Chapter 9
Clause structure

This chapter describes nonverbal clauses and the structure of verbal clauses, including pragmatically unmarked clause structure, as well as overt topicalisation and argument focussing, the clause position of peripheral arguments, negation, and the function of constituent level modifiers.

9.1 Verbless clauses

Two kinds of verbless predications exist in Kokota: equative predicates and possessive predicates. The structure of main clauses with verbless predicates is discussed here. Negative equative and possessive predications are discussed in 9.7.

9.1.1 Equative predicates

9.1.1.1 Basic equative clauses

Equative clauses equate the subject to a nominal which specifies some aspect of the subject. The equated aspect tends to be habitual or a permanent state. As with verbal clauses, equative predications of this type are coded as irrealis. As irrealis has zero marking the remaining subject agreement component of the auxiliary is typically omitted. This is true of equatives as well as verbal clauses. (In examples in this section the predication is enclosed in square brackets.)

(9.1) a. abrose varigutu [datau-na goveo]
    PN PN chief-3SGP PNLOC
    Ambrose Varigutu is the chief of Goveo.

    b. taiyo e [pusi ga-gase-na]
    PN 3.SBJ cat RD-woman-3SGP
    Taiyo is a female cat.

    c. nakoni [kaike glepo ta doli]
    person one thing SB live
    People are one [kind of] living thing.

Where the feature being assigned to the subject applied at a particular time in the past but no longer applies, or applies at the time of speaking but did not always apply, a realis auxiliary may occur, typically with the perfective aspect or present tense marker present:

(9.2) a. getu [n-e-ke mane datau]
    PN RL-3.SBJ-PRF man chief
    Getu was the chief [at that time].

    b. mane [n-e-ge nakodu]
    she RL-3.SBJ-PRS old.woman
    She is an old woman.

Other pre-head predicate modifiers occur, including the future tense marker ginai (in either pre- or post auxiliary position), the frequency marker fani, and the purposive mala:

(9.3) a. belama [ginai e mane polisi]
    PN FUT 3.SBJ man police
    Belama will be a policeman.'
b. *ia mane n-e-ke lehe *[e fani mane premie] e-u*  
theSG man RL-3.SBJ-PRF die 3.SBJ often man Premier 3.SBJ-be.thus  
The man who died used to be Premier.

c. *totogale mala no-na belama*  
picture PURP GP-3SGP PN  
a photo which is intended to belong to Belama

Not all pre-head modifiers may occur. None of the desiderative particles may occur. The frequency marker *tuma* 'very often' and the intensifier *torai* do not occur in equatives in the present corpus. It is not clear whether this reflects a restriction or a gap.

### 9.1.1.2 Possession of predicate by subject

A predicate nominal may be inalienably possessor-indexed to the subject:

(9.4) a. *ara [naĩha-ɣu-na bili]*  
I name-1SGP-thatN PN  
My name is Billy.

b. *gita [nakoni posa-da]*  
1INC person emerge-1INCP  
We were visitors.

c. *ara [mane-ɣu ka nohi-ne]*  
I man-1SGP LOC district-thisR  
I am a man of this district.

### 9.1.1.3 Subject-predicate constituent order in equative clauses

The pragmatically unmarked constituent order (see 9.2.1) does not occur in equative clauses. The sole core argument of an equative clause typically occurs before the predicate in topic position (as shown in examples (9.1) to (9.4)). This construction is only departed from when the subject occurs in clause-final focus position. When this occurs the subject must be marked with the focus particle *si*:

(9.5) a. *[mane gabili] si-ɣu-ro*  
man be.aggressive FOC-IMM-thoseNV  
These are fighting men.

b. *[e-ŋi naĩha-di nakoni] si-la-re*  
3.SBJ-NEG name-3PLP person FOC-??-thoseN  
Those aren't the names of people.

The structure of equative clauses is therefore:

(9.6)  \[ S \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{NPTOP} + \text{PRED} \\
\text{PRED} + \text{NPFOC} 
\end{cases} \]

### 9.1.1.4 Equative clause information weighting

In terms of information structure the subject of an equative clause is normally a previously established or known participant, about whom some new information is being given. Consequently the subject typically requires a less detailed mention for identification than the predicate does. Often it is realised only by a demonstrative or pronoun. However, occasionally discourse information structure leads to an atypical weighting of information:
While information weightings like this occur they are less common in normal discourse.

9.1.1.5 Telling the time

Linguistic divisions of time smaller than periods such as morning and afternoon are a recent introduction. Expressing time in terms of these division is performed using an equative construction in which the nominal tənhi 'time' occurs as subject. Hour divisions are expressed as cardinal nominals, and these function as equative predicates. Temporal interrogatives have the same construction, with the quantitative interrogative functioning as the predicate:

(9.8) a. tənhi [nɪhau]  b. tənhi [fitu-gu]
    time how.much  time seven-CRD
What's the time?  The time is seven o'clock.

Divisions of time smaller than an hour are expressed with the same construction, with a predicative NP expressing numerically quantified minutes, inalienably indexed to a possessor expressing the relevant hour:

(9.9) tənhi [naboto-ai ŋ̣a na minii kenu-na/legu-na fitu-gu]
    time ten-plus five minute front-3SGP/behind-3SGP seven-CRD
The time is fifteen minutes to/past seven.

Periods of fifteen and thirty minutes cannot be referred to using terms equating to 'half past', 'a quarter to' or 'a quarter past'. Only full minute enumeration is possible.

9.1.1.6 Equative naming predication

9.1.1.6.1 Main clause naming equatives

Equative clauses which associate a name with an entity may have the basic equative clause structure discussed above:

(9.10) naĩha-di-re [sarakaipono, legopono, ihebohebohebo] e-u
    name-3PLP-thoseN PN PN whoever 3.SBJ-be.thus
Those names of theirs [ie. their names] are Sarakaipono, Legopono, whoever, it's like that.

However, names are more usually assigned to entities by a predication in which the irrealis auxiliary is directly marked with an object enclitic, with the meaning 'does it/them', the complement of which has naĩha- 'name' as its head:

(9.11) a. fadalao [e-ni naĩha-na-na]
    PN 3.SBJ-3SGO name-3SGP-thatN
Fadalao does that name of his. [ie. ...is his name.]

b. ãuanha [e-ni bla naĩha-na-na gazu t-au-ao]
    inhale 3.SBJ-3SGO LMT name-3SGP-thatN wood SB-exist-thisT
Guanha simply does that name of this tree. [ie. ...is the name of this tree.]

The complement with naĩha- is often not overtly realised if the context prevents ambiguity:

(9.12) ã-a-ke hoda neti e-ni ka mane-vaka ide,
    NT-1.SBJ-PRF take net 3.SBJ-3SGO LOC man-ship theseR
We take a net, as it's called with these white men,
Names formerly used are indicated by use of the perfective aspect marker *ke*, in which case the irrealis zero marked subject auxiliary is omitted:

(9.13) \[ \text{ka gai tana nogoi naitu tahi ke-ni naïña-na-na e-u} \]
LOC weEXC then VOC devil sea PRF-3SGP thatN 3.SBJ-be.thus
With us, then man! 'sea devil' did that name of it, like that. [ie. ...was its name.]

As with basic equative clauses the sole argument of a naming predicate occurs in pre-head topic position. It is not clear at this stage whether the subject of a naming predicate can be focussed.

9.1.1.6.2 Naming equatives as relative clauses

Two types of relative clauses are formed from naming equatives. The naming equative in the first line of (9.12) exemplifies one type, with the same structure as a main clause except for the omission of the controlled argument. A second type has the subordinator *ta*. With equatives using this second construction, as with all *ta* subordinate clauses, no auxiliary is present. Instead the object enclitic attaches directly to the subordinating particle itself, and an obligatory demonstrative references the main clause argument which is the relative head:

(9.14) a. ...*fadalao* ta-ni-na naitu ta-o-ne
PN SB-3SGO-thatN devil SB-exist-thisR
...Fadalao, which does this devil. [ie. as this devil's called.]

b. ...*malaria* ta-ni-o nan na-na e-u ka ooe-vaka
malaria SB-3SGO-thatNV name-3SGP thatN 3.SBJ-be.thus LOC talk-ship
...malaria, which does [names] that name of it in English. [ie. as it's called in English.]

9.1.2 Possessive predicates

A possessive relationship may be expressed by use of a verbless possessive predication in which the ownership of an entity is assigned to a possessor. The possessum subject always occurs in pre-predicate topic position. The predication itself consists of a possessor indexed possessive base with its possessor NP complement (see 6.4). Both the general and consumable possessive bases may occur:

(9.15) a. keha pile-di-re [no-na bla tagi-na]
NSP side-3PLP-thoseN GP-3SGP LMT REFL-3SGP
Some parts will simply belong to him himself.

b. mala-ñhau are [ge-ğu ara]
PURP-eat thoseN CP-1SGP I
That food is mine.

As with equative clauses, auxiliaries and other pre-head modifiers may occur:

(9.16) a. ide-hi [n-e-ke no-ğü buka ara]
theseR-EMPH RL-3.SBJ-PERF GP-1SGP book I
These used to be my books.

b. a-hi [ginai no-ğü vilai ara]
thisT-EMPH FUT GP-1SGP knife I
This will be my knife.
Only alienable relationships are expressible using possessive predications. Inalienable relationships are expressed in verbless predicates in equative constructions, where the topicalised subject is equated with an inalienably possessed entity:

\[(9.17)\]  
\[are-bla\quad ira\quad doli-mai\quad gai\]  
thoseN-LMT thePL live-1EXCP weEXC  
Just those [things] are our lives.

Typically in such constructions the subject is not overtly realised, only the predicate occurring:

\[(9.18)\]  
\[totogale-\text{GU} \quad ara\]  
picture-1SGP I  
(It's) a photo of me.

9.2 Declarative verbal main clauses - pragmatically unmarked structure

9.2.1 Pragmatically unmarked core argument structure

A number of pragmatically marked clause structures exist,\(^1\) which are discussed in 9.3 and 9.4. An unmarked constituent structure also exists. Kokota is fundamentally verb-initial, with all pragmatically unmarked arguments occurring after the verb complex. With intransitive verbs the sole core argument occurs immediately following the verb complex, whether it is an unergative ((9.19)a.) or an unaccusative ((9.19)b.) subject.

\[(9.19)\]  
\[a.\quad n-o-ge\quad mai\quad bl-ago,\quad vave\]  
RL-2.SBJ-PRS come LMT-youSG in.law  
So you've come, in-law.

\[b.\quad ginai\quad lehe\quad bla\quad \text{giita}\]  
FUT die LMT weEXC  
We're going to die.

In transitive clauses the unmarked order is actor followed by object:

\[(9.20)\]  
\[n-o\quad fa-lehe-ri\quad ago\quad kokorako\quad are\]  
RL-3.SBJ CS-die-3PLO youSG chicken thoseN  
You are killing those chickens.

