1. Introduction to the matter of polysynthesis

This paper will address the complex verbal morphology of Baure (Southern Arawakan) and try to characterize morphosyntax of complex predicates.

1.1 What does polysynthetic actually mean?

- The term “polysynthetic” first applied to North American, then to Siberian languages, which show tendencies to have words (generally verbs) consisting of a high number of morphemes
- One complex verb may be translated into a sentence in English
- Today polysynthetic verbs are often used as a proclamation of a linguistic sensation, usually picking out an example from Inuit (cf. Payne 1997:28)
- Greenberg’s (1954:193) quantitative typology gives us M/W ratios for e.g. Swahili (2,55), English (1,68), and Inuit (3,72)
- Baure should then be settled at the higher end of the scale with a general M/W ratio of 2,74, and if only considering verbal words of 4,38 (M/V)

1.2 What is polysynthetic in Arawakan languages and why?

- Aikhenvald (1999b) showed that Tariana (Arawakan) has polysynthetic nouns (because of multiple-layered marking of syntactic functions) with up to 15 morpheme positions:

1) `nu-phe-ru-ma-pe=yana-pe=tupe=miki-ite=ne=se=misini=nuku` (Tariana)
   1SG-older.sibling-F:CL:F-PL=PEJ:PL=DIM:PL=CL:person=COM=CONTR=also=TOP.NON.A/S
   ‘with this very person belonging to my bad little older sister, too’

- However, in general mainly Arawakan verbs show complex synthesis (cf. Wise 1986:579), other parts of speech are much simpler

2) `no-ne-went-a-ye-we-t-an-ak-a-ri-mpa` (Ashaninka, Campan Arawakan)
   ‘We saw them leaving from a distance.’

3) `nborimbekinopashapir=nish` (Baure)
   `ni=pori-mbe-ko-ino-pa-sha=pi=ro=nish`
   1SG=sew:CLF:flat-ABS:BEN-INTL-IRR=2SG=3SGM=EXCL
   ‘Well, when I am going to mend it for you’

- Aikhenvald (1999a:80): predicate structure in Southern Arawakan languages more complex than in Northern (needs to be tested)
- A sentence may consist of only a verb, and this is also frequently the case.
- Thus much of the functional load in an utterance is put on the verb, one reason for the complex predicate structure (compare Evans & Sasse 2002:1–3).
- There are various strategies in word formation: affixation, cliticization, incorporation, compounding, reduplication.

Baure is a language that is spoken in small communities in Bolivian Amazonia. It is a highly endangered language with less than 60 speakers, who are all bilingual in Spanish. Data has been collected by author in 2003, 2004, 2006, and 2008, and by Baptista & Wallin (SIL) in the 1960s. Currently Baure is subject of a documentation project financed by the DoBeS foundation (VW): www.uni-leipzig.de/baureproj~.
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- The morphology is predominantly agglutinating or (according to Haspelmath 2009) morphology shows the features of separation, stem invariance, affix invariance, and affix uniformity.

→ Categories marked on verbs in Baure and other Arawakan languages (head-marking)
- core arguments
- incorporation of nouns, classifiers, location, adverbs, adjectives
- marking of semantic roles by means of BEN, CAUS, specific types of APPL
- TMA and other clausal elements

→ Other factors that complexify word structure:
- possessor marking on nouns
- multiple derivations V<N<V
- (almost) any part of speech can function as predicate
- subordination/ relativization through nominalization (→ arguments in clause are nominalized verbs)

- These characteristics should mean that Baure and other Arawakan languages that accord to the above lists are not only polysynthetic in the broader sense, as in Evans & Sasse 2002, but also in the definition applied by Baker 1996.

