1. Class, Species, and Basic Verbal Clauses: Introduction

1.1 The subject of this chapter is the construction of basic verbal clauses. This is, admittedly, putting the cart before the horse, as many complications of the verbal complex itself will not be addressed until the following chapter. However, we may benefit conceptually from bringing together both syntactic and morphological elements of basic clause construction into a single chapter, while relegating further verbal complexities – such as reduplication, verb serialisation, adverbs, and non-agreement affixes and particles – for a later time.

For the purposes of this chapter, a “basic verbal clause” is a clause consisting of a single verb complex, and one or more directly-involved arguments of the verb. In Rawàng Ata, basic verbal clauses are conceived of as comments upon some implicit or overt topic, and some discussion of topics will be introduced in the final part of this chapter. This chapter will not discuss the coordination of clauses, nor specialised verbal clauses such as questions and commands.

1.2 In studying Rawàng Ata, neither the morphology of its verbs nor the syntax of its verbal clauses is likely to be easily understood without first grasping the twin concepts of verbal “class” and verbal “species”.

“Species” is perhaps easiest to explain. The concept of species largely encompasses areas described as ‘voice’ in other languages: it defines the relationships between a verb and its core arguments, and sets patterns for syntactic and morphological marking of both verb and argument. The immediate difference between species and voice in the conventional sense is that Rawàng Ata possesses nine distinct species; some of the implications of their use may also deviate from the semantics of voice in a narrow sense.

More significant, however, is that species is – unlike voice in most languages – very far from fully productive. Few individual verbs are able to be placed in more than six of those nine species.

The set of species open to a given verb is not ad hoc, but can largely be explained by positing only three verb classes: agentive, patientive, and subjective. Agentive and patientive verbs can each be placed in any of seven species, three of which are shared between all three classes, while subjective verbs can only access four species, two of which are shared with both agentive and patientive verbs, and a further one of which is shared only with agentive verbs.

For ease of reference, the following table lays out the relationship of class and potential species:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Verbs</th>
<th>Agentive Verbs</th>
<th>Patientive Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antipassive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detransitive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
1.3 Verbal classes, in turn, are largely semantic in foundation, but are assigned lexically, and as a result a minority of verbs have seen their semantics drift out of alignment with their assigned class. In general, agentive verbs are prototypically verbs of transitive action, in which an agent performs an action that has a real effect upon (i.e. in most cases changes the shape, position or integrity of, or through contact causes a strong physical sensation such as pain for) an object – they include such verbs as sàkkanga, ‘to kick’, and tūfu, ‘to push’. Patientive verbs are slightly more varied, but mostly fall into one of three subclasses: verbs of sensation, perception and opinion, such as tu, ‘to see’ or yukyūsu, ‘to be disgusted by the taste of’; verbs of physical or social relation, such as sunu, ‘to be in debt to’, osār, ‘to resemble’, or āsaka, ‘to be in an analogous position to’; and verbs indicating states and conditions, and changes of such, such as rūan, ‘to be(come) blue’, and kashisha, ‘to be(come) shattered into many fragments’. Finally, subjective verbs are typically either verbs of motion, such as wa, ‘to travel upstream’, or of atelic, intransitive activity, typically either punctiliar, such as bày, ‘to blink’, or repetitive, such as vòvom, ‘to wobble’.

A relatively few verbs appear to exist in more than one class, with some semantic shift. This shift may be minor, as in the case of ǔni (in the subjective, ‘to die’, but in the patientive ‘to be killed’), or more significant, as in the case of làmi (in the subjective, ‘to chat’, but in the patientive ‘to be known or spoken of’) – or even extreme, as in the case of olùa (in the patientive, ‘to accept a suggestion from, but in the agentive, ‘to angrily reject a suggestion from’ or ‘to slap in the face’). There are also a very small number of defective verbs, which act irregularly with respect to species (typically by not allowing certain species that would otherwise be permitted) – most troubling for this analysis are the handful of verbs, such as as fòma, ‘to be known proverbially’, that are found only in the concrete, and hence cannot meaningfully be assigned a class.

Notwithstanding these peripheral complications, however, the behaviour of most verbs can be straightforwardly explained through the framework of class and species. Accordingly, the basic syntax of verbal clauses is likewise best explained by considering species in turn.

1.4 Verb species are distinct from one another in two ways: through distinctive patterns of morphological agreement on the verb; and through distinctive patterns of case marking on the verb’s core arguments. The nine verb species in fact share only three, or arguably four, agreement patterns, indicated in the above table by colour: red for subject agreement, blue for object agreement, and purple for double agreement; orange indicates the agreement pattern of concrete verbs, which is very similar to, but slightly distinct from, the usual subject agreement pattern.

