Don’t be fearful, lest it be undesirable: prohibitive and precautionary clauses in Papapana
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Apprehensive

- Type of **epistemic modality** “belief, knowledge, truth, etc. in relation to proposition” (Palmer 1986:96), “characterised by subjectivity, by pragmatic force” (Lichtenberk 1995: 293)

- **Apprehensive** – potential, undesirable, best avoided

- **Subtypes** (Lichtenberk 1995):
  1. Apprehensive - independent clause
  2. Precautionary (“preemptive” Evans 1995) clause + Apprehension-causing clause
  3. Fear Complementation – complement clause, fear predicate
Papapana: who, where, what

- 99 fluent speakers in Bougainville, PNG
- Northwest Solomonic (NWS) > Oceanic > Austronesian
Papapana: the data

- Fieldwork 1: June 2011-March 2012
  - 10.5 hrs ‘Texts’
    - Observed communicative events: custom descriptions, personal/traditional narratives...
    - Staged communicative events: describing objects, procedural descriptions...
  - 48.5 hrs Elicitation + Fieldnotes
- Fieldwork 2: March-May 2013
- Fieldwork 3: April 2018
  - 1.5 hrs Dialogues
  - 2.5 hrs Elicitation + Fieldnotes
Grammatical overview

- SVO and SOV
- Nominative-accusative
- ‘Verb Complex’: verb (or sequence) + modifiers
  - Subject proclitics and object enclitics
  - Postverbal subject-indexing enclitics (PSI) – NWS, reflects former possessor indexing, typically IPFV
- Tense: absolute, marked past and future
- Aspect: proximative, habitual, continuous, repetitive, completive
- Mode: hypothetical conditional, counterfactual conditional, optative, apprehensive
Don’t be fearful...
Overview: Reduplication

- Leftward, continuous
- Monosyllabic, disyllabic, two patterns of multiple reduplication
- Inflectional functions (Verbs):
  - All four types + PSI = Continuous/Habitual
  - Mono/Disyllabic + Reciprocal/Reflexive vei = Reciprocal
  - Mono/Disyllabic + Negative ae = Prohibitive
  - Mono/Disyllabic + Apprehensive te = Prohibitive
Overview: Negation

- **Negative ae**: Negation of verbal declarative predicates
- **aruai**
  - Negation of verbless declarative predicates
  - Numeral ‘zero’
  - Negative answer to questions ‘no’
  - Negative existential verb ‘to be not’

> In a few Oceanic languages negators are “derived from a negative verb [that] has been grammaticalised to such a degree that it has become part of the VC” (Lynch et al. 2002: 88)
# Verb Complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBJ =</th>
<th>PST. IPFV</th>
<th>OPT COND</th>
<th>NEG APPR</th>
<th>PST</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>DIR</th>
<th>VAL</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>DIR</th>
<th>COMPL</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>IPFV</th>
<th>DIR</th>
<th>IRR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pei</td>
<td>eri</td>
<td>awa</td>
<td>aete</td>
<td>ara</td>
<td>vare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REDUP</td>
<td></td>
<td>osi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=PSI</td>
<td></td>
<td>=i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **SBJ** = Subject
- **PST** = Past Tense
- **REP** = Root
- **ADV** = Adverb
- **DIR** = Direction
- **VAL** = Value
- **VERB** = Verb
- **COMPL** = Complement
- **OBJ** = Object
- **IPFV** = Imperfective
- **IRR** = Irrational
- **REDUP** = Reduplication
- **PSI** = Person-Space Index
1. “Mu=ae nao~nao tac=i, mu=ae nao~nao=i”
   2PL.SBJ=NEG RD~go up=IRR 2PL.SBJ=NEG RD~go=IRR
   “Don’t go up, don’t go/You’re not going up, you’re not going” (1-T053)

2. O=ae oto~‘oto te=na=au obutu
   2SG.SBJ=NEG RD~board OBL=SPEC=CLII canoe
   ‘Don’t board the canoe’ (2-E026)

3. Mu=te nao~nao=i
   2PL.SBJ=APPR RD~go=IRR
   “Don’t go/You’re not going” (1-T053)

4. “Mu=te atu~atun=i=a enai au=sinoni!”
   2PL.SBJ=APPR RD~attack=TR=3SG.OBJ DEM 1SG.PSSR[CLI]=husband
   “Don’t attack my husband!” (1-T101)
Prohibitives

- 2011-2013: speakers reported no difference between *ae* and *te*; interchangeable

5. O=ae  
   2SG.SBJ=NEG  
   to~tonu  
   RD~stand

6. O=te  
   2SG.SBJ=APPR  
   to~tonu  
   RD~stand

‘Don’t stand up’ (2-E028-2)
Prohibitives

- 2018: one speaker reported *ae* is used when action hasn’t begun yet, while *te* is used when prohibiting someone from doing something already commenced.

