura-a wanti-lha-a,   wayil wii nhartu-ngara, parralhara-ngara
         rolled-ACC lie-PAST-ACC maybe if   something-PL centipede-PL

         wii,   wayil wii   wanti-wirri-la mirtungkura-la punkurrimarnu-la?
         maybe maybe maybe lie-LEST-LOC underneath-LOC blanket-LOC
         Did you check carefully and undo that blanket lying rolled up, lest there should be
         something, a centipede or whatever, lying underneath it?

There is an important difference between accusative marked lest clauses and those marked locative. Where the clause is marked accusative, the predicted unfortunate actions of the subject of the clause are a direct result of an action (or inaction) on the part of the subject of the main clause on the subordinate clause subject. There is no such direct responsibility where the clause is marked locative.

In most Australian languages in which lest clauses are found, they can occur independently of a controlling main clause. For example, Austin (1981a:229) describes such lest clauses in Diyari but suggests that these be considered structurally subordinate since a wider context of circumstances leading to the situation described by the lest clause is always understood.

Some fifteen per cent of the lest clauses occurring in the Martuthunira data appear to be effectively independent of a main clause. That is, they do not bear a complementising suffix and yet do not have the same subject as some adjacent clause. In most cases these unmarked lest clauses describe a situation that is considered unfavourable but there is no strong

implication that the situation will necessarily follow if the events described in some preceding clause are not carried out. For example:

(10.42)   *Mir.ta thaawu-rninyji. Pawulu puni-wirri kayulu-la-rru*
          not   let.go-FUT   child   go-LEST   water-LOC-NOW

          nyuni-lu-rru.
          drown-PURPss-NOW
          Don't let him go. The child might go in the water and drown.

(10.43.) *Ngayu   wiru   kartungu pukarra-a   ngurnaa*
          1SG.NOM   wanting 2SG.ACC firewood-ACC that.ACC

          piyuwa-ma-lwaa   kayulu-marta. Kampa-lwirri ngurra-a.
          finish-CAUS-PURPs=o water-PROP   burn-LEST   camp-ACC
          I want you to put out that (smouldering) firewood with water. It could burn
          out the camp otherwise.

In these examples the subject of the lest clause is coreferential with an accusative argument of the preceding clause. However, the accusative complementiser would imply that the unpleasant situation was a direct consequence of the addressee's actions or inaction. The option of leaving the lest clause unmarked allows the speaker to choose not to imply this degree of responsibility.

10.3 PURPOSE CLAUSES

Purpose clauses describe a situation which occurs after the event described in the main clause and which is usually a direct result of the main clause event, or the purpose for which the event was performed.

In Martuthunira, as in many Australian languages, purpose clauses select a verbal inflection conditioned by coreference relations between main clause and subordinate clause subjects. That is, they are inflected for switch-reference (Austin 1981b). However, unlike the binary same-subject/different-subject contrast found in most of these languages (Dench 1988), Martuthunira has three separate verb inflections (Table 10.1).

TABLE 10.1: SWITCH-REFERENCE IN PURPOSE CLAUSES

-lu/-ru -PURPss	Subject of purpose clause is coreferential with subject of main clause.
-CM-*waa* -PURPs=o	Subject of purpose clause is coreferential with an accusative object of the main clause.
-CM-*wala* -PURPds	Subject of purpose clause is not coreferential with the subject of the main clause.

The -PURPs=o and -PURPds inflections quite transparently involve the addition of the accusative and locative complementisers respectively to a suffix **-wa*. The different functions of the two inflections similarly reflect the different functions of the two complementisers. The -PURPss inflection is not related to the other suffixes.

Same-subject purpose clauses describe the intended outcome of an action performed by the subject of the main clause:

(10.44)   *Kayarra kanarri-lha nganaju   nhawu-lu.*
           two   come-PAST 1SG.ACC   see-PURPss
           Two people came to see me.

(10.45)   *Kartu   puni-layi minthal-wa-rru nhuwa-ru   jankurna-a.*
           2SG.NOM go-FUT alone-Ø-NOW   spear-PURPss emu-ACC
           You can go by yourself to spear an emu.

Same-subject purpose constructions reveal clearly the rules of set inclusion by which arguments are considered referentially 'same' or 'different'. As (10.46) and (10.47) illustrate, where the subject of either the subordinate clause or the main clause is included within the reference set of the subject of the other clause, the two clauses are considered to have the same subject. This pattern holds for all other constructions organised on the basis of the coreference of arguments.

(10.46)   *Nganaju   mimi warrirti-i   panyu-ma-lalha,   ngaliya   puni-lu*
           1SG.GEN   uncle spear-ACC good-CAUS-PAST 1DU.EXC   go-PURPss

           murla-a   manku-lu.
           meat-ACC   get-PURPss
           My uncle fixed a spear so we two could go to get meat.