1.3 **Characterizing the complex structure of Arawakan verbs**

a. position class approach (e.g. Matteson 1954, 1965)
- 20–33 position classes in Arawakan (Payne 1990:215–227)
- problem: linear order classes do not reflect reality – morphemes may have different positions in relation to another and repetition of morphemes possible; in addition no word consists of all the morphemes (restrictions are not addressed)

b. semantic group model (Payne 1978, Wise 1986:583)
- affixes are grouped due to semantics
- position can be determined, but may vary to some degree within group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefixes</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>C (F)</td>
<td>ROOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Semantic groups model for Arawakan languages (Wise 1986:584)

c. production model (Payne 1990:231)⁴
- “word structure is most insightfully viewed in terms of successively embedded layers of morpho-semantic structure” (Payne 1990:231)
- attempt to explain morpheme order, restrictions on co-occurrence, multiple occurrence by referring to layering of structure
- scope used as explanation for different morpheme order
2. Baure - brief typological overview

- complex phonology: some phonological processes (voicing, vowel elision, nasal and vowel harmony, metathesis) occur between morphemes within word, but also at word boundaries (phonological phrases)
- alienable/inalienable nouns, derivation of (un)possessed forms
- classifier system with approx. 30 grammaticalized CLFs and a number of noun roots that may be used as CLF (cf. Terhart in prep.)
- adjectives are a subclass of nouns (form compounds with CLF)
- (almost) any part of speech can be used as predicate base (Split-S)

2.1 Baure complex nouns

- Baure nouns are generally not complex, but they may also have various morphemes attached (position determined by linear order classes)

(4) \( rinikorichije-ye-ji-ensh \)
\( ri=nikori-chi-je=ji=ensh \)
3SGf=plate-DIM-DISTR-LOC=QUOT=APRV
‘All over her little plate(s), she said, you know.’

- compounding of lexical roots is very common of nouns and adjectives

(5) \( kajaveshaje-ye-nish \)
\( kajaw-esh-aj-ye=nish \)
deer-meat-soup-LOC=EXCL
‘well, in the venison soup’

- there are also compounds of grammaticalized CLFs, as e.g. -aja- ‘CLF:dish.content’ + -ki- ‘CLF:bounded’ and -seki- ‘CLF:oval.content’ + -se- ‘CLF:oval’ + -ki- ‘CLF:bounded’

2.2 Baure complex verbs

- Baure verbs can be very simple, but subject marking is obligatory
- nouns or classifiers are frequently incorporated

(6) \( nisipa to niwojis \)
\( ni=sipa to ni=wojis \)
1SG=wash ART 1SG=hand
\( \rightarrow \)
\( nisipawjisap \)
\( ni=sipa-wojis-a-po \)
1SG=wash-hand-LK-PRFLX
‘I wash my hand’

- verbal morphemes are attached on three different levels: to the root, stem or base
- cliticization occurs on the two outmost layers of a verbal word
- Verb root: most basic unanalyzable lexical element of the verb; does not necessarily carry a specific meaning.
- Verb base is actual meaning unit and used as citation form.
- In very simple verbs root, stem and base may be identical (cf. (3)).
3. **Verbal morpheme orders**

   - There are different conditions of affixation and morpheme order on the different levels.
   - Out of the 24 verbal morphemes only up to 10 could theoretically co-occur on one verbal word; however, in the data there are in tendency only 5–7 verbal affixes attached to a verb root.
   - Speakers hardly produce highly complex forms spontaneously today, and they predominantly use them in narratives and lexicalized forms, but they can produce very complex forms in elicitation.
   - Language in endangerment and only very few competent speakers: loss of morphological complexity

3.1 **Conditions for root affixes**

   - Aktionsart is highly lexicalized and productivity is doubtful; only one prefix slot.
   - The classifier (nominal or local) or noun root is incorporated right after the verb root (compounding similar to nominal and adjectival compounding).
   - The last part of the root or CLF may be reduplicated for intensification.
   - The root suffixes have the following order, but only two of the first three can be combined with the DISTR⁶:

```
aktivarts | VERB ROOT | CLF/noun root | RDPL | -so | -'ino | -i | -je
APRX | SUBJ | DUR | DISTR
```

3.2 **Conditions for stem affixes**

   - There is one stem prefix (ATTR), which derives stative and passive verbs.
   - In theory there may only be one stem suffix in a verbal word, and this is perceived as the closing element of the verb base.
   - Even though the change of a stem suffix may make a difference in meaning of the base, some replacements happen regularly in a paradigm (only partly derivational slot).