7. \[O=ae \quad \text{va}e\sim\text{vaene}, \quad o=te \quad \text{pu}=i\]
   \[2\text{SG.SBJ}=\text{NEG} \quad \text{RD}=\text{climb} \quad 2\text{SG.SBJ}=\text{APPR} \quad \text{fall}=\text{IRR}\]
   ‘Don’t climb the tree (that you haven’t climbed yet), (or) you might fall’ (3-E001)

8. \[O=te \quad \text{va}e\sim\text{vaene}, \quad o=te \quad \text{pu}=i\]
   \[2\text{SG.SBJ}=\text{APPR} \quad \text{RD}=\text{climb} \quad 2\text{SG.SBJ}=\text{APPR} \quad \text{fall}=\text{IRR}\]
   ‘Don’t climb the tree (that you’ve started to climb), (or) you might fall’ (3-E001)
Prohibitives

✓ Traditional narrative: people are running with bows and clubs to attack woman’s husband and she suddenly jumps down:

9. “Mu=te atu~atun=i=a enai au=si~onon!”
   2PL.SBJ=APPR RD~attack=TR=3SG.OBJ DEM 1SG.PSSR[CLI]=husband
   “Don’t attack my husband!” (1-T101)

? Personal narrative (civil war): speaker and other women were travelling and stopped by soldiers who told them:

10. “Mu=ae nao~nao tac=i, mu=ae nao~nao=i”
    2PL.SBJ=NEG RD~go up=IRR 2PL.SBJ=NEG RD~go=IRR
    “Don’t go up, don’t go/You’re not going up, you’re not going” (1-T053)

? Women explained they were looking for some women (not just anybody), soldiers told them:

11. “Mu=te nao~nao=i”
    2PL.SBJ=APPR RD~go=IRR
    “Don’t go/You’re not going” (1-T053)
...lest it be undesirable
Overview: General irrealis =i

- Future
- Present Habitual
- Imperatives (optionally)

+ Past Imperfective *pei* = Past Habitual
+ Optative *eri* + PSI = Optative
+ Conditional *awa* = Hypothetical Conditional (with =i in main clause)
+ Apprehensive *te* = Apprehensive (with Imp/Proh/Decl main)
Overview: General irrealis \( =i \)

- **Future**
  - Event is about to occur
  - Event will occur tomorrow/following week
  - Event will occur at unspecified time in future
  - Event that speaker is hypothesising will happen

12. “U=nao=i  i-ava”
    1SG.SBJ=go=IRR  LOC-sea
    “I’m going to sea” (1-T031)

13. Ben  bea  e=oto=i  te=na=au  obutu
    Ben  maybe  3SG.SBJ=board=IRR  OBL=SPEC=CLII  canoe
    ‘Maybe Ben will board the canoe’ (2-E007-1)
# Verb Complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject (SB)</th>
<th>PST. IPFV</th>
<th>OPT COND</th>
<th>NEG APPR</th>
<th>PST</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>DIR</th>
<th>VAL</th>
<th>VERB DIR</th>
<th>COMPL ADV</th>
<th>OBJ =</th>
<th>IPFV ...</th>
<th>DIR</th>
<th>IRR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pei</td>
<td>eri</td>
<td>awa</td>
<td>ae</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>ara</td>
<td>vare</td>
<td>REDUP</td>
<td>osi</td>
<td>=PSI</td>
<td>=i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Precautionary sentences

- Precaution/pre-emptive (main) clause:
  Imperative/Hortative (=i) or Prohibitive *ae/te* + RD (=i)
  - Expresses preventative action to take, to avoid the...

- Apprehension-causing (adverbial) clause: *te* + =i

14. “Sa=nao tovoni nao=i, i=te moroko=ira=i.”
1INCL.SBJ.HORT=go check thither=IRR 3PL.SBJ=APPR lie=1INCL.OBJ=IRR
“let’s go check, if/in case they’re lying to us/they might be lying to us.”” (1-T034)

- Precaution precedes Apprehension-causing - iconic and common cross-linguistic tendency (Dixon 2009: 48)
Precaution clause

- Imperative/Hortative (=i)

15. Na=dada, o=noe, a’aisi, e=te, tuatuare=i
   SPEC[CLI]=coconut.milk 2SG.SBJ=put many 3SG.SBJ=APPR burn=IRR
   ‘Put lots of coconut milk [on your hands], otherwise it will burn’ (1-T036-8)

16. O=nabe=i, o=te, mate=i
    2SG.SBJ=swim=IRR 2SG.SBJ=APPR die=IRR
    ‘Swim, (or else) you might die’ ‘Yu swim, nogud yu dai’ (2-E028-2)