(10.47)   *Ngaliya,   nganaju   mimi, nhuwa-lalha tharnta-a, nganaju   mimi*
           1DU.EXC 1SG.GEN   uncle spear-PAST euro-ACC 1SG.GEN   uncle

           mungka-ru.
           eat-PURPss
           We two, my uncle and I, speared a euro so my uncle could have a feed.

Where the subject of the purpose clause is not coreferential with the subject of the main clause, there are two possible marking choices for the verb. Generally, where the subject of the purpose clause is coreferential with an accusative object of the main clause the *-waa* inflection may be chosen; otherwise, the *-wala* inflection is chosen. In examples (10.48) and (10.49), the subject of the subordinate clause is coreferential with an accusative argument of the main clause (possible control ambiguities are discussed in §10.6 below).

(10.48)   *Ngayu   kartungu   parla-marta purra-rninyji pal.ya-a,*
           1SG.NOM 2SG.ACC stone-PROP hit-FUT   temple-ACC

           pungka-waa-rru.
           fall-PURPs=o-NOW
           I'll hit you in the temple with a stone, so you fall down. (trans.)

(10.49)   *Ngunhu   wartirramurla-a   kampa-lalha ngurnu-ngara-a*
           that.NOM woman   meat-ACC cook-PAST that.OBL-PL-ACC

           pawulu-ngara-amungka-lwaa.
           child-PL-ACC   eat-PURPs=o
           That woman cooked those kids some meat to eat. (trans.)

The following examples illustrate the functions of the *-wala* purpose inflection. The subject of a purpose clause marked with the *-wala* inflection may be coreferential with an

argument of the main clause (examples (10.50) and (10.51)), or may introduce another participant (10.52).

(10.50)   *Nhulaa   murla kangku-Ø ngurnu-mulyarrakanyara-mulyarrakampa-lwala*
            near.you meat   take-IMP   that.OBL-ALL   man-ALL   cook-PURPds

            wuruma-l.yarra nganarna-a.
            do.for-CTEMP   1PL.EXC-ACC
            Take that meat to that man so he can cook it for us. (trans.)

(10.51)   *Ngayu   nhawungarra-ma-rnuru thamiini-ngu   pawulu-u,*
            1SG.NOM look.after-CAUS-PRES DaSo+1POSS-GEN child-ACC

            nguyirri-l   wanti-wala.
            asleep-THEN lie-PURPds
            I'm looking after my grandson's child so then he (grandson) can have a sleep.

(10.52)   *Ngawu, ngaliwa wuraal puni-layi purnumpuru, thana ngunhaa*
            yes   1PL.INC still   go-FUT quiet   let   that.NOM

            nhuurryarri-wala marli-ngka   kartawura-la.
            snore-PURPds   paperbark-LOC butt-LOC
            Yes, we'll keep going quietly so that that one can keep on snoring at the foot of that paperbark.

There is a strong implication that a purpose clause marked with the *-waa* inflection depicts an outcome of the event described in the controlling main clause and intended by the subject of the main clause. However, the link between a main clause and a purpose clause marked with *-wala* is weaker. The event described is seen as an outcome of the main clause but not as a direct result of the controlling actions of the subject of the main clause.

In example (10.53), the subject of the purpose clause is in fact coreferential with an accusative object of the preceding clause. Here, the use of the *-wala* inflection indicates that while the event is an outcome of the controlling clause, it is not an outcome *intended* by the subject of that clause. By contrast, in (10.54) the *-waa* inflection is controlled by an allative noun phrase in the matrix clause.

(10.53)   *Ngunhaa muyi, jarraa-rnu-nguru,jaya-lalha-nguru, puni-lha   mulurru*
            that.NOM dog   tie-PASSP-ABL escape-PAST-ABL go-PAST straight

            waruul-wa-rrukanarri-lu   nyina-nyila-a   thalu-waya-a.
            still-Ø-NOW   come-PURPss sit-PrREL-ACC   pet-OWNER-ACC

            Thalu-waya panyu-npa-wala-rru   wiru   ngurnula-ngu-lu
            pet-OWNER good-INCH-PURPds-NOW feelings that.DEF-GEN-EFF

            murla-marnu-lu   kanarri-yangu.
            meat-ASSOC-EFF come-PASSP
            That dog, having been tied up, having escaped, went straight to come to his owner sitting there. And so the owner was very pleased having his meat-getter come to him.

(10.54)   *Ngaliwa thathu-rninyji kulhampa-ngara-a ngurnu-ngara-arta*
            1PL.INC send-FUT   fish-PL-ACC   that.OBL-PL-DIRALL

kanyara-ngara-arta,ngawayu-l ngarti-rru wurtu,
person-PL-DIRALL turn-THEN again-NOW HYPTH

kulhampa-a-lpurtu mungka-lwaa.
fish-ACC-COMP eat-PURPs=o
We'll send fish to those people, in return, so they can eat fish [while we eat the kangaroo meat they sent us].