3.3 **Conditions for base affixes**

   - There are two types of base affixes: valency changing (CAUS, BEN, PRFLX) and aspectual.
   - CAUS is always prefixed, BEN always suffixed directly to the base.
   - The other (mainly) aspectual suffixes occur in the following relative order, but all of them can never co-occur (generally no more than three):⁷

```
-pik | -wa | -poreiy/ -poey | -wana | -wapa | -pa | -sha | -po | -wo
COME | TEMP | REP/ REPN | DEP | COS | INTL | IRR | PRFLX | IPFV
```

---

Figure 3: Structure of the verbal word in Baure

Figure 4: Verbal root suffix positions

Figure 5: Verbal base suffix positions
3.4 In addition: Clausal affixation
- Apart from clausal and phrasal clitics, there are also certain clausal operations marked by a suffix (not captured in Figure 3).
- Locative predicates get a locative suffix -yi ‘LOC’ inserted in between the base suffixes.
- Participles have to get the suffix -cho ‘PTCP’ inserted after the base.
- The nominalizer -no ‘NMLZ’ is attached to the personal enclitic or other final element in relative clause construction or interrogative clauses.

4. Lexicalization of morphemes into units
- There are so many combination possibilities that it is almost impossible to present a complete paradigm, and as typical of polysynthetic languages certain forms or parts of the paradigm may lexicalize (cf. Evans & Sasse 2002:5).

4.1 Complex suffixes
- Certain suffixes could be analyzed further into frozen morpheme units, such as:
  - -wapa ‘COS’ < -wa ‘TEMP’ + -pa ‘INTL’
  - -wana ‘DEP’ < -wa ‘TEMP’ + ‘na’?
  - -poreiy ‘REP’ < -po ‘PRFLX’ + -ro ‘backgrounding?’ + -yi ‘LOC’

4.2 Lexicalization of base suffixes with the root
- Seemingly “reversed” morpheme order can easily be explained: the morphemes lexicalized on a different level.
- Lexicalized morphemes are different from those with a regular derivational/inflectional function: they cannot be replaced, they are not part of a paradigm but add to the meaning of the verb base.

(7) ver pino wano ekpaw.
*lexicalized -wana:* -nowana- ‘say good-bye’
*ver pi=nowana-i-ko-pa-wo*<
*PERF 2SG=tell-DEP-DUR-ABS-INTL-IPFV*
‘You already went to say goodbye to them all.’

(8) nikonowana.
-wana as a regular base suffix
*nikonoe wana-wo*
1SG=write-DUR-DEP-IPFV
‘I write and leave.’

(9) nijiropinoper.
-lexicalized -po: -jiro(o)- ‘dance’
*ni=jiro-po-ino-pa=ro*<
*jir(o) ‘man’
1SG=man-PRFLX-BEN-INTL=3SGm
‘I will dance with him (lit. for him).’

(10) nijirpowana.
-po as a regular base suffix
*ni=jiropo-wana-po*
1SG=dance-DEP-PRFLX
‘I dance and leave.’

(11) nga to ka nochonowop.
-lexicalized -wo: -chonowo- ‘accompany’
*nga to ka no=chono-wo-po*<
*-chon(o) ‘companion’
NEG ART IND 3PL=companion-IPFV-PRFLX
‘There is no-one who they accompany.’

(12) nochonowonii.
-wo as a regular base suffix
*no=chonowo-wo=ni*
3PL=accompany-IPFV=1SG
‘They are accompanying me.’

4.3 Multiple layered derivation
- Seemingly “reversed” morpheme order, morpheme repetition and weird morpheme combinations are usually due to several levels of derivation.
• One example of verbal derivation is given in (13):

(13)a. nga nokopoewok
   b. ikarek nokoemokopoesiow.
   nga no=ko-poe-ko-wo                   ikarek no=ko-imo-ko-poe-si-wo
   NEG 3PL=ATTR-down-ABS-IPFV           therefore 3PL=ATTR-CAUS-ATTR-down-PASS-IPFV
   'They didn’t come down.'              'Therefore they were brought (lit. made to come) down.'