Non-concrete species, which may for convenience be termed fluid, have important differences from the concrete species. Accordingly, the eight fluid species will be considered in turn first, followed by a consideration of the concrete. To reduce redundancy of description, we will first describe the three fluid agreement patterns, before going on to consider the case marking patterns associated with each species in turn.
Accordingly, this chapter is divided into six parts, including this introduction: the second part will cover the agreement affixes in the fluid species; the third part will cover how those systems of agreement combine with patterns of case-marking and default word order in each species; the fourth part will address agreement, case-marking and default word order in the concrete species; the fifth part presents brief explanation of the concept of ‘animacy barring’, a set of semantic-syntactic obstacles to the formation of basic verbal clauses; and the sixth part deals with pragmatically-motivated deviations from the default word order, which necessitates a brief discussion of topicality.
2. Agreement in the Fluid Species

2.1 There are, as explained above, three possible agreement systems for fluid verb species: subject agreement, object agreement, and double agreement.

Subject agreement is found in the active, transitive, detransitive and antipassive species. In all these species, the verb agrees with its subject by means of an unstressed initial prefix.

There are only three such prefixes: inanimate sa-, animate ra-, and female ku-.

The prefix sa- applies whenever the subject of a verb in any of these species is inanimate, with the exception that the prefix is dropped whenever the subject is represented by a pronoun that immediately precedes the verb. Thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ex. 1 a) } & \text{lubu sa-vòvom} \\
& \text{ball INAN-wobble} \\
& \text{the ball wobbles} \\
\text{b) } & \text{songà sa-wànsha-tu} \\
& \text{rock INAN-crush-ANT} \\
& \text{the rock comes crushing down} \\
\text{c) } & \text{tara wànsha-tu} \\
& \text{3.INAN crush-ANT} \\
& \text{it comes crushing down} \\
\text{d) } & \text{tara ingùa sa-wànsha-tu} \\
& \text{3.INAN another.time INAN-crush-ANT} \\
& \text{on another occasion it comes crushing down}
\end{align*}
\]

In \text{ex. 1 d)}, the intrusion of the adverb between the pronoun and the verb prevents the pronoun from triggering prefix-dropping.

The prefix ra-, correspondingly, marks animate subjects, and, as with the inanimate prefix, this prefix is likewise dropped when the subject is a pronoun that directly precedes the verb. Thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ex. 2 a) } & \text{fòna ra-bày} \\
& \text{foreigner AN-blink} \\
& \text{the foreigner blinks} \\
\text{b) } & \text{dàn bày} \\
& \text{3.INT blink} \\
& \text{he blinks} \\
\text{c) } & \text{dàn sàkkanga lubù-m} \\
& \text{3.INT kick ball-ACC} \\
& \text{he kicks the ball}
\end{align*}
\]
d) dàn lubù-m ra-sàkkanga

3.INT ball-ACC AN-kick

he kicks his ball; OR: as for him, its the ball he kicks

Here, in ex. 2 d), the focusing movement of the direct object divides the pronominal subject from the verb, so prefix dropping does not occur.

However, the behaviour of sa- and ra- is not perfectly equivalent, because in the case of the latter, this dropping also occurs after any noun referring to a human of the Là ethnicity, or (typically) any closely-related ethnicity. Dropping may also occur with foreigners or gods, but this is marked, typically seeking to indicate a particularly strong empathy with the subject. Dropping may also frequently occur when the subject is in point of fact non-Là, but is referred to by a noun strongly associated with Là culture. As with pronouns, this dropping does not take place when the pronoun and verb are separated. Thus:

ex. 3  a) kèsar ra-tùfu lubù-m

  goat AN-push ball-ACC

  the goat pushes the ball

b) fòna ra-tùfu lubù-m

  foreigner AN-push ball-ACC

  the foreigner pushes the ball

c) dattà tùfu lubù-m

  sailor push ball-ACC

  the (Là) sailor pushes the ball

d) dattà lubù-m ra-tùfu

  sailor ball-ACC AN-push

  the sailor pushes his ball; OR: as for the sailor, it’s the ball that he pushes

The female prefix ku- is more limited in use. It occurs only when the verb is in the transitive species, when the subject is female (i.e. of the damùn, yanha or maòko sòngra) and Là (etc), and when the direct object is male (i.e. of the yojo or òro) and Là (etc). It is never dropped due to contact, and replaces the ra- prefix if the latter would otherwise be present. Thus:

ex. 4  a) kòma tùfu lubù-m

  girl push ball-ACC

  the girl pushes the ball

b) kòma tùfu fòna-m

  girl push foreigner-ACC

  the girl pushes the foreigner

c) dattà tùfu kòma-n

  sailor push girl-ACC

  the sailor pushes the girl
d) kòma ku-tufu dattà-m
   girl F-push sailor-ACC
   the girl pushes the sailor