The following examples, involving the verb *wangka-Ø* 'speak, tell', further demonstrate that the contrast between the two different-subject inflections is not an automatic response to the case-marking of the controlling noun phrase. Where the verb is interpreted as an information transfer predicate the accusative addressee typically controls the *-wala* inflection (example (10.55) – but see (9.86)). Where *wangka-Ø* is interpreted as a manipulative predicate the accusative addressee controls the *-waa* inflection (10.56).

(10.55) *Kartu wangka-Ø nganaju wanthala-a kartu*
2SG.NOM say-IMP 1SG.ACC where-ACC 2SG.NOM

withawitha-ma-lalha-a kartungu-u muyi-i, ngayu
lost-CAUS-PAST-ACC 2SG.GEN-ACC dog-ACC 1SG.NOM

puni-wala wawayi-ru.
go-PURPds look.for-PURPss
You tell me where you lost your dog and I'll go and look for it. (trans.)

(10.56) *Ngayu wangka-lha ngurnu pawulu-u wawayi-waa*
1SG.NOM say-PAST that.ACC child-ACC look.for-PURPds

muyi-i ngurnula-ngu-u.
dog-ACC that.DEF-GEN-ACC
I told that kid to look for his dog. (trans.)

Contrastive use of the two choices of purpose clause marking is not restricted to situations involving animate instigating participants. There are no such participants in the following portion of text, in which the main event line involves ambient verbs with forces of nature as their subjects.

(10.57) *Yakarrangu thanturri-layi yawurrari-rru, thulharra-npa-rra*
sun descend-FUT westward-NOW afternoon-INCH-NOW

jarruruwuraal-wa-rru muthumuthu-npa-rra-rru
slow all.right-Ø-NOW cool-INCH-CTEMP-NOW

thanturri-rra-rru. Ngunhaa malumalu-npa-waa-rru
descend-CTEMP-NOW that.NOM dark-INCH-PURPs=o-NOW

jarruru-u waruul. Ngartil malumalu-npa-layi paju-rru,
slow-ACC still next dark-INCH-FUT REAL-NOW

mir.ta paju-rru nhawu-wala wayala paju-rru.
not REAL-NOW see-PURPds night REAL-NOW
The sun is going down in the west, it's afternoon, it's slowly getting cool now as [it] goes down. That will make everything go dark slowly. Next it gets really dark, so [we] really won't be able to see anything in the night.

The process of getting dark in the *-waa* clause is interpreted as a direct result of the sun going down. However, there is no accusative object controlling the purpose clause. No subject for the *-wala* marked verb appears anywhere in the text but since it requires an animate 'perceiver' a generalised 'we' is assumed.

Finally, purpose clauses introduced by the permissive, *thana*, can appear independently of a controlling main clause (§7.10). Such constructions usually have the illocutionary force of a mild imperative and imply an action that would otherwise be described in a controlling clause (examples (7.105) and (7.106)).

10.4 CLAUSAL COMPLEMENTS

Verbs of perception, cognition and information transfer, and the predicate nominals *nhuura* 'knowing', *wiru* 'wanting' and *waya* 'fear', select clausal complements of various kinds. Clausal complements occur either on subject position or on an accusative argument position and are usually non-verbal ascriptive clauses or relative clauses. However, the purpose clause inflection *-waa* is used to mark object complements of 'subsequent time' for some predicates.

The predicate noun phrase or verb in an object complement clause bears an accusative complementising suffix and this accusative marking extends to the subject of the clausal complement. But, as described in §3.3.2, subordinate clauses typically bear complementising case only on the head verb (or nominal predicate); noun phrase arguments and adjuncts on these arguments remain unmarked for complementising case. Even though the subject argument of a subordinate clause is generally omitted, surviving second predications on that subject remain unmarked. Thus it is possible to argue that the subjects of clausal complements are 'raised' into object position in the matrix clause. For example:

(10.58) *Nhuwana nhuura*   ⎰ *nganaju   yilangu karri-nyila-a   purnumpuru.*
         2PL   knowing ⎱ 1SG.ACC here   stand-PrREL-ACC quiet

                              ⎰ **ngayu*   yilangu karri-nyila-a   purnumpuru.*
                              ⎱ 1SG.NOM here   stand-PrREL-ACC quiet
         You know that I'm standing here quietly.

There are a number of examples in the data that suggest that second predications may be raised out of complement clauses along with the subject of the clause. All such examples involve interrogative/indefinite second predications of manner as in the following example.