In clauses with ditransitive verbs the argument which is indexed by postverbal object agreement precedes the unindexed object:

---

\(^1\) The notion of markedness used here is not that of frequency but of pragmatic markedness. An unmarked clause structure in terms of frequency will be that which occurs most frequently in discourse, all other structures being marked. However in pragmatic terms, the unmarked structure is that which has no special pragmatic effect such as the foregrounding or backgrounding of an argument. Due to the frequency of zero anaphora and overt topicalisation in Kokota, the pragmatically unmarked clause structure is not the frequency unmarked structure. However, since varying clause structures in Kokota have varying pragmatic affects, it is more meaningful to use the terms 'marked' and 'unmarked' in their pragmatic sense for the purposes of discussing clause structure.
I am going to tell you some medicines of us here in Kokota.

In summary, the pragmatically unmarked constituent order for core arguments is VS/VAO. This does not mean, however, that clauses that look like this are the typical clause found in normal discourse. These structures are not unmarked in the sense that they are the most common. As with most Oceanic languages, subject and object agreement mean that participants, once established in the discourse, typically do not receive an overt mention again unless some pragmatic factors motivates a fresh mention. Such factors include the backgrounding or foregrounding of arguments, emphasis (contrastive or otherwise), and the prevention of ambiguity. Zero mentions, topicalisation and focusing are discussed in 9.2.3 to 9.2.5.

9.2.2 Pragmatically unmarked oblique argument structure

Pragmatically unmarked oblique arguments follow any postverbal core arguments present in the clause:

(9.22) a.  
g-e  lao-ña  šobilologu  ka  faknoe
NT-3.SBJ go-IMM PN LOC PN
Gobilologu went to Faknoe.

b.  
g-e  la  uf-i  ia  to-toi  ka-ia  papağı  ǧazu
NT-3.SBJ go blow-TR theSG RD-cook LOC-theSG stack wood
He went and blew on the fire on the wood stack.

Note that in (9.22)b. the transitivised uf-i 'blow' subcategorises for a patient, ia toto 'the fire' therefore being a direct object.

Where several obliques occur in the same clause no syntactic order restrictions apply. In some clauses with more than one ka prepositional phrase the semantics of the verb will dictate the order of the arguments. In (9.23) the semantics of fa kamo 'cause to cross' require a source and a goal, which participate in the process temporally in that order. The order of the obliques realising these participants is then iconic, with the source preceding the goal:

(9.23)  
fa  kamo-i  bakru  t-au-ana  [ka  timosi  ana]  [ka  panakini  ana]
CS go.across-3SGO liquid SB-exist-thatN LOC thermos thatN LOC cup thatN
Transfer that tea from that thermos to that cup.

In other clauses the semantics of the verb does not have this effect and any order is possible. In (9.24) the two PPs could occur in either order.

(9.24) a.  
zemesi  e  au  [ka  nau  ine  goveo]  [ka  nohi-ne  kokota]
PNN 3.SBJ exist LOC place thisR PNLOC LOC district-thisR PNLOC
James lives in this village of Goveo in this Kokota district.

b.  
e  au  no-di  fama  [ka-ira  buluka],  [ka-ira  zora]
3.SBJ exist GP-3PLP farm LOC-thePL cow LOC-thePL pig
They have their farms with cows, with pigs.

Where a prepositional phrase occurs with another oblique argument such as an associative oblique or a temporal locative either order is possible, as (9.25) and (9.26) show. However there is a strong tendency for the PP to precede the other oblique - the constructions in (9.25)b. and (9.26)b. occur less commonly.

(9.25) a.  
ara  n-a  lao  [ka-ia  sitoa]  [tarame-na  pita]
I RL-1.SBJ go LOC-theSG store ASSC-3SGP PN
I went to the store with Peter.
9.3 Zero mentions

Participants which have been established in the discourse are typically not overtly mentioned in subsequent clauses as long as they are not topicalised or focused, unless an overt mention is necessary to prevent ambiguity (including where an established argument occurs with a new grammatical relation). This applies as much to first and second person as to third person referents. As long as a participant maintains the same grammatical relation it is not overtly mentioned after the initial reference, unless a clause intervenes in which a different participant is in that relation.

The fragment of text in (9.27) illustrates the maintenance of participants in established grammatical relations with zero mentions. A participant is overtly mentioned in clause 1 as an intransitive subject. In clause 2 the same participant again occurs, this time as a transitive actor. Being the subject of the preceding clause, no overt mention is necessary for the listener to interpret that participant as the actor of this clause. In the same clause a further participant is overtly mentioned as the object of the predication. Clause 3 is outside the events of the narrative. The subject is an anaphoric reference to the events of the preceding clauses. Apart from emphatic observations like this on the part of the narrator, all subsequent core arguments represent the subject/actor and object established in clauses 1 and 2. Once established in their roles, neither participant receives an overt core argument mention again, being maintained in their grammatical relations by a series of zero mentions. No further overt mentions are necessary for the listener to be able to follow the narrative, despite the fact that both participants are 3SG and thus subject and object agreement markers could both potentially refer to either.

The only further overt mention of either participant in (9.27) is in the second part of clause 5, where the subject is mentioned overtly as the possessor of the snake-tail. The only other overt mention is of an instrument in clause 5. This oblique participant, once established is also not mentioned overtly in the subsequent clause where it is assumed to be the instrument of the same predicate.

(9.27) 1. ...n-e hage gobilologu
    RL-3.SBJ ascend PN
    ...Gobilologu went up,

2. kai gilai n-e la toke-i bla mane n-e-ke seha-n-lau
    LOC until RL-3.SBJ go arrive-3SGO LMT man RL-3.SBJ-PRF climb-thatN-SPC
    until [he] reached that man who was climbing.

3. e-u si-la-na
    3.SBJ-be.thus FOC-?-thatN
    That's how it was,

4. lao sini ge age n-e lao-nia
    go FOC SEQ and RL-3.SBJ go-IMM
    Go, and then [he] went.

5. n-e la piri-nu ka-ia kolu e-u,
    RL-3.SBJ go tie-3SGO-PRG LOC-theSG snake 3.SBJ-be.thus
    [He] went and was tying [him] up with the snake, like that,
ka-ia kolu-seku-na-o mane.
LOC-theSG snake-tail-3SGO-thatNV him
with that snake-tail of his,

6-7. la piri fa-lehe-i-u sin-ge age ț-e hure-i-ña
go tie CS-die-3SGO-PRG FOC-SEQ and NT-3.SBJ carry-3SGO-IMM
went and was tying up and killing [him], and then [he] carried [him].

8-10. ț-e hage-u ț-e hage-u ț-e hage-u
RL-3.SBJ ascend-PRG NT-3.SBJ ascend-PRG NT-3.SBJ ascend-PRG
[He] was going up, [he] was going up, [he] was going up,

11. ț-e toke-u sara fate sin-ge
NT-3.SBJ reach-PRG thereD high FOC SEQ
[he] was arriving there on top and then

12. ț-e la de-deke-u sin-ge
NT-3.SBJ go RD-step-PRG FOC SEQ
[he] went and stepped [with his tail on the ground],

13. age ț-e koko-la-ni-ña sara rauru
SEQ NT-3.SBJ leave-go-3SGO-IMM thereD seaward
and then [he] threw [him] there seaward.

Where a different participant intervenes an established participant may receive an overt mention to clarify that the relevant relation has switched back to them. In (9.28) clause 2 the subject and object both receive an overt mention. In clause 3 a new subject occurs, and receives an overt mention. As this participant, the turtle, received an overt mention only two clauses earlier, a proform mention is sufficient. However, an overt mention of some kind is made because the subject of clause 3 is not the same as the subject of the preceding clause 2. This occurs despite the fact that the subject indexing in clause 3 makes it clear that the subject must be a different participant. In clause 4 the subject is the same as in clause 3 so no overt mention is necessary. In 5, however, subject has switched back to the subject of clause 2. Now an overt mention occurs to re-establish that participant as subject, although again subject indexing also indicates that. Once established, that participant again receives a zero mention in the subsequent clause 6.

(9.28) 1. ...n-a la fakae-ni-u ka tahi are teg ine e-u
RL-1.SBJ go see-3SGO-PRG LOC sea thoseN turtle thisR 3.SBJ-be.thus
...we go and see in the sea this turtle, like that.

2. ț-a koko-ni-ña gai momoru ana
NT-1.SBJ leave-3SGO-IMM weEXC turtle.net thatN
We throw out that turtle net.

3. ț-e mai kale-u mane ka momoru ana e-u
NT-3.SBJ come snag-PRG it LOC turtle.net thatN 3.SBJ-be.thus
It comes and gets caught in that turtle net, like that,

4. mai kale-u ka momoru ana si-ge
come snag-PRG LOC turtle.net thatN FOC-SEQ
comes and gets caught in that turtle net and then

5. ț-a zogu-ni-ña gai
NT-1.SBJ fall-IMM weEXC
we drop [in to the water]
An established participant may also receive an overt mention if it occurs in a new grammatical relation, typically when an established subject becomes an object. In (9.29) a subject participant receives an overt mention in clause 1 and a zero mention as subject in clauses 2 and 3. In 5. the subject is assumed to be the participant which was newly introduced with an overt mention in 4. Typically a newly introduced overtly mentioned subject supplants a previously established subject. When this occurs, if the relevant clause is transitive, the most recently mentioned subject is assumed to be the actor, and the next most recently mentioned argument is assumed to be the object, even if that argument was itself subject. However, the change in relation of the former subject participant often motivates a further overt mention of the argument in its new role, as occurs in clause 5. This is particularly common where some ambiguity is possible. As both participants in clause 5 are 3SG, neither subject nor object indexing associates a participant to a relation.

(9.29) 1. **mane ine n-e-ge mai mhoko**
   man thisR RL-3.SBJ-PRS come sit
   This man comes and sits.

2. **n-e-ge au-gu ka nafu-ğazu ine**
   RL-3.SBJ-PRS exist-PRG LOC base-wood thisR
   He stays at this tree base.

3. **n-e-ge au-gu**
   RL-3.SBJ-PRS exist-PRG
   He stays.

4. **posa mai-na-o bla göbolologu**
   emerge come-3SGP-thatNV LMT PN
   That emergence of Gobilologu.

5. **n-e-ge mai fakae-ni-u mane ine, nakoni ine**
   RL-3.SBJ come see-3SGO-PRG man thisR person thisR
   He's coming and seeing this man, this person.

A switching of relations does not necessarily require overt mentions, however, as long as no ambiguity is possible. A participant may be established as subject in one clause, but participate as an object with a zero mention in a subsequent clause, if a further subject has been established and no ambiguity is possible. In (9.30) the semantics of the clauses make the roles of the participants clear, as does the object indexing in clause 3.

(9.30) 1. **n-e-ke la zaho ia naitu**
   RL-3.SBJ-PRF go go theSG devil
   The devil went away.

2. **tetu-ña ira naitu toke nogoi**
   stand-IMM thePL devil arrive VOC
   The arriving devils stood up, man!

3. **ğ-e toğla-ni n-e-ke-u**
   NT-3.SBJ chase-3SGO RL-3.SBJ-PRF-be.thus
   and chased [him].