• Another example shall illustrate the derivation N<V<N<V:

(14)a. pikoïrinsiow.
   b. kon to koïrinsiowon?
   pi=ko-yori-no-si-wo                   kon to ko-yori-no-si-wo-no
   2SG=ATTR-be.angry-NMLZ-PASS-IPFV     who/what ART  ATTR-be.angry-NMLZ-PASS-IPFV-NMLZ
   'You are being provoked.'            'Who is being provoked?'
   first level:  -yori-                    V   'be angry'
   second level: yorin                      N/ADJ 'angry (one)'
   third level:  -koyorinsi-                V   'be annoyed, provoked'
   fourth level: koïrinsiowon               N   'the one being provoked' (syntactically a noun)

5. Conclusions

I hope to have shown how word formation works in Baure. In the creation of complex words
compounding plays a major role, and this includes grammatical morphemes. These compounds lead
to complex forms on one level, which are then treated as a unit on the next level and undergo complex
compound formation again.

LEVEL 1
verb stem composition
(internal):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aktionsart prefix</th>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>incorporation</th>
<th>RDPL</th>
<th>derivational root suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Level 2
verb base composition
(internal):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stem prefix</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>stem suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Level 3
verb base operations:
main clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal proclitic</th>
<th>derivational base prefix</th>
<th>BASE</th>
<th>derivational base suffix</th>
<th>inflectional base suffixes</th>
<th>personal enclitic</th>
<th>clausal enclitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>O₁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 4
verb base operations:
subordinate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTCP</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>NMLZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(complementation)</td>
<td>(locative subordination)</td>
<td>(interrogative clause + relativization)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Word formation on the different levels
Multiple layered derivation is very common in Baure. The distinction of different levels makes sense and gives some explanations for morpheme orders that do not agree with the regular model (Figure 3), if we allow the lexicalization of morphemes of one level into another one. The morphological conditions listed may be language specific. Nonetheless, general tendencies in Proto-Arawakan probably lay the preconditions for complex compounding and layering of morphemes and the thus created internal morphosyntactic structures within structures, where the sentence is only one more layer of complexity.

I did not want to come up with a general model to explain morpheme order in Arawakan verbs. My aim was to characterize the specific kind of complexity we find in Baure and try to give reasons for some of the morpheme orders that may have puzzled linguists working with other Arawakan languages.

The interesting morphosyntax of Arawakan verbs calls for linguists to further investigate the rules and restrictions of morphology applied. Certain generalizations may hold for most Arawakan languages, such as general tendency to suffixation, the position of personal affixes or clitics, place of incorporation, closure of verb base by stem suffix (frequently *-ko/-ka and called “thematic suffix”), and relative position of a rich inventory of TMA base suffixes, possibly also clausal enclitics. The divergences are due to semantic restrictions, different morpheme inventory with specific grammaticalized functions.

To sum up the position class model is very weak, because it does not account for the different layers and pretends there were linear ordering of morphemes. The semantic group model looks similar to the model given for Baure in Figure 3, because certain morpheme positions seem to be Arawakan tendencies, but the model does not account for the different levels either, and in addition it claims that suffixes could be divided into semantic groups, which does not seem to be so. The model suggested in Payne (1990:231) shows a general concept of layering, but it does not give enough detail for specific morphemes and their placement. After having analyzed Baure verbal morphology in so much detail, I intend to extend the study to other Arawakan languages in order to come to generalizations that are valid for the whole language family or subgroups within it.
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Abbreviations:

1 = first person  
2 = second person  
3 = third person  
ABL = ablative  
ABS = absolute morpheme  
ADJ = adjective  
APPL = applicative  
APRV = approval  
APRX = approximative  
ART = article  
ATTR = attributive  
BEN = benefactive  
CAUS = causative  
CL = class marker  
CLF = classifier  
COM = comitative  
COME = directional: towards  
CONTR = control  
COS = change of state  
DEM = demonstrative (1, 2, 3 = specific types)  
DEP = departitive  
DIM = diminutive  
DISTR = distributive  
DUB = dubitative  
DUR = durative  
EMPH = emphatic  
EP = epenthesis  
EXCL = exclamative  
f, F = feminine  
(F) = future in Figure 1  
FRUST = frustrative  
HES = hesitation  
IND = indefinite pronoun  
INTL = intentional, go (to do sth.), directional  
IPFV = imperfective state (also past of achievement verbs); copula  
IRR = irrealis  
LK = linker  
LOC = locative  
m = masculine  
N = noun  
NEG = negative  
NMLZ = (participant) nominalizer  
NON.FUT = non-future  
O1 (P) = (generally direct) object or patient  
O2 (R) = (generally indirect) object or recipient  
OBJ.DIST = distal object  
PASS = passive  
PAST = past tense  
PEJ = pejorative  
PERF = perfect  
PL = plural  
PRFLX = perfective & reflexive  
PTCP = participle
Appendix: Incomplete verbal paradigm example -pori(a)- ‘sew’

(A1) a. niporiaw  b. niporiawor  c. niporiejewor
   \[ \begin{align*}
   ni=pori-a-wo & & ni=pori-a-wo=ro & & ni=pori-a-je-wo=ro \\
   1SG=sew-LK-IPFV & & 1SG=sew-LK-IPFV=3SGm & & 1SG=sew-LK-DISTR-IPFV=3SGm \\
   \end{align*} \]
   ‘I am sewing.’  ‘I am sewing/sew it.’  ‘I am sewing it all.’

(A2) niporiwanapor
   \[ \begin{align*}
   ni=pori-wana-po=ro \\
   1SG=sew-DEP-PRFLX=3SGm \\
   \end{align*} \]
   ‘I am sewing it and leave.’

(A3) niporimbekow
   \[ \begin{align*}
   ni=pori-mbe-ko-wo \\
   1SG=sew-CLF:flat-ABS-IPFV \\
   \end{align*} \]
   ‘I am sewing up (mending).’

(A4) a. rokoporimow  b. rokoporiai
   \[ \begin{align*}
   ro=ko-pori-mo-wo & & ro=ko-pori-a-si \\
   3SGm=ATTR-sew-CLF:woven-IPFV & & 3SGm=ATTR-sew-LK-PASS \\
   \end{align*} \]
   ‘It (piece of clothes) is sewn.’  ‘It was sewn.’

(A5) a. niporinovir  b. nimboriawori
   \[ \begin{align*}
   ni=pori-ino-wo=pi=ro & & ni=imo-pori-a-wo=ri \\
   1SG=sew-BEN-IPFV=2SG=3SGm & & 1SG=CAUS-sew-LK-IPFV=3SGf \\
   \end{align*} \]
   ‘I am sewing it for you.’  ‘I make her sew.’

(A6) a. viporinokokow  b. vimboriakokow
   \[ \begin{align*}
   vi=pori-ino-koko-wo & & vi=imo-pori-a-koko-wo \\
   1PL=sew-BEN-RCPC-IPFV & & 1PL=CAUS-sew-LK-RCPC-IPFV \\
   \end{align*} \]
   ‘We are sewing for each other.’  ‘We are making each other sew.’

(A7) a. nimboriejewori  b. vimboriejekokow
   \[ \begin{align*}
   ni=imo-pori-a-je-wo=ri & & vi=imo-pori-a-je-koko-wo \\
   1SG=CAUS-sew-LK-DISTR-IPFV=3SGf & & 1PL=CAUS-sew-LK-DISTR-RCPC-IPFV \\
   \end{align*} \]
   ‘I am making her sew it all.’  ‘We are making each other sew it all.’