(10.59) *Ngayu   nhawu-layi nhartu-u   wantharra-ayirna   muyi-i*
         1SG.NOM see-FUT   what-ACC like-ACC   this.ACC dog-ACC

         murti-i,   yanga-rnura-a   tharnta-a.
         fast-ACC chase-PrREL-ACC euro-ACC
         I'll see what this dog's speed is like, chasing kangaroos.

The choice of verb inflection in complement clauses is not entirely free but depends in part on the matrix predicate. Firstly, the perception verbs *nhawu-Ø* 'see', *kuliya-L* 'hear', and *nguyi-ma-L* 'dream' take only complements which can be interpreted as having non-future temporal reference. As noted in §9.5.7, the subject complement constructions involve the reflexive nominal *jankul* 'self', which is best described as an adjunct on the matrix subject a in (10.60) below.

(10.60) *Ngayu   nguyi-ma-lalha   ngurnu   muyi-i   jankul*
1SG.NOM dream-CAUS-PAST that.ACC dog-ACC self

yanga-lalha-nguru.
chase-PAST-ABL
I dreamt that I had been chasing that dog. (trans.)
(lit. I dreamt about myself that I had been chasing that dog).

(10.61) *Ngayu   nhawu-lha ngurnu   pawulu-u   thani-rnura-a*
1SG.NOM see-PAST that.ACC child-ACC hit-PrREL-ACC

wirra-marta   ngurnu   muyi-i.
boomerang-PROP that.ACC dog-ACC
I saw that child hitting the dog with a boomerang. (trans.)

On the other hand, complements of the predicate nominals *wiru* 'wanting' and *waya* 'fear', and the derived verbs *wiru-npa-Ø* 'come to want' and *wayangka-Ø* 'be frightened', take only 'subsequent time' complements. Subject complements bear the future tense inflection, object complements bear the *-waa* PURPs=o, inflection. Examples (10.62) and (10.63) illustrate for *wiru*.

(10.62) *Ngayu   wiru   yungku-ngu-layi ngurnu-tharra-a*
1SG.NOM wanting give-PASS-FUT that.OBL-DU-ACC

wirra-tharra-a.
boomerang-DU-ACC
I want to be given those two boomerangs.

(10.63) *Ngunhaa mir.ta wiru yirna-tharra-a   ngayala-tharra-a*
that.NOM not   want this.OBL-DU-ACC nephew-DU-ACC

nhurnti-ma-lalha-a   jankurna-amungka-lwaa ngurnaa.
dead-CAUS-PAST-ACC emu-ACC eat-PURPs=o that.ACC
He didn't want these two nephews who had speared the emu to eat it.

The cognition verb *kuliyanpa-Ø* 'think, believe' allows both non-future and subsequent time complements on both subject (10.64), and object (10.65) and (10.66).

(10.64) *Ngayu   kuliyanpa-lha nhartu-u   ngawayu yungku-layi*
1SG.NOM think-PAST   something-ACC in.turn   give-FUT

nganaju-u   mimi-i.
1SG.GEN-ACC uncle-ACC
I thought about giving my uncle something in return.

(10.65) *Kartu   kuliyanpa-nguru nganaju   ngalawangka-nyila-a wurtu?*
2SG.NOM think-PRES   1SG.ACC tell.lie-PrREL-ACC HYPTH
Do you think that I'm lying?

(10.66) *Ngunhaa nganaju   kuliyanpa-lha paya-lalha-nguru*
that.NOM 1SG.ACC think-PAST   drink-PAST-ABL

nhurnti-npa-waa   paju-rru.
dead-INCH-PURPs=o REAL-NOW
She thinks that I'm really going to die from drinking.

The predicate nominal *nhuura* 'knowing' and its inchoative counterpart *nhuura-npa-Ø* 'learn' similarly take both subsequent time and non-future complements on subject and object.

(10.67) *Nhuura-npa-layi   minthal warra panyu-ma-rninyji warrirti-i.*
know-INCH-FUT alone   CONT   good-CAUS-FUT spear-ACC
Learn to fix a spear on your own for a change.

(10.68) *Ngunhu kanyaramir.ta nhuura wantharni-ma-lwaa   ngurnaa*
that.NOM man   not   knowing what.way-CAUS-PURPs=o that.ACC

thaapuwa-a.   Ngunhaa-nu   kuyil ngunhaa. Nhuura-npa-layi
bad.fellow-ACC that.NOM-QUOTbad   that.NOM know-INCH-FUT

nhartu-u   wii   mil.yirri-nguli-nyila-a. ... Ngunhaa nhuura
something-ACC maybe hide-PASS-PrREL-ACC   that.NOM knowing

waruu-lpurtu yirna   mil.yirri-nyila-a, kanyara-a.
still-COMP   this.ACC hide-PrREL-ACC man-ACC
That man didn't know what that bad fellow was going to do. He was bad
that one. He was waking up to the fact that something or other was being
hidden...He knew this man was hiding something all right.