It should be noted that the dropping or retention of these prefixes depends on the subject noun phrase being adjacent to the verb complex, not necessarily to the verb itself. Thus, preposed verbal particles, including counters, articles and numerals, or postposed nominal particles, do not prevent dropping – although adverbs do. Hence:

ex. 5  a) dattà lù sàkkanga lubù-m
      sailor three kick ball-ACC
      the sailor kicks the ball three times

b) kòma inta bày
   girl ART blink
   the girl also blinks on a different occasion

c) kòma ingùa ra-bày
   girl another.time AN-blink
   another time, the girl blinks

2.2 Turning to objective agreement, we find a very similar pattern, moved to the rear of the verb. There are two possible agreement suffixes: animate -ra and inanimate -sa. As with subject agreement prefixes, the object agreement suffixes are both dropped when immediately followed by a pronoun, and the animate object agreement suffix is additionally dropped whenever immediately followed by a noun referring to a Là human, with the same provisos as described above. Of particular note, postpositive particles are considered part of the verb complex, and hence do not prevent dropping. Accordingly, and bearing in mind that the object of patientive verbs in Rawàng Ata often corresponds to the subject of the corresponding verb in English:

ex. 6  a) tu kòma
      see girl
      the girl sees

b) rùan à
   blue sea
   the sea is blue
   [the sea is considered animate]

c) tufu-ku dattà
   push-STAT sailor
   the sailor is pushed
d) ruà-sa lubu
    blue-INAN ball
    the ball is blue

e) tùfu-ku-sa lubu
    push-STAT-INAN ball
    the ball is pushed

f) kòma tu-ra
    girl see-AN
    as for the girl, she sees

g) à ruà-ra
    sea blue-AN
    as for the sea, it is blue

h) dattà tùfu-ku-ra
    sailor push-STAT-AN
    as for the sailor, he is pushed

2.3 Finally, there is the double agreement system. As might be anticipated, this incorporates both subject and object agreement. However, this system is notably more complicated than either of the two smaller systems.

Within double agreement, agreement with the subject can where appropriate employ the same three prefixes as plain subject agreement employs, with two small modifications: the prefixes are never dropped, and the female subject prefix does not replace, but is preposed to, the animate prefix. In this way:

ex. 7 a) kòma ku-ra-tùfu-sa lubù-m
    girl F-AN-push-INAN ball-ACC
    the girl pushes the ball

In addition to these basic prefixes, however, double agreement further distinguishes within third person animate subjects between subjects of differing status. Where the object is animate and the subject is a non-intelligent animate, or where the subject is a non-intelligent animate and the addressee or an acknowledged audience member is of notably higher or lower social status than the speaker, the subject is marked by fu-. So:

ex. 8 a) à fu-yantì-n dattà-m
    sea AN-splash-INT sailor-ACC
    the sea splashes over the sailor

b) à fu-yanti-ra bedùj-ma
    sea AN-splash-AN ship-ACC
    the sea splashes over the ship, sir
Where the subject is an intelligent animate, and superior in status to an animate object (including cases where the object is animate but unintelligent), or else is of notably higher or lower social status than the speaker, the subject is marked by nà-. The prefix ra- may also, in double marking, be replaced by nà- as a general indicator of more formal and sombre speech – or of mockery. So:

ex. 9  a) ruìnga na-sàkkanga-n dattà-m
freeholder AN-kick-INT sailor-ACC
the freeholder kicks the sailor

b) dattà ra-sàkkanga-ra fòna-m
sailor AN-kick-AN foreigner-ACC
the sailor kicks the foreigner

c) dattà na-sàkkanga-ra fòna-m
sailor AN-kick-AN goat-ACC
his excellency the sailor kicks the foreigner

The prefix sequence **ku-nà- resolves to kùn-; notably, female intelligent animates are always considered socially superior to males of otherwise equivalent social rank. Thus:

ex. 10 a) kòma kun-tùfu-n dattà-m
girl F.AN-push-INT sailor-ACC
the girl pushes the sailor