In clause 1 of (9.30) a devil (whose identity was established much earlier in the narrative) receives an overt mention as subject. In the next clause a group of other devils receive an overt mention as subject. In the transitive clause 3 both the actor and object receive zero mentions. There is no difficulty in interpreting this
clause. The most recently mentioned subject (the group of 'arriving devils' mentioned in the preceding clause) is assumed to remain subject of the new clause. This is reinforced by the fact that the clause involves an event of chasing. As the preceding two clauses involved one participant going away (zahe involves movement away from a location), and the other participants then standing up, it is clear who is likely to be doing the chasing. The potential for ambiguity is also removed by the object indexing in 3, which indicates that it is the singular previously mentioned participant that is the object. (The subject indexing does not contribute to the prevention of ambiguity since it marks only person, not number.)

In normal discourse zero mentions occur with high frequency. In a typical narrative text, for example, the proportion of overt mentions to zero mentions in main clauses was:

Table 9.1: Proportion of overt to zero mentions in a typical narrative text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overt pragmatically unmarked mentions</th>
<th>Overtly mentioned topicalised arguments</th>
<th>Zero mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zero mentions account for half of all subject arguments, transitive and intransitive. However all object and oblique arguments receive an overt mention. While both do receive zero mentions in discourse, most mentions are overt. Both these findings accord with the crosslinguistic tendency for subjects, particularly A arguments, to be already established participants, and for objects and obliques to be new information. These crosslinguistic tendencies are reflected in the information structure of Kokota. Since only established participants may occur as zero mentions, it is to be expected that a high proportion of A and S arguments will receive a zero mention. Conversely, it is to be expected that objects and obliques, tending to represent new information, will overwhelmingly receive overt mentions. The result is that a majority of intransitive clauses have no overtly mentioned core arguments, while a majority of transitive clauses have only one overt core argument, usually the object. The occurrence of a transitive clause with two overt arguments is unusual in normal discourse.

9.4 Topicalisation

In overt topicalisation the topicalised argument is realised in preverbal position. An argument in any grammatical relation may be fronted in this way. Subjects of any kind may be topicalised, including transitive actors ((9.31)a.), and unergative ((9.31)b.) and unaccusative ((9.31)c.-d.) intransitive subjects:

(9.31) a. *ago n-o fa-lehe-au ara* youSG RL-2.SBJ CS-die-1SGO I You are killing me.

b. *ia tara-*iña n-e mai-ne* theSG enemy-IMM RL-3.SBJ come-thisR

The enemy has come.

c. *tilo tomoko n-e au-re zelu* three war.canoe RL-3.SBJ exist-thoseN PNLOC

Three war canoes are at Zelu.

---

2 The pragmatic motivation for overt and zero mentions in the closely related neighbouring language Maringe are discussed in Palmer (forthcoming)b.

3 Information structure tendencies of this kind in the related Roviana language are discussed in depth by Corston (1996: Chapter 4).
d. *mane* 3.SBJ keha niheihe
   He 3.SBJ separate
He is different.

Objects also occur as preverbal topics:

(9.32) a. *ia pike mau-ŋu n-e-ke hod-i-o sala ge ruruboŋi bla*
   theSG piece taro-1SGP RL-3.SBJ-PRF take-TR-this PN and PN LMT
   My piece of taro just Sala and Rurubongi brought.

b. *are-lau tahe-di ago*
   thoseN-SPC tell-3PLO youSG
   Those ones [parts of a story] you will tell.

Although objects may be topicalised this occurs rarely in natural discourse. Subjects, both transitive and
intransitive occur much more commonly. In the first 100 verbal main clauses of a typical narrative text, the
following break down of argument position occurrence applied:

Table 9.2: Proportion of arguments in preverbal, focused, and pragmatically unmarked position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preverbal topicalised arguments</th>
<th>Focused arguments</th>
<th>Arguments in unmarked position</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2 (28.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (71.5%)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>8 (15.5%)</td>
<td>2 (4.0%)</td>
<td>41 (80.5%)</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1 (5.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 (94.5%)</td>
<td>18 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2 shows that overtly realised arguments of all types overwhelmingly occur in their pragmatically
unmarked positions. However a cline exists from A arguments, which are most likely to be overtly
topicalised, to O arguments, which are the least likely. Slightly more than half the proportion of S
arguments are topicalised as A arguments, and only a third as many O arguments as S arguments. Only one
sixth the proportion of Os are topicalised as As.

Topicalisation occurs when the speaker assumes that the referent participant is prominent in the listener's
mind, typically because the participant has recently been mentioned in the discourse. In most instances such
a participant will receive a zero mention, as discussed in 9.3. However, there are some instances when a
zero mention is not sufficient to identify the argument. In such instances an overtly realised topicalised
mention occurs. This occurs for a number of reasons. It may be that a participant has been recently
mentioned, but another participant has received a subsequent mention. Attention may switch back to the
previously mentioned participant, but without an overt mention this will not be clear. Consequently the
participant receives an overt mention to preclude ambiguity, but due to the recent mention and consequent
assumed prominence of the participant in the listener's mind, the argument is backgrounded. In (9.33) a text
fragment of three clauses illustrates this. In clause 1 the subject occurs in its unmarked position. In clause 2
a new subject occurs (itself topicalised as a result of prominence arising from a recent overt mention). In
clause 3 the subject of clause 1 is again subject. Due to its prominence this participant would receive a zero
mention if it were not for the intervening subject of clause 2. The switching back of the subject in clause 3
requires an overt mention. Without it the subject would be assumed to remain the subject of the preceding
clause - clause 2. However due to the very recent mention of the relevant participant, the subject of this
clause is backgrounded through topicalisation:

(9.33) 1. *n-e-ke la mai-u mane ide kokota*
   RL-3.SBJ-PRF go come-PRG man theseR PNLOC
   These Kota men used to come [to pray].

2. *huhrurangi tana teo e-u*
   PNLOC then be.not 3.SBJ-be.thus
Overt topicalisation also occurs when a participant which has already been established and is assumed to be prominent in the listener's mind, occurs with a new grammatical relation. Often no overt mention is needed in this situation because the subject and object indexing make clear the new relations, or the semantics of the clause as a whole allows only one reading. However, in some instances an overt mention is needed to indicate the participant's new relation. In (9.34) two participants are introduced in clause 1 as an oblique argument. In the next clause they occur as subject with an anaphoric reference. Although they have only just been mentioned and are assumed to be prominent in the listener's mind, they receive an overt mention to clarify their shift from oblique to subject. However, their prominence allows a topicalised mention.

(9.34) 1. ara-hi a turi tufa-nigo kaike tu-turi fakasai-di nau-de
I-EMPH 1.SBJ tell affect-2SGO one RD-tell history-3PLP place-theseR
I will tell you a history story of these places,
gu-di göbilologu ge faknoe...
CNTX-3PLP PN and PN
I will tell you a history story of these places, about Gobilologu and Faknoe...

2. ka au-di-re palu mane aro n-e-ke au ĝerona
LOC exist-3PLP-thoseN two man theseT RL-3.SBJ-PRF exist PNLOC
In their living these two men were at Gerona.

Overt topicalisation also occurs when an argument refers to a participant which is assumed to be prominent in the listener's mind as the result of a recent overt reference, but is being referred to in a different way. In (9.35) clause 3 has a topicalised subject. The subject is the event expressed in clause 1. This event is assumed to be prominent in the listener's mind, as it has just been mentioned, but it has not previously been referred to in the way it is in clause 3. As it has just been mentioned and is prominent it receives a proform mention, and is backrounded through topicalisation. However the new nature of the reference to it means it must receive an overt mention.

(9.35) 1. n-e teo ĝa aĝe aĝe mhoko fa-lehe-i ago to-toi-ne ge
RL-3.SBJ be.not IMM NT go sit CS-die-3SGO youSG RD-cook-thisR SEQ
[If] it is not so that you go and sit on and kill this fire, then

2. ago teo bla ĝe heta-u e-u
youSG be.not LMT NT be.strong-PRG 3.SBJ-be.thus
you are not strong.

3. a-hi bla fa gilagila-na k-ara
thisT-EMPH LMT CS-test-thatN LOC-me
This will be the sign to me.

The text fragment in (9.35) illustrates a further use of overt topicalisation. This fragment is taken from a discussion between two participants, one of whom, the speaker, hopes to kill the addressee by tricking him to sit on the fire. In clause 2 the subject is the same participant as the subject of the preceding clause. Here the topicalisation is contrastive - the implication of the overt topicalisation in clause 2 is that the addressee will reveal himself to not be strong in contrast with the speaker. The participant receives an overt mention to create that contrast, but the mention is topicalised to backround it, so that the lack of strength can represent a comment on the addressee.

It is not always the case that the topicalised referent has been previously mentioned in the discourse, however. Certain participants are typically assumed to be prominent in the listener's mind simply because of their relationship to the speech event. First and second pronouns are frequently topicalised on this basis. Even if a speaker or addressee has not been overtly mentioned in the discourse, they are assumed to be
prominent in the listener's mind and are topicalised accordingly. In the 100 verbal main clauses analysed in Table 9.2, of the 11 preverbal topics 5 were first inclusive, first exclusive or second person pronouns.

All but one were in reported speech. The exception was the narrator introducing the story. This was the first occasion in the text when the speaker referred to himself, but that reference was topicalised, as was the first use of the 1SG pronoun in reported speech. The first use of the first inclusive pronoun was also topicalised. In each case the speaker was assuming that he himself and the interlocutors together were already prominent in the listener's mind. In the 100 verbal main clauses, the following numbers of first and second person core argument pronouns were topicalised:

Table 9.3: Number of first and second person pronouns topicalised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preverbal topicalised arguments</th>
<th>Focused arguments</th>
<th>Arguments in unmarked position</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>1 (14.5%)</td>
<td>2 (28.5%)</td>
<td>4 (57.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of special clause types typically have a topicalised subject. As discussed in 9.1, the subjects of nonverbal predicates always occur in a pragmatically marked position. Rarely this is the clause final focused position. Typically the subject of a nonverbal predicate occurs clause initially in topic position.

A further clause type typically occurring with topicalisation is the sequencer clause. Sequencer clauses, a form of recapping, are common in exposition, and indicating completion of the event of the preceding clause as a prelude to the next clause. In (9.36) the subjects of clauses 2 and 4 repeat the event expressed in the preceding clauses.

(9.36) 1. o la roh-i ia ḡuanha...
        2.SBJ go scrape-TR theSG inhale
        You go and scrape [the bark of] the 'inhale' [tree]...

        2. la roh-i n-e nhigo
go scrape RL-3.SBJ be.finished
Going and scraping is finished,

        3. toke-na fa blahi
arrive-thatN CS be.tabu
go back and bless it.

        4. fa blahi n-e nhigo ara ge
CS be.tabu RL-3.SBJ be.finished I SEQ
The blessing is finished and

        5. age ḡ-e ḡuanha-ña nakoni ta kuru-i-ne foğra e-u
SEQ NT-3.SBJ inhale-IMM person SB have-3SGO-thisR sick 3.SBJ-be.thus
then the person who has this sickness inhales.