Complements of the information transfer verbs *wangka-Ø* 'speak, tell', and *nhuura-ma-L* 'teach show' are illustrated in §9.5.8. *Nhuura-ma-L* typically takes object complements while *wangka-Ø* may take either subject or object complements. Subject complements are illustrated in the two following examples.

(10.69) *Mir.ta wangka-lha, nganaju   mimi, wantharni puni-rra.*
not   say-PAST 1SG.GEN uncle what.way go-CTEMP
He didn't say, my uncle, which way he was going.

(10.70) *Ngayu   wangka-layi mir.ta-rru yinka-rninyji wirra-a   ngartil.*
1SG.NOM tell-FUT   not-NOW chisel-FUT   boomerang-ACC again
I'll tell [him] that I won't chisel a boomerang again.

As example (10.70) shows, *wangka-Ø* permits subsequent time complements on the subject. However, for both *wangka-Ø* and *nhuura-ma-L*, subordinate clauses involving the *-waa* PURPs=o inflection are interpreted as regular purpose clauses as below.

(10.71) *Ngayu   wangka-lha kartungu manku-waa   nganaju-u*
1SG.NOM tell-PAST   2SG.ACC get-PURPs=o 1SG.GEN-ACC

ngamari-i!
tobacco-ACC
I told you to get my tobacco!

(10.72) *Ngayu   kartungu-ngara-a   pawulu-ngara-a nhuura-ma-rninyji*
1SG.NOM 2SG.GEN-PL-ACC   child-PL-ACC   know-CAUS-FUT

marrari-i Martuthunira-a   wangka-waa.
language-ACC *Martuthunira*-ACC speak-PURPs=o
I'll teach your children to speak Martuthunira.

10.5 PASSIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

The description of subordinate clause types in the preceding sections of this chapter demonstrates that Martuthunira has no general constraint requiring coreference between the subject of a subordinate clause and some argument of the matrix clause. There are many complex sentence patterns in which one clause is subordinate to another but where the two share no arguments. Thus it should not be surprising that the choice of a passive subordinate clause is not dictated by strict syntactic rule. Many Australian languages have similar systems of clausal subordination and yet function perfectly well without a productive voice system.

As noted in §9.6, a passive main clause is used either to present a non-subject argument in a highly topical position, or to turn attention away from the agent. The same pragmatic/semantic considerations are relevant to the choice of passive subordinate clauses. However, the choice of a passive clause is also dependent on the particular relationship between main and subordinate clause indicated by subordinate verb inflection and complementising case.

The most common subordinate passive clauses occur in contemporaneous relative clauses and in *-waa* purpose clauses. Passive contemporaneous clauses are usually agentless, have the same subject as the controlling main clause, and typically describe a general state characterising that subject. In many cases no specific agent can be understood.

(10.73) *Nhuwana panyu-ma-rninyji minthal-wa-rru, kanyarra-lpurtu warnu?*
2PL   good-CAUS-FUT   alone-Ø-NOW   man-COMP   ASSERT

Mir.ta nyina-layi wuruma-nngu-rra   yirla.
not   be-FUT   do.for-PASS-CTEMP only
You fellows do it on your own, you're men aren't you? Don't just have it done *for* you all the time.

(10.74) *Nhuwana mir.ta nhuura   kalya nyina-layi, kuyil   paju,*
2PL   not   knowing still   sit-FUT   bad   REAL

karimalkarimalpaju   karta-nngu-rra   wantharra
jumpy   REAL poke-PASS-CTEMP like

yimpalaa karta-nngu-rra   wantharra milhu.
like.that poke-PASS-CTEMP like   bum
You don't know to sit still, really bad, jumpy as if you were being poked in the bum.

(10.75) *Ngunhu   jantira   wangka-ngu-rra   Tharnturranythani-lalha muyi-i.*
that.NOM old.woman say-PASS-CTEMP *Tharnturrany* hit-PAST   dog-ACC
That old woman called *Tharnturrany* hit the dog. (trans.)

By contrast, passive subordinate clauses marked with the *-waa* purpose inflection rarely occur without an explicit agent. The choice of a passive clause here is largely motivated by the particular semantic properties of the purpose construction. The *-waa* inflection implies an effective action in the main clause, typically directed at a participant which functions as the subject of the subordinate clause. The object in the main clause may be prodded into action in the subordinate clause, in which case the subordinate clause is active. Alternatively, the referent of the main clause object may be placed in a situation in which it is further affected by a subordinate clause agent. In this case the subordinate clause is passive. For example:

(10.76) *Nganarna warrirti-i   kangku-nguru kartungu-mulyarrayirla, kartungku*
1PL.EXC spear-ACC bring-PRES   2SG.OBL-ALL   only 2SG.EFF

yirla panyu-ma-nnguli-waa,   thaapuwa-ngku kur.ta-ngku.
only good-CAUS-PASS-PURPs=o bastard-EFF   clever-EFF
We bring spears only to you, to be fixed by you alone, you clever old bastard.