(A8) a. rokamiyow to roporiachow
   \[ \begin{align*}
   ro=kamiyo-wo & & ro=pori-a-cho-wo \\
   3SGm=like-IPFV & & 3SGm=sew-LK-PTCP-IPFV \\
   \end{align*} \]
   ‘He likes to sew.’
b. **rokamiyow to roemboriachowoni**

\[\text{ro}=\text{kamiyo-wo} \text{ to } \text{ro}=\text{imo-pori-a-cho-wo}=\text{ni}\]

3SGm=like-IPFV ART 3SGm=CAUS-sew-LK-PTCP-IPFV=1SG

‘He likes to make me sew.’

(A9)a. **kori porinoworon?**

\[\text{ko}=\text{ri} \text{ pori-ino-wo}=\text{ro-no}\]

why=3Sgf sew-BEN-IPFV=3SGm-NMLZ

‘Why is she sewing for him?’

b. **amo yiporinokokowon?**

\[\text{amo } \text{yi}=\text{pori-ino-koko-wo-no}\]

why.not 2PL=sew-BEN-RCPC-IPFV-NMLZ

‘Why aren’t you sewing for each other?’

(A10)a. **niporiayiwor**

\[\text{ni}=\text{pori-a-yi-wo}=\text{ro}\]

1SG=sew-LK-LOC-IPFV=3SGm

‘where I am sewing it’

b. **riporiaiyiworon?**

\[\text{ni}=\text{pori-a-yi-wo}=\text{ro-no}\]

1SG=sew-LK-LOC-IPFV=3SGm-NMLZ

‘Where is she sewing it?’

B. Text sample: How synthetic is Baure in text reality?

(B1) **nakirok-ye tech kotis achow to sipori nokomirachkok.**

\[
\text{nakirok-ye tech} \text{ kotis ach-wo} \text{ to } \text{sipori no}=\text{komirach-koko}
\]

ancient.times-LOC DEM2m lizard and-IPFV ART frog 3PL=meet-RCPC

‘Once upon a time the lizard and the frog met.’

**rokichowor-ji tech rotori: ndori, rokichow,**

\[\text{ro}=\text{kich-wo}=\text{ro}=\text{ji} \text{ tech } \text{ro}=\text{tori} \text{ ni}=\text{tori} \text{ ro}=\text{kich-wo}\]

3SGm=say.do-IPFV=3SGm=QUOT DEM2m 3SGm=friend 1SG=friend 3SGm=say.do-IPFV

‘He said to his friend: My friend, he said.’

\[\text{nga} \text{ piki’inow paskoni niwoyiksha to niwer?}\]

NEG 2SG=want-IPFV 2SG=help=1SG 1SG=make-IRR ART 1SG=house

‘Don’t you want to help me when I make (rebuild) my house?’

(B2) **jenowore ja nimowoyikpasha ten netiporos, rokichowori-ji.**

\[\text{jeno-wo}=\text{ro}=\text{i} \text{ ja } \text{ni}=\text{imo-woyik-pa-sha}\]

good-IPFV=3SGm-EMPH HES 1SG=CAUS-make-INTL-IRR

\[\text{ten} \text{ ni}=\text{etiporos} \text{ ro}=\text{kich-wo}=\text{ri}=\text{ji}\]

DEM3m 1SG=bow 3SGm=say.do-IPFV=3SGf=QUOT

‘It is good if I have my bow made, he told her.’

---

1. This spot check up was done with narratives, altogether 1583 words, interjections were excluded (cf. Danielsen 2007:83).
2. Aikhenvald 1999b:236
3. Wise 1986:582
4. Aikhenvald (1999a, 2001) uses a mixture of all approaches, but no concrete analysis of structure has been done in literature.
5. attested are nouns, adjectives, adverbs, particles, pronouns, numerals, quantifiers; examples:
   a. **nenowori.**
   b. **ngawaper.**
   \[\text{ni}=\text{eno-wo}=\text{ri} \text{ nga-wapa}=\text{ro}\]
   1SG=mother-IPFV=3SGf NEG=COS=3SGm
   ‘She is my mother.’
   ‘He is not here any more.’
8. The lexicalized units are only separated here for transparency, but generally they are analyzed and glossed as one.