9.5 Focused constructions

Focus is a formal means of foregrounding a piece of information. In Kokota two kinds of focusing exists. One involves focus marking a particular argument. This is done by locating the argument in clause final position and marking it with the focal particle si-. The other involves foregrounding the content of the entire clause using the focal particles sini and si-.

---

4 Guanha means to inhale something. It is also the name of a tree the bark of which is used as an infusion for inhaling.
9.5.1 Clause foregrounding

9.5.1.1 Clauses foregrounded with *si*

When it occurs without marking an argument the particle *si* marks the entire main clause as being focused. It is procliticised to the final constituent of the clause. This effectively means that it forms a part of the clause final constituent, and cannot occur alone. A sequence of the focus particle and the clause final sequencer *ge* occurs very commonly in discourse:

(9.37)  
*ke broza lao putuo, toke putuo sare si-ge*
PRF pack go PNLOC arrive PNLOC thereP FOC-SEQ
[We] packed up and went to Putuo, arrived there at Putuo and then

*ge*  
tetu-ni man-dou mare
NT-3.SBJ stand-IMM man-be.big PN
old man Mare stood up.

This combination of particles frequently marks a clause preceding reported speech:

(9.38)  
*n-e-ge mai fa nhigo-i-u lao tabar-i-na banesokeo si-ge*
RL-3.SBJ-PRS come CS finish-3SGO-PRG go buy-TR-thatN PNLOC FOC-SEQ
He came and bought Banesokeo and then

*ge*  
ta-e au-i-na putuo...'
be.not flee-3SGO PRS exist-3SGO-PRG PNLOC
"No, leave where you are at Putuo..."

The cooccurrence of the focal particle and the sequencer is entirely optional, and clauses with this collocation are equally grammatical without *si*.

*Si* combines with the clause level modifier *ba*. As discussed in 9.8.1, this particle marks alternatives, performing in part the function served by the English conjunction *or*. The resulting form, *si-ba*, places the clause in contrastive focus. Thus in (9.39) the second clause of speaker B's response he is telling speaker A to follow his suggestion instead of his own idea.

(9.39)  
A. *ka la au fufunu foșra-na mane, ta-ke fufunu-na ara*
LOC go exist begin sick-3SGP he SB-PRF begin-thatN I
When his sickness began, that's where I'll start [the story].

B. *fufunu ke la keli-kava [e-u lao bla si-ba]*
begin PRF go be.good-land 3.SBJ-then go LMT FOC-ALT
Start when there was peace, just go like that instead.

Again *si* may be omitted. The presence of *ba* alone marks the clause as contrastive, but the clause is not focused.

*Si* also cooccurs with the clause level markers *ni* 'immediate mood' and *la* (the function of which is unclear), but only when in combination with an argument. Thus *si-la* and *si-ni* alone are ungrammatical. Their occurrence with arguments is discussed further below.

9.5.1.2 *Si* marking constituents other than main clauses

The focal proclitic *si* also marks constituents other than an entire main clause, when the constituent is a context for the event expressed in the following clause. The marked constituent may be a temporal locative:
(9.40) A. *ginai saigona si-*ge ꩥ-o tahe-i-ña t-au-ana ba
   later evening FOC-SEQ NT-2.SBJ tell-3SGO-IMM SB-existN ALT
   This evening then you tell them to do that instead [of now].

B. *che ginai saigona si-*ba
   yes later evening FOC-ALT
   Yes, this evening instead.

More typically *si* marks a recapping or sequencing constituent, either a sequencing demonstrative, as in (9.41)a., or a sequencing clause, as in (9.41)b.

(9.41) a. *ke fa noto la-i manei*
   PRF CS stop go-3SGO he
   He will stop it (the tape).

   *an-lau si-*ge fa la-i-ña tu-turi-na a-hi*
   thatN-SP FOC-SEQ CS go-3SGO-IMM RD-tell-3SGP thisT-EMPH
   That, then you give this story.

b. ...*g-e mai kale-u manei ka momoru-ana e-u*
   NT-3.SBJ come snag-PRG he LOC turtle.net-thatN 3.SBJ-be.thus
   ...it comes and gets caught in that net,

   *mai kale-u ka momoru-ana si-*ge
   come snag-PRG LOC turtle.net-thatN FOC-SEQ
   comes and gets caught in that net and then

   *g-a zogu-i-ña g’ai g-a fa hage-i ka hinage*
   NT-1.SBJ drop-3SGO-IMM weEXC NT-1.SBJ CS ascend-SGO LOC boat
   we jump in and lift it into the boat.

The marking of a nonverbal constituent as a focused clause indicates that the constituent is an existential clause of the kind where no existential verb is overtly present. This is the case with the sequencing demonstrative in (9.41)a. This is not limited to sequencers, however. In (9.42) the nominal marked with a focused sequencer is functioning as a nonverbal existential predication.

(9.42) *n-a la lisa-di t-au-are*
   RL-1.SBJ go put-3PLO SB-exist-thoseN
   We go and put down those [the food],

   *age n-a-ke zaho koko-ni-ña e-u*
   SEQ RL-1.SBJ-PRF go leave-3SGO-IMM 3.SBJ-be.thus
   and then we go away and leave it [the shrine].

   *glepo t-au-o si-*ge
   thing SB-exist-thatNV FOC-SEQ
   That thing [the devil] [is there] and then

   *age g-e mai-ña g-e nihau-gu e-u*
   SEQ NT-3.SBJ come-IMM NT-3.SBJ eat-PRG 3.SBJ-be.thus
   then it comes and it is eating, it’s like that.

9.5.1.3 Clause final focus marker *sini*

*Sini* attaches to the final constituent of a clause, and cannot occur clause finally alone. However, the variant form *sini* does occur clause finally:
like si-, sini foregrounds the entire clause. However, unlike si- it does not also focus mark clause final focused arguments. *Sini* only focuses entire clauses.

As with *si-* *sini* may mark a sequencing or recapping constituent. Like *si-* it may mark a recapping demonstrative, as in (9.44)a. *Sini* also marks the recapping prepositional phrase *katau-* ((9.44)b.), which *si-* does not appear to do.

(9.44) a. *g*-a kaike fa-lehe-ri gudu ṁa gai teğe are-laup
-NT-1.SBJ one CS-die-3PLO EXHST IMM weEXC turtle thoseN-SP
We kill every one of those turtles

ĝe vahe-ri-u
-NT carve.up-3PLO-PRG
and cut them up.

*a-lau sini* ge ġe tufa-ṁa *ka-ira* nakoni mavitu...
-thatN-SPC FOC SEQ NT affect-IMM LOC-thePL person community
That, and then we distribute them among the community...

b. *...la au kuru mai-di-re n-e-ke-u*
-RL-3.SBJ-PRF-be.thus
...and stopped them from coming.

(9.45) *ke pulo-u* ġoğomo
-PRF return-PRG PN
Gogomo went back.

*sini* ge ġe tetu-ṁa *solomoni*
-FOC SEQ NT-3.SBJ stand-IMM PN
At that then Solomon stood up.

**9.5.1.4 Sentence initial extra-clausal occurrence of *sini***

*Sini* may also occur sentence initially in an extra-clausal position. In this construction *sini* always occurs with the sequencing conjunction *ge* between two sequenced constituents, with the effect of emphasising the sequential relationship between the preceding constituent and the following clause. The preceding constituent may be an entire clause:

(9.46) *'teo, le-legu k-ago.' sini* ge *ke hage-ṁa*
-be.not RD-behind LOC-youSG FOC SEQ PRF ascend-IMM
"No. It's up to you." [He said.] Then [he] went up.
9.5.2 Foregrounding of arguments

Arguments are foregrounded by occurring in clause final focus position, marked with the focal proclitic \textit{si-}. 

9.5.2.1 Focused forms

Any core argument may be focus marked, including transitive actors, objects, and unergative, unaccusative and middle voice subjects:

(9.47) a. \textit{o-}ti \textit{dupa-i} \textit{manei} \textit{si-ago} \\
\hspace{1cm} 2.SBJ-NEG punch-3SGO be FOC-youSG \\
Don't you hit him!

b. \textit{ara} \textit{n-a} \textit{toka} \textit{fizi-ni} \textit{si-gazu} \textit{ana} \textit{ba} \\
\hspace{1cm} I RL-1.SBJ chop cut.up-3SGO FOC-wood thatN ALT \\
I chopped up that wood.

c. \textit{n-o-ke} \textit{mai} \textit{si-ago} \\
\hspace{1cm} RL-2.SBJ-PRF come FOC-youSG \\
You've come.

d. \textit{n-e} \textit{keha} \textit{iihe\ihe} \textit{si-za-zaho-na-na} \\
\hspace{1cm} RL-3.SBJ NSP be.separate FOC-RD-go -3SGP-thatN \\
That way of it is different.

e. \textit{n-o} \textit{bula-nigo} \textit{si-ago} \\
\hspace{1cm} RL-2.SBJ be.angry-2SGO FOC-youSG \\
You're angry.

Focus is not limited to core arguments - prepositional obliques may also be focused:

(9.48) \textit{e} \textit{la} \textit{puku} \textit{bai} \textit{si-ka} \textit{tepi-ana} \textit{n-a-u} \\
\hspace{1cm} 3.SBJ go be.short PSBL FOC-LOC tape-thatN RL-1.SBJ-be.thus \\
It might go short on that tape, I think.

The focal particle may mark arguments of any kind, including nominalised clauses:

(9.49) \textit{mala} \textit{ja-lehe-i-u} \textit{n-e-ke-u-o} \textit{b-ara}, \\
\hspace{1cm} PURP CS-die-3SGO-PRG RL-3.SBJ-PRF-be.thus-thatNV ALT-I \\
I intended to kill him, \\
\hspace{1cm} \textit{teo} \textit{bla} \textit{si-boka-gu-na} \textit{ka} \textit{kuiti} \textit{aro-hi} \\
\hspace{1cm} be.not LMT FOC-be.able-1SGP-thatN LOC trick theseT-EMPH \\
but that ability of mine with these tricks was not [able to do it].

The vocative \textit{goi} may also be focused:

(9.50) \textit{ago} \textit{n-o} \textit{tore} \textit{glehe} \textit{si-goi} \\
\hspace{1cm} youSG RL-2.SBJ ask very FOC-VOC \\
You're asking a lot, man!

When the focal particle elicitises to a vowel initial form a reduced form occasionally occurs. So \textit{si} + \textit{ana} may have the surface form /sana/ and \textit{si} + \textit{ide} the form /side/:

(9.51) a. \textit{mai} \textit{s-ago} \\
\hspace{1cm} come FOC-youSG \\
You come!
9.5.2.2 Focus and constituent modifiers

Foregrounded arguments may be marked with the constituent modifiers ba 'alternative', ña 'immediate' or la (function unclear). The 'alternative' particle may occur clause finally as it otherwise does in non-focus clauses:

(9.52)  
puku-na  bla  bai  s-ana  ba  
be.short-thatN  LMT  PSBL  FOC-thatN  ALT  
I think that's short.