(10.77) *Ngaliwa nhartu-ngara-a   wii   kanyja-rninyji muyinu-u   paju*
1PL.INC something-PL-ACC maybe keep-FUT   hidden-ACC REAL

mir.ta paju   nhawu-nguli-waa   muyal.yi-ngara-lu.
not   REAL see-PASS-PURPs=o thief-PL-EFF
We'll keep all the things well hidden so they won't be seen by any thieves.

(10.78) *Kartu-lwa   ngurnaa maruwa-lalha   manku-nguli-waa*
2SG.NOM-ID that.ACC make.trouble-PAST grab-PASS-PURPs=o

marntamarta-lu.
policeman-EFF
You're the one who made trouble for that fellow so that he was grabbed
by the police. (trans.)

Although passive same-subject purpose clauses are accepted as grammatical, no examples occur in free text. Instead a construction involving a passive verb inflected for future tense is used. Example (10.79) illustrates the elicited pattern while (10.80) presents the preferred pattern.

(10.79) *Ngayu   puni-layi thawun-mulyarra nhawu-ngu-lu   pulhanyji-lu.*
1SG.NOM go-FUT   town-ALL   see-PASS-PURPss doctor-EFF
I'll go to town to be seen by the doctor. (trans.)

(10.80) *Ngayu   puni-layi pulhanyji-lu nhawu-ngu-layi.*
1SG.NOM go-FUT   doctor-EFF see-PASS-FUT
I'll go and be seen by the doctor.

Where the purpose clause has the same subject as the main clause the two situations are typically seen as being intended and controlled by the one participant. However, since the subject of a passive clause is not an instigating and controlling participant, the choice of a passive is contrary to the expected reading of a same-subject purpose clause. It is not surprising that the construction illustrated in example (10.80) is more natural in free text.

The choice of a passive form of a NP-relative clause is partly dependent on a grammaticalisation of the topicalising function of the passive. If a relative clause has a non-subject core argument which is coreferential with a core argument of the main clause, and if the subject of the subordinate clause is NOT coreferential with a core argument of the main clause, then the subordinate clause is presented as a passive with the coreferential argument in subject/pivot position.

(10.81) *Mir.ta-nu yanga-rnuru purrkuru paju   wantharni-i*
not-QUOT follow-PRES truly   REAL what.way-ACC

yungku-yangu-u   nhiiyarra-lu puni-layi-lu.
give-PASSP-ACC this.DU-EFF go-FUT-EFF
Apparently they didn't follow the law (lit. way) given to them by these two who were going to go [away].

(10.82) *Puni-lha ngunhaa   manku-lu   yilhi-i-rru   ngurnu   kayarra-a*
go-PAST that.NOM grab-PURPss chip-ACC-NOW that.ACC two-ACC

wirra-tharra-a   yinka-rnu-u.
boomerang-DU-ACC chisel-PASSP-ACC
He went to get the chips of those two boomerangs that been carved.

Clearly, this strategy will not account for the choice of passive clauses in object complement clauses of verbs of perception, for example. Here the choice of a passive is purely determined by pragmatic considerations; compare (10.83) with (10.84).

(10.83) *Ngayu   nhawu-lha pawulu-ngara-a puliyanyja-ngara-lu*
1SG.NOM see-PAST   child-PL-ACC   old.people-PL-EFF

nhuura-ma-nnguli-nyila-a.
know-CAUS-PASS-PrREL-ACC
I saw the children being taught by the old people. (trans.)

(10.84) *Ngayu   nhawu-lha puliyanyja-ngara-a nhuura-ma-rnura-a*
1SG.NOM see-PAST old.people-PL-ACC know-CAUS-PrREL-ACC

pawulu-ngara-a.
child-PL-ACC
I saw the old people teaching the children. (trans.)

There are very few examples in the data of passive forms of the more weakly linked locative finite relative or unmarked present relative clauses. Since these clauses are not bound by the constraint placing coreferential non-subject arguments in pivot position, this is not at all surprising. At the same time, since they often constitute parenthetical comment on events or participants in the narrative they do not have the topic presentation function of passive main clauses. All examples occurring in the data are agentless passives. For example:

(10.85) *Puyi   paju, ngunhaa   thanarti-laKurlanypungkunhu,*
far.NOM REAL that.NOM sea-LOC *Kurlanypungkunhu*

ngunhu   ngunhu-lwa Pantuwarnangkamuya-rnu-la.
that.NOM that.NOM-ID Pannawonica   steal-PASSP-LOC

Thalu-ngara ngularla kurlany-ngara.
site-PL   there.NS knife-PL
It's a long way off, in the sea, that *Kurlanypungkunhu* Island. That's the one Pannawonica Hill was stolen from. There are lots of increase sites somewhere there, knife quarries.