When the subject is of notably higher status than the speaker, the prefix nà- (or kùn-) is the bare minimum required by etiquette, indicating either a relatively narrow gap in status, or a relatively plainspeaking established relationship between speaker, subject and listener (in addition to personal relationships, some familial and authority relationships, such as between a captain and a sailor, are also marked by plainspeaking). In a more formal context, or where the subject is of even higher status, an honorific prefix is required. Formal and poetic grammars list many possibilities, particularly for addressing kings, but most are now obsolete in practice (particularly since the abolition of the monarchy). Today, only five further third-person prefixes are likely: formal masculine adàn-; formal feminine kadàn-; highly formal masculine haràdan-; highly formal feminine kāhankàdan-; and greatly honorific ōhànga-. The lower honorifics are appropriate for aristocrats or people who merit particular respect from the speaker (such as in-laws, direct superiors and relevant officials); aristocrats do not use them for one another unless either a special relationship of this kind exists, or they have superior rank within the speaker’s own lineage, but outside their household (they may also be used within the household for elders, but only as a semi-serious sign of affection and respect). The higher honorifics are used for higher aristocrats, for holders of important offices, and by convention on formal occasions for those who have saved the speaker’s life. The greatly honorific form is in the modern world in most circumstances used only for clan matriarchs and patriarchs. However, it is common, when speaking of the dead in a formal context, to employ
prefixes one rank higher than those to which they would otherwise be entitled; in this case, dead clan matriarchs may take the prefix āhanāhanga-. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ex. 11</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) kòma-ya</td>
<td>kāhankàdan-tù-n</td>
<td>dattà</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girl-ERG</td>
<td>FH-see-INT</td>
<td>sailor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the sailor sees her ladyship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b) ruìnga       | adan-sàkkanga-sa | songà-m |
| freeholder      | MH-see-INAN      | rock-ACC |
| the noble freeholder kicks the rock |

| c) āhanàhanga-tu-ra | kèsar |
| H-see-AN           | goat  |
| the goat saw her grace, the late matriarch |

2.4 In addition to the above prefixes indicating third-person subjects, the double agreement species can also be found with first- and second-person subject agreement prefixes. Such prefixes are only found with double agreement.

There are three possible second-person subject prefixes: tu-; ōtu-; and kutu-. The first of these may be regarded as the default; with people of similar or inferior rank it is used almost invariably, except with in-laws; with in-laws, ōtu- is used. This latter prefix is also used when addressing people of superior rank in a formal situation – in informal situations, even between strangers, plain tu- is preferred, providing that the second-person subject is not the matriarch of a house. One final use of ōtu-, particularly in relatively formal situations, is in addressing a group of people, or addressing an individual as a representative of a group. In situations where tu- is preferred, the use of ōtu- is liable to be considered aggressive mockery. The prefix kutu-, meanwhile, is used only for female subjects, and only when a considerable affection and familiarity is present – it is appropriate among siblings, to a lover, or from a parent to a child, or between two close female friends. It has a generally diminutive connotation. All these prefixes are typically used in the absence of any independent noun or pronoun referring to the subject, although a subject pronoun may also be present for increased formality (particularly in establishing relative rank in a conversation) or emphasis. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ex. 12</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) tu-mandu-sa</td>
<td>lubù-m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-carry-INAN</td>
<td>ball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you carry the ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b) kutu-tu-ra | kèsar |
| 2.DIM-see-AN | goat  |
| the goat sees you, little one |

| c) ōtu-tùfu-ra | bedùj-ma |
| 2.FORM-push-AN | ship-ACC |
| you push the ship, sir |
| OR: you all push the ship |
The situation with first-person subject agreement is slightly more complicated, as there are eight possible prefixes.

First to consider is the prefix *wa*; this is the first-person inclusive prefix, which is to say that it is used when the subject comprises the speaker, the addressee, and potentially other people. The inclusive pronoun is not obligatory in such an instance, but it is widely used when co-operation is to be stressed. It is also often used simply to signal a non-confrontational attitude, and in place of the second person to make suggestions to an addressee of lower status or a direct subordinate without implying authoritative force. Narrower in usage is *wanà*; this is best seen as an intimacy prefix, used most often between two lovers or spouses, referring to speaker and addressee alone. It is not usually used in public. By extension, it may also be used between two lovers or spouses, to refer not only to those two, but also to the pair’s other spouses or lovers, whether present or not. In text, however, it has a more expansive dual inclusive meaning, indicating the writer and the intended reader alone. Thus:

\[\text{ex. 13 a) } \text{wa-mandu-sa} \quad \text{lubù-m} \]
\[1.\text{INC-carry-INAN} \quad \text{ball-ACC} \]
\[\text{we (including you) carry the ball} \]
\[\text{OR: we – by which I mean ‘you’ – carry the ball} \]
\[\text{b) } \text{wanà-mandu-sa} \quad \text{lubù-m} \]
\[1.\text{INC-carry-INAN} \quad \text{ball-ACC} \]
\[\text{you and I, love, carry the ball} \]
\[\text{OR: we (our family, love) carry the ball} \]
\[\text{OR, in writing: you and I carry the ball} \]

By contrast, the prefix *ma* is explicitly non-inclusive. It may be considered the default first-person non-inclusive prefix, and as such is widely used in formal situations, and particularly when the speaker is presenting themselves as impartial. It is also widely used as a plural, particularly for large, indefinite groups, and for groups containing people of all *sônga*. Related is the prefix *manà*; this is a more informal, but still sex-neutral, prefix – it is often used to convey a certain distance, yet in an unthreatening way, as between for example a trader and a customer, or a guardsman and an interesting but not yet officially suspicious passer by. It is also used extensively by *kùnyi*. So:

\[\text{ex. 14 a) } \text{ma-mandu-sa} \quad \text{lubù-m} \]
\[1.\text{N-carry-INAN} \quad \text{ball-ACC} \]
\[\text{I carry the ball} \]
\[\text{OR: we carry the ball} \]
The prefixes ba- and banà-, on the other hand, are distinguished by their masculinity. The former is the more masculine of the two – it is typically used by adult yojo, and in formal circumstances by adult òro. It is well suited to claiming authority, and is also used in particular in circumstances that emphasise masculine identity, such as having sex with a woman, spear-fishing, working leather, or hair-removing. The latter, on the other hand, is more associated with projecting a ‘boyish’ persona. It is used by young males, and by yojo in contexts where they wish to de-emphasise their adulthood, particularly in order to avoid claiming authority. It is the default prefix used by òro outside formal contexts; it may be used by kùnyi when exhibiting more stereotypically ‘male’ behaviour, particularly in conversation with their wives or children and usually only in private; it may even be used by yanha, particularly in talking to their wives, but in these cases it is always jocular and ironic in function.

These prefixes have as their feminine counterparts the prefixes kà- and kanà-. The former is used by damùn and maòko, and, in very formal or serious situations, by yanha. The latter is the default prefix used by yanha and by young females, and may be used as an affectation by damùn and maukò feigning childishness.

These eight prefixes collectively may be seen as the ‘ordinary’ stock of first-person subject agreement prefixes. However, three further prefixes have a limited role: dàn-, as a prefix asserting great authority; kòana-, as a prefix employed by untouchables; and lokanà-, the prefix taught to foreigners. A range of other, mostly self-honorific prefixes may be encountered in old texts or a few rituals, but are no longer widely used in the language today.

2.5 Just as double marking utilises a somewhat different set of prefixes from plain subject agreement, so too there are some differences between its set of suffixes and those of plain object agreement. The suffix -sa is still found marking inanimate third-person objects, and -ra still marks non-human animates, but human animates are instead marked with -n (that is, an -n suffix triggering accent). As with prefixes, the dropping found in non-double agreement is absent in double agreement. Thus:

\[
\text{ex. 15 a) } \text{kòma} \quad \text{kun-sakkànga-n} \quad \text{fòna-m} \\
\text{girl} \quad \text{FHA-kick-INT} \quad \text{foreigner-ACC} \\
\text{the girl kicks the (male) foreigner}
\]

\[
\text{ex. 15 b) } \text{kòma-ya} \quad \text{ra-tù-n} \quad \text{dattà} \\
\text{girl-ERG} \quad \text{AN-see-INT} \quad \text{sailor} \\
\text{the sailor sees the girl}
\]