However, it may also occur between the focal particle and the argument, forming a single word:

(9.53)  
nogoi,  ge  lehe  si-b-ara  
VOC  PRS  die  FOC-ALT-I  
Man! I'm going to die now.

The immediate marker also occurs in this construction:

(9.54)  
n-a  bakora  si-n-ara  goi  
RL-1.SBJ  be.cut  FOC-IMM-I  VOC  
I've been cut, man!

The dubitative bai(u), contrastive bo and limiter bla(u) do not occur in this construction. However, the particle la does occur.

(9.55)  
a.  
fafra  si-gau-palu  ba,  ginai  ãrugu  si-la-ine  
be.quick  FOC-youPL-two  ALT  FUT  be.dark  FOC-??-thisR  
Hurry up, you two, or this [day] will get dark.

b.  
keli  blau  si-l-are  
be.good  LMT  FOC-??-thoseN  
Those are alright.

The function of this particle is not clear (see 9.8.7).

9.5.2.3 Focused dummy argument -ia

The focus particle occasionally occurs attached to the host -ia. This requires the presence of one of the clause level modifiers discussed in 9.5.2.2 (so the form sia does not occur in Kokota as it does in Maringe and Blablanga). The form -ia appears to be a dummy argument, in the sense that the resulting focused form functions as a proform in itself, without any overt argument form present:

(9.56)  
a.  
hae  si-ba-ia  
who  FOC-ALT-PRO  
Who is it?

b.  
n-e-ke  lehe  hogo-na  bla  ka  mane  iaro  si-ba-ia  
RL-3.SBJ-PRF  die  be.true-thatN  LMT  LOC  man  thosePV  FOC-ALT-PRO  
He truly died from those men. [ie. ...because of the actions of those men.]

c.  
'aria,  oloue  sara-ña  gita.’  ge-u-di-ña  si-la-ia  
1INC.IMP  ??  thereD-IMM  weINC  NT-be.thus-3PLO-IMM  FOC-??-PRO  
"Let's move. We'll go straight there." Say [those things].
9.5.2.4 Focus politeness in imperatives

The *si* marked focus construction occurs very commonly in imperatives where it is regarded as the respectful or polite way of forming an imperative. In imperatives it is regarded as impolite to refer to the addressee without using *si*. Both examples in (9.57) are grammatical, but (9.57)b. is not respectful and would normally only be used for addressing young people.

(9.57)  

a. *fafra*  

*si-gau-palu ba*  

be.quick FOC-youPL-two ALT  

Hurry up you two!

b. *fafra*  

*gaupalu ba*  

be.quick youPL-two ALT  

Hurry up you two!

9.5.2.5 Focus marking in equative and possessive predicates

Not only the verbal predicate arguments may be foregrounded with the focal particle. The subjects of nonverbal predicates may also marked in this way, typically with a clause level modifier present. This construction occurs with all nonverbal predicate types, including simple equatives ((9.58)a.-b.), naming equatives ((9.58).), *gela* 'resemble' equatives ((9.58)d.), and possessive predicates ((9.58)e.):

(9.58)  

a.  

*n-e ooe-vaka bla-s-ide*  

RL-3.SBJ talk-ship LMT-FOC-theseR  

These [words] are Pijin.

b. *mane gabili*  

*si-n #-aro mane faaknu sini*  

man be aggressive FOC-IMM-theseT man smite FOC  

Those are men who want to fight. [They are] killers.

c. *e-ti nanha-di nakoni si-l-are*  

3.SBJ-NEG name-3PLP person FOC-??-thoseN  

They're not the names of people.

d.  

*#-e-la turi-di nau-de si-l-are*  

NT-3.SBJ-go tell-3PLP place-theseR FOC-??-thoseN  

Those are like stories of these places.

e. *ara-ná, no-ğu nau-ro #-aro*  

I-IMM GP-1SGP place-thoseNV FOC-theseT  

Me, those are my places.

Nonverbal predicate subject focusing also occurs with equative interrogatives, where, as with imperatives, the forms are regarded as being more polite than questions without the focal particle:

(9.59)  

a. *heï si-ba-ia*  

who FOC-ALT-PRO  

Who is it?

b. *heve si-ba-na*  

who FOC-ALT-thatN  

What's that?

9.6 Peripheral arguments

The form and function of peripheral arguments are discussed in chapter 5. Their behaviour within clause structure is discussed here.
9.6.1 Contextual arguments

The form and function of contextual arguments are discussed in 5.6. While the contextual nouns *gu-* and *nafu-* may have a nominal complement, they typically govern a subordinate clause. Contextual arguments only occur clause initially or clause finally. They cannot intervene between any other arguments.

Clause initially:

(9.60) a. *gu-nā* *ia* *visi ka* *to-toi* *n-o-ke-u-o* *bla* *ago*
CNTX-3SGP theSG play LOC RD-cook RL-2.SBJ-PRF-be.thus-LOC-3SGP LMT youSG
Because "a game with fire" you said,

*da* *visi ka* *to-toi*
1INC play LOC RD-cook
[so] we will play with fire.

b. *nafu-na* *n-e-ke-ge* *no-mai* *tañano* base-3SGP RL.3.SBJ-PRF-PRS GP-1EXCP food
Because it's our food

*n-e* *ağe* *mhemhe* *no-mai-ni-u* *gai* *faete-na*
RL-3.SBJ go be.difficult GP-1EXCP-3SGO-PRG weEXC choose-thatN
it's hard for us to choose.

Clause final contextual arguments follow any arguments present. In (9.61)a. a contextual argument follows an actor and (subordinate clause) object, in (9.61)b. a subject and deictic locative, in (9.61)c. a subject and PP, and in (9.61)d. a local noun.

(9.61) a. *n-a* *no-mai* *ağe* *mhemhe-ni-u* *gai*
RL-1.SBJ GP-1EXCP go be.difficult-3SGO-PRG weEXC
We find it hard

*ta-ke* *fa* *nodo-i* *fea* *t-au-na* *za-zaho-na-na* *tege* *ine*
SB-PRF CS stop-3SGO INIT SB-exist-thatN RD-go-3SGP-thatN turtle thisR
to stop this way of hunting of turtles,

*nafu-na* *are* *bla* *ira* *doli-mai* *gai*
base-3SGP thoseN LMT thePL live-1EXCP weEXC
because they are our life.

b. *teo* *boka* *mai* *au-na* *gai* *ade*
be.not be.able come exist-thatN weEXC here
We can't come and live here,

*nafu-na* *n-a-ge* *zaho* *koko-dī* *ira* *ge-mai* *no-mai...* base-3SGP RL.1.SBJ-PRF go leave-3PLO thePL CP-1EXCP GP-1EXCP
because we would leave behind our food and our things...

c. ...*a* *boka* *niha-dī* *gudu* *gai* *ira* *nakori*
1.SBJ be.able eat-3PLO EXHST weEXC theSG person
...we people could eat them all

*ka-ia* *futuma-na* *ia* *kastom* *ka* *gai*
LOC-theSG begin-3SGP theSG custom LOC weEXC
in the origins of our custom
9.6.2 Locative and associative arguments

Locative and associative arguments have similar behaviour in clause structure. Locative arguments include spatial and temporal deictics (discussed in 5.2 and 5.5), prepositional phrases (see 5.1), and place names (see 5.3). Associative arguments have the associative noun *tareme-* as head (see 5.7).

9.6.2.1 Locatives and associatives as outermost arguments

There is a very strong tendency for these peripheral arguments to occur as the outermost arguments in a clause. This means that such arguments typically occur clause initially or clause finally. In (9.62) each type of argument is illustrated in clause initial position.

(9.62) a.  
\[
\begin{align*}
  & \text{n-e lao ia-hi la kamo ia-hi lego} \\
  & \text{NT-3.SBJ go thatPV-EMPH go cross thatPV-EMPH PNLOC}
\end{align*}
\]

So he went there and crossed over there to Lego, it was like that.

b.  
\[
\begin{align*}
  & \text{tifaro ara a lao tarai fakamo le-legu sade n-a goinode teo} \\
  & \text{before I 1.SBJ go pray always RD-behind Sunday but todayRL be.not}
\end{align*}
\]

I used to always go to prayer every Sunday, but now I don't.

c.  
\[
\begin{align*}
  & \text{huhurāni au-re keha-re n-e-ke-u gai} \\
  & \text{PNLOC exist-thoseN NSP-thoseN RL-3.SBJ-PRF-be.thus weEXC}
\end{align*}
\]

...[and] some lived at Huhurangi. We were like that.

d.  
\[
\begin{align*}
  & \text{ka nare sade g-e lao-u g-e la tarai-u...} \\
  & \text{LOC day Sunday NT-3.SBJ go-PRG NT-3.SBJ go pray-PRG}
\end{align*}
\]

On Sundays they were going, they were going and praying...

e.  
\[
\begin{align*}
  & \text{tareme-na kodere n-a toqla-ni ara ia zora} \\
  & \text{with-3SGP PN RL-1.SBJ chase-3SGO I theSG pig}
\end{align*}
\]

With Kodere I chased the pig.

In (9.63) each locative and associative argument type is shown in clause final position.

(9.63) a.  
\[
\begin{align*}
  & \text{mhoko bla fea au-gu ago sare} \\
  & \text{sit LMT INIT exist-PRG youSG thereP}
\end{align*}
\]

You sit down first there.
b. **ara** n-a-ke **fakae-ni** kaike **baexu** ta **dou** ĝlehe **nhorao**
   I see-3SGO one shark SB be.big very yesterday
   I saw a shark that was very big yesterday.

c. **g̱-e** mai **haidu** maneri **kokota**
   NT-3.SBJ come meet they PNLOC
   They came and held a meeting at Kokota.

d. **e-u** friihe n-e-ke friihe-ni-na **palu** **mame** **aro**
   3.SBJ-be.thus work RL-3.SBJ-PRF work-3SGO-thatN two man theseT
   That's what those two men did

   *ka nasona ine*
   LOC point thisR PNLOC
   at the point of Gerona.

e. **manei** n-e **za-zaho** tareme-na **mhagu**
   he RL-3.SBJ RD-go with-3SGP be.afraid
   He walked with fear.

These peripheral argument types are not all distributed equally commonly in initial and final position. Temporal and spatial deictics and prepositional phrases occur with similar frequency in either position. However, place names and associative phrases typically occur in clause final position. While these arguments do occur in clause initial position, they do so rarely.

Peripheral arguments may occur clause initially when a preverbal topicalised argument is also present, as (9.62)b. and the examples in (9.64) illustrate.

(9.64) a. **sara hae** **manei** n-e **lisa-i-na** no-ĝu **vilai** **ana**
   there where he RL-3.SBJ put-3SGO-thatN GP-1SGP knife thatN
   Where did he put that knife of mine?

   b. **ka pau-na** **kumai** t-au-ana
   LOC head-3SGP water SB-exist-thatN
   At the head of that river

   *dadara e-u** blau n-e-ke zikra-ro
   blood 3.SBJ-be.thus LMT RL-3.SBJ-PRF pour-thoseNV
   blood was pouring out.

   c. **ka au-di-re** **palu** **mame** **aro** n-e-ke **au**
   LOC exist-3PLP-thatN two man theseT RL-3.SBJ-PRF exist PNLOC
   In their living those two men were at Gerona.