(10.86) *Walywanti-lha-rru   yila-ngara   pungka-lha ngurra-ngka-rru,*
come.off-PAST-NOW this.LOC-PL fall-PAST   ground-LOC-NOW

jal.yu-rru   thani-nnguli-nyila, karla-ngka warntitha-nnguli-nyila.
neck-NOW hit-PASS-PrREL fire-LOC   throw-PASS-PrREL
All these things here (pointing to private parts) came off and fell onto the ground, and they were being hit in the [back of the] neck, and being thrown in the fire.

Similarly, passive *-wala* purpose clauses are quite uncommon. Once again, the choice of a passive clause in this construction is motivated by the same principles as explain main clause passives: a decision to topicalise the patient, and/or to ignore the agent. For example:

(10.87)   *Ngayu   panyu-ma-lalha   warrirti-ngara-a maruwarla-a,wuruma-l.yarra,*
          1SG.NOM good-CAUS-PAST spear-PL-ACC   many-ACC   do.for-CTEMP

          ngulu   kanyara-lu mirtuwarra-lu kur.ta-ngku pawulu-ngara
          that.EFF   man-EFF   teacher-EFF   clever-EFF   child-PL

          nhuura-ma-nnguli-wala   ngulu.
          know-CAUS-PASS-PURPds   that.EFF
          I fixed a lot of spears, doing a favour, so that the children could be taught [about
          them] by that clever teacher.

(10.88)   *Ngunhu   wartirrakarra-ngka-rru   thurtinti-lha,   yarrwa-ngka-rru*
          that.NOM that.NOM woman   scrub-LOC-NOW disappear-PAST behind-LOC-NOW

          ngurnula-ngu-ngara pawulu-ngara nhawungarra-ma-nnguli-wala
          that.DEF-GEN-PL   child-PL   look.after-CAUS-PASS-PURPds

          yarta-ngara-lu.
          other-PL-EFF
          That woman disappeared into the scrub and now, behind [her], her children
          have to be looked after by other people.

In both of these examples the situation denoted by the subordinate clause could easily have
been described with an active verb bearing the same *-wala* purpose inflection. However, in
both cases the children are the focus of interest and so a passive is chosen.

10.6 SUBORDINATE CLAUSES ON DOUBLE-OBJECT CLAUSES

Verbs which allow more than one accusative object similarly permit subordinate clauses on
more than one argument. In fact there are few examples in the data in which two accusative
arguments, one controlling a subordinate clause, both occur in the same clause. And there are
no examples in which two accusative arguments each control separate subordinate clauses.

Nevertheless, it is clear from elicited and test data that there is little room for ambiguity in
the interpretation of control relations between accusative arguments and subordinate clauses.
Correct assignment of control relations is facilitated by a number of factors. Firstly, the
controlling accusative argument typically occurs at the matrix clause margin adjacent to the
subordinate clause. Secondly, possible coreference relationships are inferred from knowledge
of the semantic roles of the main clause and subordinate clause predicates and knowledge of
the likely roles of the participants. For example, consider the following pair of test examples
which were given the same English gloss.

(10.89)   *Ngayu   ngurnu   muyi-i   kartungu-u   kurntal-yu   yungku-lha,*
          1SG.NOM that.ACC dog-ACC 2SG.GEN-ACC daughter-ACC give-PAST

          nhawungarra-ma-lwaa.
          look.after-CAUS-PURPs=o
          I gave your daughter the dog so she could look after it. (constr.)

(10.90)   *Ngayu   ngurnu   muyi-i   kartungu-u   kurntal-yu   yungku-lha,*
          1SG.NOM that.ACC dog-ACC 2SG.GEN-ACC daughter-ACC give-PAST

nhawungarra-ma-nnguli-waa.
look.after-CAUS-PASS-PURPs=o
I gave your daughter the dog so she could look after it. (constr.)
(lit. I gave your daughter the dog so it could be looked after by her.)

It is clear that the subject of the subordinate clause is linked to different matrix accusative arguments in each sentence. Such examples have an unmarked interpretation in which the participant higher on some scale of relative animacy is left 'looking after' the lower. To force a reading of a sentence such as (10.89), in which the dog is left looking after the child, the noun phrase 'your daughter' must appear in the subordinate clause. The following examples involving *nhuura-ma-*L 'show' illustrate this.