- Prohibitive ae/te + RD (=i)

17. O=ae, ago~agos=i=a, pei, to’o~to’o,
    2SG.SBJ=NEG RD~hold=TR=3SG.OBJ PART RD~cut
    e=te, tepe=i=o=i
    3SG.SBJ=APPR cut=TR=2SG.OBJ=IRR
    ‘Don’t hold the knife, (or else) it might cut you’
    ‘Yu no holim naip, nogud em katim yu’ (2-E028-2)
Precautionary sentences: subjects

- Precaution clause: Hortative/Imperative – 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} subject
  - Also one example of Declarative with 3\textsuperscript{rd} subject

18. \textit{e=va-mamago=a} \hspace{1cm} \textit{pei\hspace{1cm}tanga,}
\textit{3SG.SBJ=CAUS-decorate=3SG.OBJ} \hspace{1cm} \textit{part\hspace{1cm}hang}

\textit{tenava \hspace{1cm} e=te} \hspace{1cm} \textit{uga} \hspace{1cm} \textit{poto=i.}
\textit{so.that \hspace{1cm} 3SG.SBJ=APPR} \hspace{1cm} \textit{drown} \hspace{1cm} \textit{INTS=IRR}
\textit{‘she adorned him with the necklace, otherwise he would drown}
\textit{/so that he did not drown’ (1-T029)}

- Apprehension-causing clause - 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} subject
- No preference for non-co-referential subjects (unlike in Schmidtke-Bode’s 2009 typological study)
Avertive vs. ‘in case’ (Lichtenberk 1995)

- **AVERTIVE function**: Agent can prevent event

19. \[\text{nu=tataguvu} \quad \text{o=de=a},\]
\[\text{SPEC.CLII=umbrella} \quad \text{2SG.OBJ=take=3SG.OBJ} \]
\[\text{o=te} \quad \text{u’usi=i}\]
\[2SG.SBJ=APPR \quad \text{wet=IRR}\]
‘Take the umbrella so that you don’t get wet/or you might get wet’ (3-E002)

- **IN CASE function**: Agent cannot prevent event

20. \[\text{o=de=a} \quad \text{nu=tataguvu},\]
\[2SG.OBJ=take=3SG.OBJ \quad \text{SPEC.CLII=umbrella}\]
\[\text{na=naoi} \quad \text{e=te} \quad \text{si’i=i}\]
\[\text{SPEC[CLI]=rain} \quad \text{3SG.SBJ=APPR \ rain=IRR}\]
‘Take the umbrella, in case it rains/it might rain’ (3-E002)

- No formal distinction in Papapana
Apprehensive clause: dependent

- Precaution clause and Apprehension-causing clause are usually linked asyndetically
- Apprehension-causing clause is pragmatically dependent as it is justification for Precaution
- Apprehension-causing clause is syntactically dependent
  - Evidence that subordinator can be employed
  - No strong evidence that Apprehension-causing clause can occur independently
Apprehensive clause: subordinator

- Sometimes there is a subordinator:

21. `tenava e=te uga poto=i. 
   so.that 3SG.SBJ=APPR drown INTS=IRR`
   ‘she adorned him with the necklace, otherwise he would drown
   /so that he did not drown’ (1-T029)

22. `O=tavia o’ogo=a=i, 
   2SG.SBJ=rub well=3SG.OBJ=IRR`
   `avosia saviako te ani o na=gono... e=te ravarava=i 
   SUBR tapioca OBL 2SG or SPEC[CLI]=banana 3SG.SBJ=APPR black=IRR`
   `o=to eri tatu=ina=mu=i. 
   2SG.SBJ=EMPH OPT mash=3PL.OBJ=2SG.IPFV=IRR`
   ‘You rub it well, so that your tapioca or banana… [whatever you cooked] won’t be black when you want to mash them’ (1-T036-8)
Apprehensive clause: independent?

- Only examples from one speaker in April 2018 when...
  - ...we’d discussed the complex sentence first

23. O=te mate=i
    2SG.SBJ=APPR die=IRR
‘you might die’ (3-E001)

- ...I provided context (shock/Tok Pisin lukaut ‘look out’)

24. Na=’oru e=te ani=o=i
    SPEC[CLI]=snake 3SG.SBJ=APPR eat=2SG.OBJ=IRR
‘the snake might/will bite you’ (3-E002)

- ...I elicited with Tok Pisin nogud ‘lest’

25. U=te nao=i Buka natui
    1SG.SBJ=APPR go=IRR Buka tomorrow
‘Nogud bai mi go long Buka tumora’
‘I might go to Buka tomorrow’ (3-E002)
Apprehensive clause: dependent