Temporal and spatial deictics and prepositional phrases follow this pattern. It is not clear whether place names and associative arguments also occur clause initially with a preverbal core argument.

**9.6.2.2 Non-outermost locatives and associatives with core arguments**

While peripheral arguments typically occur as the outermost arguments in a clause, they occasionally intervene between the predicate and a following core argument. This occurs infrequently.

Temporal and spatial deictics, location names, and prepositional and associative phrases all may intervene between the verb complex and a core argument in its pragmatically unmarked postverbal position, as (9.65) illustrates. A peripheral argument occurs before an intransitive subject in (9.65)a.-c., a transitive actor in (9.65)d., a direct object in (9.65)e., and a (clausal) indirect object in (9.65)f.
(9.65)  a. boro bla au sare maneii
    boro LMT exist thereP she
    She just stays boro there.

b. n-e-ke ageh tareme-na keha foegra ihehe-o bo
RL-3.SBJ-PRF go with-3SGP NSP sick be.different-thatNV CNT
    ia naitu tahi...
theSG devil sea

    The sea devil goes with that other different sickness...

c. n-a-ke lao buala ara
RL-1.SBJ-PRF go PNLOC I
    I went to Buala.

d. t-au-ne e tore-i ka hei maneii
SB-exist-thisR 3.SBJ ask-3SGO LOC who he
    Who will he ask this [question] to?

e. n-e ageh-na la-ni ka keha hobo-gazu-o
RL-3.SBJ go-thatN go-3SGO LOC NSP branch-wood-thatNV
He went and put on a tree branch
    keha lholhoai-na-o
    NSP coil-3SGP-thatNV
one of those coils of his.

f. manahagi-nigo nariha ta mai...
    want-2SGO day.after.tomorrow SB come
    [I] want you the day after tomorrow to come...

    In addition, temporal locatives also occasionally intervene between a preverbal topicalised argument and the predicate:

(9.66)  ara fusugo ginai a fakae-ni vaka ana
I tomorrow FUT 1.SBJ see-3SGO ship thatN
I tomorrow will see that ship.

No other peripheral arguments occur between a topicalised argument and the predicate in the corpus.

9.6.2.3 Order of multiple peripheral arguments

More than one peripheral argument may occur in a single clause. One peripheral argument may occur clause initially and one clause finally. However, multiple peripheral arguments are also possible in either position.

In some instances apparent multiple peripheral arguments actually represent a single argument. This occurs where an argument governes its own adjunct. In (9.67)a. and b. the second PP is embedded within the first, the two representing a single argument at the clause level. In (9.67)c. the local noun fate 'above' is governed by the locative head ade 'here', together representing a single complex spatial locative argument.

(9.67)  a. [ka gai [ka-ia kastom gai]]
LOC weEXC LOC-theSG custom weEXC
With us in our custom
    tana goi momoru e-ni e-u
then VOC momoru 3.SBJ-3SGO 3.SBJ-be.thus
momoru does [ie. names] it...
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b. a boka nīha-di gudu gai ira nakoni
   1.SBJ be.able eat-3PLO EXHST weEXC thePL person
   ...we people could eat them all

   [ka-ia fufunu-na ia kastom [ka gai]...]
   LOC-theSG begin-3SGP theSG custom LOC weEXC
   at the beginning of our custom...

c. e la fufunu ka n-e-ke au-o rei-palu [ade [fate]]
   3.SBJ go begin LOC RL-3.SBJ-PRF exist-thatNV they-two here above
   It [the story] starts where they two stayed here on top.

True multiple peripheral arguments do occur, however. Clause initial multiple peripheral arguments are
uncommon and appear to be limited to two arguments:

(9.68) a. [ka-ia kokolo-di t-au-are bla] [ka-ia fai dokta]
   LOC-theSG class-3PLP SB-exist-thoseN LMT LOC-theSG side doctor
With those kinds of things, on the part of doctors

e au-i la bla keha ta fakilo-ni tritmenti ka-ia ooe-vaka
   3.SBJ exist-3SGO ?? LMT NSP SB name(V)-3SGO treatment LOC-theSG talk-ship
they have something that [they] call treatment in Pijin.

b. [ka-ia ti mai-na-o-īa velepuhi]
   LOC-theSG NEG come-3SGP-thatNV-IMM right.way
At the [time when] there was not yet that coming of Christianity,

   [kokota] n-e-ke au-re keha-re
   PNLOC RL-3.SBJ-PRF exist-thoseN NSP-thoseN
at Kokota some lived.

b. [ka-ia grui] [tareme-na kodere] ara n-a togli-ni ia zora
   LOC-theSG garden with-3SGP PN I RL-1.SBJ chase-3SGO theSG pig
In the garden with Kodere I chased the pig

c. [goinode] tana [ka-ia heta-na ia mereseni ka-ia fai dokta]
   todayRL then LOC-theSG be.strong-3SGP theSG medicine LOC-theSG side doctor
Now, with of the strength of the medicine on the part of doctors,

   tana nogo ke age
   then VOC PRF go
man!, it's gone,

   ke age no-mai fa mana-ri-u oilagi-ri-u gai
   PRF go GP-1EXCP CS be.powerful-3PLO-PRG be.powerful-3PLO-PRG weEXC
our great power is gone.

As (9.68)b. shows, two clause initial peripherals can occur when a preverbal topicalised core argument is
also present, though this occurs very infrequently.

Much more commonly two or more peripheral arguments occur clause finally. Where two PPs occur in
some instances their order is dictated by the semantics of the predicate. In (9.69)a. the locative nature of the
existential predicate determines that the first PP will be interpreted as the location of the staying, the second
being interpretable in whatever way is meaningful in the context. In (9.69)b. the verb of transference
determines that the two PPs will be interpreted iconically in correspondence with the order of the locations:
the liquid is located at the source before it is located at the goal, so the PPs are interpreted as source then
goal.
(9.69) a. ...mala e au histri are-lau [ka sikolu-ne]
PURP 3.SBJ exist history thoseN-SPC LOC school-thisR
...so those histories can stay in the school

[ka suli-da gita]
LOC child-1HNCP weNC
for our children.

b. fa kamo-i bakru t-au-ana [ka timosi ana] [ka panakini ana]
CS cross-3SGO liquid SB-exist-thatN LOC thermos thatN LOC cup thatN
Transfer that tea from that thermos to that cup.

In other instances no semantic basis of PP order exists and the PPs can occur in either order. In (9.70) two PPs occur, one a temporal locative, one a spatial locative. These could occur in either order.

(9.70) ĝ-a turi-ni-ña ara turi gabili faaknu
NT-1.SBJ tell-3SGO-IMM I tell be.aggressive smite
I will tell the story of the killers

n-e-ke au-re [ka-ia pahi bofīhehe]
RL-3.SBJ-PRF exist-thoseN LOC-theSG way heathen
who lived in the heathen time

[ka gizuna a-hi gai]
LOC island thisT-EMPH weEXC
on this island of ours.

Where a PP cooccurs with another type of peripheral argument either order in possible. In (9.71) a PP and an associative phrase cooccur, in (9.72) a PP and a temporal adverbial.

(9.71) a. sogemarava n-e-ke aĝe-re-u
PN RL-3.SBJ-PRF go-thoseN-PRG
Sogemarava was going

[ka hinage-ne] [tareme-di tilo mane]-u
LOC boat-thisR with-3PLP three man-be.thus
in the boat with three men.

b. ara n-e-ke turī tareme-na gase ana [ka kaile fata bla]
I RL-1.SBJ-PRF tell with-3SGP woman thatN LOC one occasion LMT
I have talked to that woman only once.

(9.72) a. ara a lao tarai [tifaro] [ka sade ide]
I 1.SBJ go pray before LOC Sunday theseR
I used to go and pray before on Sundays.

b. ara ginai manahagi lao [ka sitou] [fufugo]
I FUT want go LOC store tomorrow
I will need to go to the store tomorrow.

Similar possibilities apply to combinations of other locative argument types

9.7 Negation

Negation in Kokota is expressed in two ways: by use of the negative particle ti; and by a subordinating construction involving the negative existential verb teo 'be.not'. Overall the subordinating construction is by far the more frequently employed strategy. However, in a number of environments the particle is the standard means of marking negative.
9.7.1 Negation by the negative particle \( ti \)

The negative particle \( ti \) is suffixed to the auxiliary, joining with other tense and aspect particles to form a single complex auxiliary. In some clause types the particle is the only means of expressing negation, the subordinating construction not occurring. In some clause types both \( ti \) and the subordinating construction are possible but the \( ti \) construction typically occurs, while in others the preference is reversed.

The particle \( ti \) is the only means of expressing negation in 'be thus' clauses, in nominalised clauses, and with equative predicates.

In 'be thus' clauses the verb complex always forms a single word consisting of the verb -\( u \) 'be thus', the auxiliary, and any other tense or aspect particles that are present. Because it forms a single word, the subordinating construction does not occur. Instead \( ti \) is employed:

\[(9.73) \]
\[ a. \ ka \ gau \ e-ti-u \]
\[ LOC \ youPL \ 3.SBJ-NEG-be.thus \]
With you they're not like that [ie. not correct].

\[ n-e-u \ are-lau \ za-zaho-di-re \ friihe-di-re \ ka \ maner \]
RL-3.SBJ-be.thus thoseN-SPC RD-go-3PLO-thoseN work-3PLO-thoseN LOC they
That's how they are, those ways of making them with them.

\[ b. \ o-ti \ \# \ ela \ an-lau \ o-ti-u \ ago \]
2.SBJ-NEG resemble thatN-SPC 2.SBJ-NEG-be.thus youSG
Don't be like that. Don't be like that, you.

The particle is also the only means of marking negation in nominalised clauses:

\[(9.74) \]
\[ ka-ia \ ti \ mai-na-o-ña \ velepahi \]
LOC-theSG NEG come-3SGP-thatNV-IMM right.way
At that non-coming of Christianity [ie. When Christianity had not yet come]

\[ kokota \ n-e-ke \ au-re \ keha-re... \]
PNLOC RL-3.SBJ-PRF exist-thoseN NSP-thoseN
some lived at Kokota...

It will be noted that in (9.74) the negative particle occurs without the presence of an overt auxiliary. As discussed in 8.5.2.5 irrealis auxiliaries are omissible. This applies when \( ti \) is present, as (9.74) illustrates.

The particle is also the only way of expressing negation in nonverbal predications.

\[(9.75) \]
\[ a. \ n-e-ti \ \# \ gazu \ hogo-na \]
RL-3.SBJ-NEG wood be.true-3SGP
They're not true sticks.

\[ b. \ e-ti \ naĩha-di \ nakoni \ si-la-re \]
3.SBJ-NEG name-3PLP person FOC-??-thoseN
They aren't the names of people.