As with prefixes, double agreement suffixes also mark formality and status. A more formal suffix, and one widely used to show respect, is -dànana; more honorific still is -dànhama. A third degree of elevated respect is shown with -handànuhara, and a fourth, by -harâhandradôhonga. The proper use of these suffixes is complicated by the phenomenon of elevating verbs – verbs that ‘promote’
their objects by an honorific degree, both in agreement markers and (where relevant) pronouns. In this way:

ex. 16  
a) kòma kun-sakkànga-danan dattà-m  
girl FHA-AN-kick-H sailor-ACC  
the girl kicks the (male) sailor

b) kòma ku-ra-tu-kuitsì-danan sujotà-m  
girl F-AN-hug-H elder-ACC  
the girl hugs the (male) elder

c) kòma ku-ra-tufù-danhamà sujotà-m  
girl F-AN-push-H elder-ACC  
the girl pushes the (male) elder

d) kòma-ya ra-tufù-haràhandradōhonga dàn  
girl-ERG AN-push-H 3.INT  
the girl pushes the clan matriarch

In these examples, the agreement affixes carefully follow social status. In a), the prefix kùn- indicates a female agent acting upon a male of otherwise equal or lower status; the verb sàkkang is an elevating verb, so the honorific -dànan is appropriate for objects that would otherwise not deserve it. In b), the prefixes ku-ra indicate a female agent acting upon a male of higher status; the verb is not elevating, and therefore -dànan here is a true honorific, as the prefix presages. In c), the verb changes to an elevating verb, and therefore the honorifix object suffix must increase in status by a degree. Finally, in d), the object pronoun does not directly indicate status or sex; however, the absence of ku- on the verb, despite a female subject, indicates that the object is not male, while the use of ra- in place of nà- indicates that the object is not of lower status than the subject. More pertinently, the verb is elevating, and the highest commonly-used suffix is employed, which means that the object must be a person of the highest status – that is, a clan matriarch (if they were male, the Prime Minister would also be a possibility). The changes in nominal marking in d) are due to considerations that will be discussed later.

Similarly, double agreement permits the use of several second-person object prefixes.

There are six second-person suffixes: -tu; -yōtu; -yamātu; -yaràhonga; -iyanga; and -yaràiyanga. However, only the first two are widely used: -tu is the default suffix, even in formal situations, while -yōtu is more deferential. The suffix -yamātu can be used for males of very high rank, but is more often found as an elevation of -yōtu; -yaràhonga might be used for great kings and dignitaries in a diplomatic context, but is far more often used as an elevation of -yamātu. The suffixes -iyanga and -yaràiyanga, meanwhile, are only used in formal address to females of high rank, with the latter an elevation of the former.

There are only two first-person object suffixes: -ma for singular and for exclusive plural, and -wa for inclusive plural.

In addition to these person-specific suffixes, there is one final object suffix: a reflexive, -sutta. In the case of patientive and agentive verbs, this generally indicates a straightforward identity of subject
and object. In subjective verbs, it can indicate a heightened volition or control on the part of the subject; however, as double agreement is necessary for the use of first- and second-person pronouns, and for higher formal registers (see below), the reflexive is often used simply as a ‘dummy’ agreement to enable subjective verbs to take the agentive disynthetic species. Notably, the use of the reflexive object suffix with an animate prefix necessitates nà- (or kùn-) rather than ra- (or ku-, or fu-) – that is, the reflexive is considered an animate of lower status than its subject. Thus:

ex. 17  
a) dattà na-sàkkanga-sutta  
sailor AN-kick-REFL  
the sailor kicks himself  

b) kòma-ya kùn-tu-sutta  
girl-ERG F.AN-see-REFL  
the girl sees herself  

c) ruìnga bày-sutta  
freeholder blink-REFL  
the freeholder makes himself blink  

d) kana-bày-sutta  
1.F-blink-REFL  
i, a yanha or young girl, blink  

2.6 Lastly, double agreement has one further complication: third-participant marking. When an topicalised human individual is a recipient, cause, beneficiary, or otherwise closely involved in an action without being either its subject or its direct object, they receive an agreement suffix on the verb. This suffix is placed immediately before the object suffix. In the third person, this suffix is -daya, or -arādān in more formal situations or with higher-status individuals; -arāhama is the most respectful version. In the second person, the options are the same as for object suffixes, with the exception that object suffix -tu becomes third-participant -ìtu; in the first-person, there is no third-participant suffix. Notably, the third-participant suffix is also used when a listener was a witness to the actions discussed, and is of high status, even if they were not essentially involved in the action. So:

ex. 18  
a) dattà nà-ha-yamātu-ra kèsaj-ma  
sailor AN-eat-2.H-AN  
goat-ACC  
the sailor eats the goat for your lordship  
OR: the sailor eats your lordship’s goat  
OR: the saior eats the goat, as you can see, your lordship  

b) lokana-tufù-arahama-yaraiyanga  
i, a foreigner, push you, your ladyship, as his lordship here observes