- Arguably the speaker was biased by Tok Pisin, especially as using English ‘might’ > =i + bea ‘maybe’
- Arguably the speaker had Precaution clause in mind, c.f.
- **Diyari** *(Pama-Nyungan; Australia)*: Implicit imperative/warning/suggestion and such sentences “may be regarded as structurally subordinate because it is always possible to add a main clause before them, although context may make it unnecessary” (Austin 1981:229)
- **Mwotlap** *(Austronesian; Vanuatu)*: Command left implicit (François 2003)
- **Ese Ejja** *(Takanan; Amazon)*: Precaution not syntactically obligatory in Apprehensive (only for Avertive) (Vuillermet 2018)
Don’t be fearful, lest it be undesirable
Some other languages demonstrate same polysemy as *te*

- **Hoava (NWS; Solomons):** modal negative, NEG:WARN *maki* ‘lest, let not, don’t’ and NEG *kae* for prohibitives (Davis 2003)
- **Rotokas (Papuan; Bougainville):** APPR particle *teapi* ‘lest’, also as PROH, ‘don’t / mustn’t’ and *opeita* ‘don’t’ (Robinson 2011)
- **Tukang Besi (Austronesian; Indonesia):** conjunction *bara* ‘lest’, or ‘don’t’ in main clauses (Donohue 1999: 453-454),
- **Maori (Austronesian; NZ):** monitory particle *kei* can also negate imperatives (Bauer 1993: 37, 465)
- **Akkadian (Semitic; Iraq):** *lā* negates imperative, purposive clauses, non-main clauses (Deutscher 2009)
- **Sakha (Turkic; Russian Federation):** 2nd affirmative “Voluntative-Potential” forms convey future prohibition, 1st and 3rd forms express possibility&hope but may have apprehensive nuance (Pakendorf&Schalley 2007)
Grammaticalisation

- Pakendorf & Schalley (2007) find use of affirmative epistemic forms to express prohibitives rare and propose the grammaticalisation path:
  possibility → apprehension → warning → prohibition
- Involves conventionalization of implicatures (Traugott 1989)
  - Undesirability implicates warning = incipient prohibition
  - Undesirability is semanticised – pragmatic strengthening

- Counter to assumed unidirectional development
  Deontic modalities → Epistemic modalities
  - Involves generalisation/weakening of semantic content, brought about by metaphorical extension
    (Bybee & Pagliuca 1985)
## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>=i</th>
<th>APPREHENSIVE $te + =i$</th>
<th>PROHIBITIVE $te + RD (+ =i)$</th>
<th>PROHIBITIVE $ae + RD (+ =i)$</th>
<th>ae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Affirmative?</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2/3 person</td>
<td>(1)2/3 person</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>1/2/3 person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indep./Dep.</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Indep./Dep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future (uncertain – <em>bea</em> ‘maybe’)</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Potential? About to/ In progress?</td>
<td>Potential Not started /General?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best avoided (speaker takes precaution or directs hearer to take precaution)</td>
<td>Best avoided (speaker directs hearer to avoid)</td>
<td>Best avoided (speaker directs hearer to avoid)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **APPR $\rightarrow$ PROH** or **PROH $\rightarrow$ APPR?**
How did polysemy arise?

- Oceanic languages (in Lynch et al. 2002) – unusual to have two PROH

  - If **APPR te → PROH te**, then **ae** is original PROH
    - Why would **te** develop into PROH? To add **more subjectivity/pragmatic force (disapproval, urgency)** to the command?
      - No evidence of initial Possibility stage (Pakendorf & Schalley 2007)
    - Some Oceanic languages do use NEG for PROH
    - x2 more examples of **ae** than **te** in Texts
    - Restriction to 2nd person, but Dependent → Independent

  - If **PROH te → APPR te**, then **te** is original PROH
    - Creates new APPR category
    - Oceanic languages tend to have distinct NEG and PROH (Lynch et al. 2002, Mosel 1999)
    - Why would **ae** develop into PROH? **Extending** its scope from Decl → Imp? Are speakers forgetting **te** and using more **general** marker?
    - Extension to all persons, but Independent → Dependent
Concluding remarks

- Prohibitives – two constructions
- Precautionary sentences
  - Precaution/preemptive precedes apprehension-causing (common cross-linguistically)
  - No preference for non-co-referential subjects (c.f. Schmidtke-Bode 2009)
- No formal distinction Avertive vs. In Case
- Usually clauses linked asyndetically
- Apprehensive is dependent
- Polysemy with Prohibitive clauses, not widely attested
- APPR $te \leftrightarrow$ PROH $te$ ??
Mata:na!
Thank you!
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