As discussed in 9.7, negation may be expressed in imperative clauses by either \( ti \) or the subordinating construction:

\[(9.76) \]
\[ a. \ o-ti \ fa \ doli-ni \ gilai \ au \ batari \ foforu \ ago \]
2.SBJ-NEG CS live-3SGO until exist battery new 2SG
Don't turn it on until you have new batteries.
However, there is a very strong preference for using the negative particle in imperative clauses, the subordinating construction occurring rarely. The same is true in relative clauses:

(9.77) \[ g\ e \ e \ \text{teo} \ \tilde{g}\ e \ \text{faete} \ gai \ \tilde{g}\-e-\text{la} \ \text{tege} \ \text{heve} \ \text{bo} \]
\[ \text{SEQ IRR be.not NT choose weEXC NT-3.SBJ-go turtle what CNT} \]
So we didn't choose what kind of turtles

\[ \text{ta} \ \text{hod-i-na} \ \text{ta-ti} \ \text{hod-i-na...} \]
\[ \text{SB take-TR-thatN SB-NEG take-TR-thatN} \]
to take or to not take...

In declarative main clauses the opposite preference exists - the tendency is strongly towards the subordinating construction (see 9.7.2). However, it is possible to use the negative particle instead:

(9.78) a. \[ \text{ara-hi} \ \text{a-ti-ke} \ \text{fufunu-di-bo} \ \text{t-au-de} \]
\[ \text{I-EMPH 1.SBJ-NEG-PRF begin-3PLO-CNT SB-exist-theseR} \]
I didn't start these [arguments].'

b. \[ \text{n-o-ti} \ \text{noto} \ \text{fa-nomho} \]
\[ \text{RL-2.SBJ-NEG stop CS-hear} \]
You didn't stop and be quiet.

c. \[ \text{buka} \ \text{are-lau} \ \text{e-ti-ke} \ \text{mala} \ \text{fa} \ \text{za-zaho} \ \text{hae} \ \text{ge} \ \text{hae} \]
\[ \text{book thoseN-SPC 3.SBJ-NEG-PRF PURP CS RD-go where and where} \]
These books aren't for sending wherever and wherever.

Such clauses are relatively uncommon in comparison to the subordinating construction.

9.7.2 Subordinating negation

The standard means of expressing negation in declarative main clauses involves a subordinating construction in which the negative existential verb teo occurs with a subordinated positive declarative clause as its complement.

The negative existential verb is the negative counterpart of the positive existential verb au. As such it occurs without a complement, with a straightforward negative existential function:

(9.79) a. \[ n-e-ge \ \text{la} \ \text{teo} \ \text{ira} \ \text{nakoni} \ n-e-u \]
\[ \text{RL-3.SBJ-PRS go be.not thePL person RL-3.SBJ-be.thus} \]
The people have gone to nothing [ie. have all died out].

b. \[ e \ \text{teo} \ \text{kaike} \ \text{ihai} \]
\[ \text{3.SBJ be.not one someone} \]
There is not anyone

\[ \text{ta} \ \tilde{g}\-e \ \text{boka} \ \text{fa-lehe-i-na} \ \text{ia} \ \text{to-toi} \]
\[ \text{SB NT-3.SBJ be.able CS-die-3SGO-thatN theSG RD-cook} \]
who can kill the fire. [lit. Someone who can kill the fire does not exist.]

It also functions as a negative verb of possession:

(9.80) \[ \text{ara} \ \text{n-a} \ \text{teo-nau} \ \text{sileni} \]
\[ \text{I RL-1.SBJ be.not-1SGO money} \]
I've got no money.
Existential verbs including *teo* are discussed in detail in 7.6.

As a strategy for expressing negation *teo* occurs as the verb of a main clause, with the negated event expressed as a positive declarative clause functioning as a sentential complement:

(9.81)  
\[
\text{gai teo \{g-a mai-u k-ago\}}
\]
WeEXC be.not NT-1.SBJ come-PRG LOC-youSG
We will not be coming to you.

Here the positive complement clause is bracketed. The subject of the main clause is also the controlled subject of the complement clause. A more literal translation of (9.81) would be something like 'We are not that we are coming to you'.

The subject of the main clause is always the controlled argument of the complement clause in these constructions. However, while there is a strong tendency for the controlled argument to also be the subject (or actor) of the complement clause, the controlled argument may represent a different grammatical role. In (9.82), for example, the controlled argument is the complement clause object.

(9.82)  
\[
\text{mane t-au-ana teo \{g-a lase-i ara\}}
\]
man SB-exist-thatN be.not NT-1.SBJ know-3SGO I
That man I don't know.

The literal meaning of this sentence is something like 'That man is not that I know him.'

The subject of the main clause may occur in preverbal topic position, as in (9.81) and (9.82). However, the subject may also occur after the complement clause:

(9.83)  
\[
teo \{g-e sodu-gu are\}
\]
be.not NT-3.SBJ be.long-PRG thoseN
Those aren't long.

When this occurs, the overt argument is in fact the subject of the complement clause, not the main clause. Consequently if the complement clause is transitive the subject and object of that clause occur in their pragmatically unmarked order:

(9.84)  
\[
teo \{g-a manahagi-ni-u ara ta hoda kave-i-na\}
\]
be.not NT-1.SBJ want-3SGO-PRG I SB take descend-3SGO-thatN
I don't want that [it] be taken down.

In sentences such as these the main clause subject is semantically as well as formally empty. This somewhat similar to English cleft constructions, except that no overt dummy subject occurs. The more literal translations of (9.83) and (9.84) would be 'It is not so that those are long.' and 'It is not so that I want that [it] be taken down.' (but without the pragmatic emphasis of the English sentences).

The main clause is almost always in irrealis modality. As discussed in 8.5.2.5, irrealis auxiliaries are frequently omitted, and this is the case in examples (9.81) to (9.84). Rarely, the main clause may be treated as realis:

(9.85)  
\[
n-e teo-\text{nā} \{g-e mai-u mane huhura\text{nī} are\}
\]
RL-3.SBJ be.not-IMM NT-3.SBJ come-PRG man PNLOC thoseN
Those Huhurangi people aren't coming.
(lit. It is not so that those Huhurangi people are coming.)

Equally rarely, the main clause may contain a neutral auxiliary:
Within the complement clause itself in this negative construction only a neutral auxiliary may occur, as (9.81) to (9.85) illustrate. However, when the verb of the complement clause is the abilitative boka, the auxiliary is typically deleted, as (9.86) illustrates. This is optional, however. Complement clauses with boka may have a neutral auxiliary:

(9.87)  
...teo  [g-e boka turi-di mane]  
be.not NT-3.SBJ be.able tell-3PLO he  
...he can't tell [about]  
heve glepo n-e-ke torai dia-re]  
what thing RL-3.SBJ-PRF very be.bad-thoseN  
whatever things were very wrong.

The complement clause in the subordinating negative construction is typically marked with progressive aspect, as (9.81) and (9.83) to (9.85) illustrate. However, this is not obligatory, as (9.82) illustrates. Complement clauses involving boka, however, cannot be marked with progressive aspect.

In subordinating negation the main clause verb teo is often marked with the immediate marker n̄a, the limiter bla, or the possibilitative bai(u):

(9.88)  
a.  n-e teo-na  ĝe aĝe mhoko fa-lehe-i āgo to-toi-ne ĝe  
RL-3.SBJ be.not-IMM NT go sit CS-die-3SGO youSG RD-cook-thisR SEQ  
If you don't go and sit and kill this fire,  
  āgo teo bla ĝe heta-u e-u  
youSG be.not LMT NT be.strong-PRG 3.SBJ-be.thus  
you are simply not strong.

b.  gita teo baiu aĝe-na buala  
weINC be.not PSBL go-thatN PNLOC  
We won't go to Buala; Let's not go to Buala.

None of the other modifiers discussed in 9.8 can modify teo in this construction.

9.7.3 Negation and modality

There is a very strong tendency in Kokota to treat negatives as irrealis. Realis is typically reserved for specific events that have actually occurred or are actually occurring at the time of speaking. Consequently, irrealis marks not only future events but habituals, where the events are real but no specific individual event is being referred to; and negatives, where the events are not real by virtue of not having occurred. Negative clauses, with either the particle or the subordinating construction, typically have an irrealis auxiliary (or no overt auxiliary as the result of irrealis auxiliary deletion). However, it is possible to mark negative clauses as realis. In (9.75) and (9.78)b. realis auxiliaries occur with the negative particle, and in (9.85) the negative existential verb is marked with a realis auxiliary. This use of realis occurs when the speaker is emphasising that they have a particular specific non-occurrence in mind, rather than simply that an event has not occurred, for example because someone has not done something they were supposed to do at a particular time.

9.8 Constituent modifiers

A number of modifiers exist which mark constituents at a range of levels in the syntax, from individual words to entire clauses. These include:
The particle *ba* marks constituents of all kinds indicating they are one of two or more alternatives or possibilities. The particle may immediately follow or immediately precede the marked constituent, with a very strong tendency towards occurring after the constituent. In (9.90)a. *ba* marks several possibilities, preceding the relevant constituent in each case. In (9.90)b. It follows two of the three possibilities.

(9.90)  
a. ke toke-ri bo ira no-mai friñe tañano,  
\hspace{1cm} PRF arrive-3PLO CNT thePL GP-1EXCP work food  
\hspace{1cm} [The times] arrive for our making food,  
\hspace{1cm} *ba* ira nare-di suña, *ba* ira krismas, *ba* ira esta  
\hspace{1cm} ALT thePL day-3PLP house ALT thePL Christmas ALT thePL Easter  
\hspace{1cm} like festival days, or Christmas, or Easter.

b. ...g-e-la naboto-u *ba*, varedake-u *ba*, tulufulu tegeh  
\hspace{1cm} NT-3.SBJ-go ten-CRD ALT twenty-CRD ALT thirty turtle  
\hspace{1cm} ...it might be ten, or twenty, or thirty turtles  
\hspace{1cm} ta la hod-i-di-re gai  
\hspace{1cm} SB go take-TR-3PLO-thoseN weEXC  
\hspace{1cm} that we take.

When several alternative constituents are overtly expressed the particle may mark each constituent, as in (9.90)a. Alternatively it may mark all but the final constituent when postposed, as in (9.90)b, or all but the initial constituent when preposed, as in (9.91)b. Once the presentation of alternatives is established by the marking of one or more constituents with *ba*, the final constituent in the series is interpretable as a further alternative without the particle's presence. This lack of marking of the final alternative occurs commonly, and gives the particle the appearance of a conjunction functionally akin to *or* in English. However in any such instance the final alternative may also be marked. Moreover, where the particle precedes each alternative, as in (9.90)a., the first occurrence of *ba* is not between two alternative constituents, so is clearly not functioning as a conjunction. When *ba* follows the alternatives and the final relevant constituent is marked, the same is true. Clearly *ba* marks individual constituents, rather than conjoins several constituents. The preference for a postposed realisation of *ba*, and the commonness of a lack of marking of the final constituent perhaps suggests the particle is in the process of being reanalysed as a conjunction. However, counter evidence for this reanalysis lies in the fact that in a majority of occurrences only one alternative is expressed, as discussed below.