(10.91)   *Ngayu   ngurnu   muyi-i   nhuura-ma-lalha   kartungu-u*
          1SG.NOM that.ACC   dog-ACC know-CAUS-PAST 2SG.GEN-ACC

          pawulu-u, nhawungarra-ma-lwaa.
          child-ACC look.after-CAUS-PURPs=o
          I showed that dog to the child so he would look after it. (trans.)

(10.92)   *Ngayu   nhuura-ma-lalha   ngurnu   muyi-i   kartungu-u*
          1SG.NOM know-CAUS-PAST   that.ACC   dog-ACC 2SG.GEN-ACC

          pawulu-u, nhawungarra-ma-lwaa   ngurnu   pawulu-u.
          child-ACC look.after-CAUS-PURPs=o that.ACC   child-ACC
          I showed that dog to the child (or the child to the dog) so it would look after the child. (trans.)

10.7 MULTIPLE SUBORDINATION

The following examples illustrate more complex sentences involving a number of subordinate clauses. As these show, the coreference relationships marked by verbal inflection and complementising case allow sequences of clauses in which the core arguments of the verb need not appear. Clause boundaries are marked by a slash (/):

(10.93)   *Ngayu   jarraa-lalha / nganaju-u   pawu-u   wuruma-l.yarra*
          1SG.NOM tie.up-PAST   1SG.GEN-ACC   father-ACC do.for-CTEMP

          warrirti-ngara-a/ wanti-waa   / wartawirrinpa-rra
          nganaju-u
          spear-PL-ACC   lie-PURPs=owait.for-CTEMP   1SG.GEN-ACC

          pawu-u   / wantharta kanarri-waa   / manku-lu
          father-ACCsometime   come-PURPs=o get-PURPss

          yirna-ngara-a   warrirti-ngara-a.
          this.OBL-PL-ACC spear-PL-ACC
          I tied up [the spears] / doing the spears for my father / so they would be / waiting for my father / to come sometime / to get these spears.

(10.94)   *Thurlanyarraramir.ta wiyaa nhuura ngali-i   / karri-nyila-a*
          poor.fellow   not   maybe knowing 1DU.INC-ACC   stand-PrREL-ACC

          / nhawu-rra   ngurnaa yimpala-a-lwa   / nyina-nyila-a   /
             watch-CTEMP that.ACC like.that-ACC-ID   sit-PrREL-ACC

mungka-l.yarra.
eat-CTEMP
The poor fellow didn't know we / were standing / watching him like that / sitting / eating.

(10.95) *Nyina-Ø   nganaju-wu-la   ngurriny-tha   /   martama-l.yarra   /*
sit-IMP   1SG.OBL-GEN-LOC   swag-LOC   press.down-CTEMP

kanarra-lu patha-rrnguli-yirri / warntitha-rniyangu / puni-wirri-la   /
wind-EFF   blow-PASS-LEST   throw-PASSLEST   go-LEST-LOC

karra-ngka-a-rru   kurti-l.yarra   /   kanarra-lu
scrub-LOC-ACC-NOW gather-CTEMP   wind-EFF

kuyil-wa-rnu-u.
bad-CAUS-PASSP-ACC
Sit on my swag / press down on it / lest it get blown away by the wind / get thrown about / lest I have to go / and gather all the things that are in the scrub / ruined by the wind.

These examples consist of a simple chain of adjoined subordinate clauses each dependent on the previous clause. In (10.96) a set of three purpose clauses is controlled by the one matrix clause.

(10.96) *Nhuwana! Marrari wangka-lha nhuwana-a / mir.ta patharri-waa   /*
2PL   word   say-PAST   2PL-ACC   not   fight-PURPs=o

panyu nyina-waa   / mir.ta patharri-waa.   / Patharri-rra   wii   /
good   be-PURPs=o   not   fight-PURPs=o   fight-CTEMP   if

nhuwana mir.ta panyu nyina-rra   / ngulu-wa   ngarniwurtu-lu
2PL   not   good   be-CTEMP that.EFF-YK   policeman-EFF

manku-ngu-layi   paju-rru.
grab-PASS-FUT   REAL-NOW
You fellows! The law (lit. word) tells you / not to fight / to be good / not to fight. / If you fight / you aren't good / you'll be grabbed by the policeman for sure.

In example (10.97), the clause *paya-lalha-nguru* 'having been drinking', is dependent on the following *-waa* marked purpose clause, not on the preceding complement taking predicate *wayangka-Ø* 'fear'.

(10.97) *Ngunhaa   nganaju   kuliyanpa-lha / paya-lalha-nguru /*
that.NOM 1SG.ACC think-PAST   drink-PAST-ABL

nhurnti-npa-waa   paju-rru.
dead-INCH-PURPs=o REAL-NOW
She thinks that I'm really going to die from drinking.