The alternative particle marks a wide range of constituent types. But only constituents of the same syntactic type may be presented as alternatives. In (9.91) *ba* marks single words, in one instance adnominal numerals, in the other stative verbs:

(9.91)  
a. e-u ge g-e turi-ña gita  
\hspace{1cm} 3.SBJ-be.thus SEQ NT-3.SBJ tell-IMM weINC  
\hspace{1cm} Before we talk

\hspace{1cm} da koze-i kaike *ba* tilo koze  
\hspace{1cm} 1INC.SBJ sing-3SGO one ALT three sing  
\hspace{1cm} we'll sing one or three songs.
Ba also marks phrasal constituents. In (9.92) it marks alternative NPs in one example, PPs in the other:

(9.92) a. ia puka ba, ia do ba, e-u n-e kati-nau-na ara
theSG fly ALT theSG mosquito ALT 3.SBJ-be.thus RL-3.SBJ bite-1SGO-thatN I
A fly or a mosquito bit me.

b. ...roha-i nhigo ka botolo ba ka tini...
scrape-3SGO finish LOC bottle ALT LOC tin
...finish scraping it into a bottle or tin...

In addition ba may occur with a focussed pronoun or demonstrative in the construction discussed in 9.5.2.2:

(9.93) nogoi, ge lehe si-b-ara
VOC PRS die FOC-ALT-l
Man! I'm going to die now. [repeating (9.53)]

The particle also marks complete clauses, both main clauses, as in (9.94)a.-b., or subordinate clauses. In (9.94)c. two relative clauses are presented as alternative possibilities:

(9.94) a. fafra si-gau-palu ba, ginai ērugu si-la-ine
be.quick FOC-youPL-two ALT FUT be.dark FOC-??-thisR
Hurry up you two, or it will get dark.

b. ara mai ka suغا ine ago ba, ago mai ka suغا-o ara
I come LOC house thisR you ALT you come LOC house-thatNV I
Will I come to your house, or will you come to my house?

c. ta la hod-i la gai
SB go take-TR CND weEXC
If we go and take

่งazu t-au-o ta fa ku-kumai-ni-u ba ta fa siri la-i-u
wood SB-exist-thatNV SB CS RD-drink-3SGO-PRG ALT SB CS smell go-3SGO-PRG
that tree that [one] drinks or that [one] smells

ka nakoni t-au-o ta toke-i t-au-o malaria
LOC person SB-exist-NV SB arrive-3SGO SB-exist-thatNV malaria
to that person who has caught malaria,

boka ke ağa keli bo bla
be.able PRF go be.good CNT LMT
[they] are able to just get well again.

As indicated above, ba occurs most frequently with only one overt alternative. In the text corpus, out of 45 occurrences of the particle, in 34 instances (75.5%) only one alternative is expressed. Typically the marked constituent represents an alternative to a previously established possibility. In this very common use of ba it equates more to the English instead than to or. In the discourse preceding the exchange in (9.95) speaker B has been eager to leave in order to tell something to others, but speaker A, his chief, does not want him to leave:
In the first line of this exchange *ba* marks the entire clause, in the second line it marks a temporal locative. In both, the marked constituent is presented as an alternative to the previously established possibility of speaker B leaving immediately.

In (9.96) *ba* marks an NP which is being presented as an alternative group to those mentioned in the preceding clause:

\[(9.96)\]
\[
gaha\ mane\ n-e-ge\ \ fa\ kenu-ri\ \ ka-ia\ \ hinage\ldots\]
\[
five\ man\ \ RL-3.SBJ-PRS\ \ CS\ \ front-3PLO\ \ LOC-theSG\ \ boat\]
\[
Five\ men\ were\ sent\ ahead\ in\ a\ boat...\]
\[
tehi-na\ mane-o\ \ ba\ \ n-e\ \ ađe\ \ rhuku\]
\[
many-3PLP\ \ man-thatNV\ \ ALT\ \ RL-3.SBJ\ \ go\ \ landward\]
\[
Many\ other\ people\ went\ by\ land...\]

The sentence in (9.97) is taken from a discussion about which story a speaker should tell. A number of possibilities have been discussed. The speaker then raises the possibility of a further alternative:

\[(9.97)\]
\[
ba\ heve,\ naitu\ ine-hi\]
\[
ALT\ \ what\ \ devil\ \ thisR-EMPH\]
\[
Or\ what\ [else]?\ \ [The\ story\ of]\\ this\ devil?\ (Speaker\ pointing\ to\ location\ of\ devil's\ home.)\]

In other instances *ba* is used when no other alternative has previously been established, but when it is apparent from the marked constituent what alternative the speaker has in mind. In (9.98) the clause has the form of a declarative, with intonation indicating that it is an interrogative. The possibility of 'that' having been opened is being presented as an alternative, the other alternative clearly being that 'that' is not open:

\[(9.98)\]
\[
n-e-ge\ \ tor-i\ \ b-an\ \ mane\]
\[
RL-3.SBJ-PRS\ \ open-TR\ \ ALT-thatN\ \ he\]
\[
Has\ he\ opened\ it?\]

Note that in this example it is not the entire clause which is marked with *ba* and presented as an alternative. Instead only the verb complex is marked. Constructions like this are common. However, it is not clear whether in this kind of construction *ba* marks only the verb itself, or the entire verb complex. Although *ba* forms a single phonological word with *ana* it marks the verb complex and not the demonstrative. Collapsing vowel initial words with preceding words which have as the same vowel as their finally segment occurs frequently in casual speech (see 3.2.1.2). In careful speech *ba* and *ana* would be separated in (9.98).

In (9.98) *ba* marks a clause which has the structure of a declarative but the intonation of an interrogative, to seek confirmation or otherwise of the veracity of the statement. Similarly, *ba* may occur extraclausally after a statement, to seek confirmation of the statement. In (9.99) the clause itself is not a question. The *ba* then occurs separately seeking confirmation.

\[(9.99)\]
\[
\ldots ge\ \ pulo\ \ mai\ \ gau-palu\ \ fufugo\ \ ba\]
\[
SEQ\ \ return\ \ come\ \ youPL-two\ \ tomorrow\ \ ALT\]
\[
\ldots then\ you\ two\ are\ coming\ back\ tomorrow.\ Or\ [not]?
Ba occurs frequently in interrogatives, particularly in interrogatives like that in (9.98), where a statement is presented and its veracity questioned, and in interrogatives with heve 'what'. In 'what' interrogatives again no other alternatives are presented. Instead ba invokes all possible alternatives:

(9.100) a. u heve ba n-e fa fo-fog̱a-di-re...
   be.thus what ALT RL-3.SBJ CS RD-be.sick-3PLO-thoseN
   What is making them sick...?

   b. visi ģ-e-la heve la ba...
   play NT-3.SBJ-go what ?? ALT
   A game that goes how...?

In (9.100)a. the addressee is asked to say what, out of all possible causes of sickness, applies in that instance. In (9.100)b. the range of alternatives implicit in ba is all possible ways of making games.

Ba also occurs in self-corrections, marking the corrected constituent:

(9.101) ...n-e-u ana faknoe. e, mane ģobilologu ba
   RL-3.SBJ-be.thus thatN PN EXCLM man PN ALT
   ...said Faknoe. Oh! [I mean] the man Gobilologu.

9.8.2 Bo Contrastive

The particle bo indicates that the marked constituent is being contrasted with another entity or event. The form is postposed and may mark constituents at various level of the syntax, including an entire clause, as in (9.102)a., or a verb complex only ((9.102)b.):

(9.102) a. fifugo ara ginai a kuru-nau hore bo
   tomorrow I FUT 1.SBJ have-1SGO dugout CNT
   Tomorrow I will have a canoe.

   b. manei n-e au bo sara buala
   he RL-3.SBJ exist CNT thereD PNLOC
   He is staying in Buala.

When marking a clause or verb complex the event or state is contrasted with some other event or state. In (9.102)a. the speaker had intended to go fishing that day but did not have access to a canoe to do so. The statement contrasts the availability of a canoe the following day with that day's situation. In (9.102)b. the speaker is correcting an assumption on the part of the addressee that the subject referent was in Goveo.

Bo also marks nominals and obliques of various types, including full NPs, pronouns, personal names and location names:

(9.103) a. man-t-au-ana teo ģ-a lase-i ara
   man-SB-exist-thatN be.not NT-1.SBJ know-3SGO I
   That man I don't know his name,

   ŋa ira naitu toke aro bo ta au kuru naĩha-di-re
   but thePL devil arrive theseT CNT SB exist have name-3PLP-thoseN
   but the arriving devils have names.

   b. ara bo n-a lao-na ŋa zemesi teo ģ-e zaho
   I CNT RL-1.SBJ go-thatN but PN be.not NT-3.SBJ go
   I went, but James didn't go.
c. ara n-a maŋho bla, tikani bo n-e korho namhari-na
   I RL-1.SBJ be.unlucky LMT PN CNT RL-3.SBJ pull fish-thatN
   I had bad luck, but Tikani caught fish.

d. ara manahagi au goveo bo, ŋa buala teo
   I want exist PNLOC CNT but PNLOC be.not
   I like being in Goveo, but not in Buala.

In (9.103) each of the contrasted entities are overtly expressed. However as (9.102) illustrates, the contrasted state, event or entity need not be expressed. It may be understood due to having been previously established in the discourse. This applies to the contextual background for the examples in (9.102). Alternatively, nonlinguistic elements of the discourse may be contrasted despite being verbally unexpressed. In (9.104) speaker B has asked speaker A to pass one of a group of mugs on a table:

(9.104) A. hei bo
   who CNT
   Which one?

   B. ana-hi-bo
   thatN-EMPH-CNT
   That one. [pointing.]

In other instances it is apparent from the marked constituent what the contrasted state, event or entity is:

(9.105) ara za-zaho pile mairi bo
   I RD-go side left CNT
   I will walk at the left side.

This principle applies to the very commonly used expression in (9.106), the Kokota equivalent of something like OK in English.

(9.106) (n-e) keli bo
   RL-3.SBJ be.good CNT
   (It's) good.

Bo often occurs in polar interrogatives. These have the form of a declarative, but with clause final rising intonation. The presence of the contrastive particle reinforces that confirmation is sought as to whether the state or event expressed in the clause is true, as opposed to not true.

(9.107) boka hoda aŋe-nau bo ago
   be.able take go-1SGO CNT youSG
   Can you take me there?

In all the examples given so far where both contrasted states, events or entities are overtly expressed, only one is marked with bo. However, this is preference, not a restriction - both may be marked:

(9.108) ara ginai aŋe bo, ba teo bo e-u
   I FUT go CNT ALT be.not CNT 3.SBJ-be.thus
   I will go or not, it's like that.

The contrast expressed by bo is functionally close to the presentation of alternatives performed by the alternative marker ba. Indeed, the two may cooccur, with ba in its clause initial or clause final position, as in (9.108) and (9.109).

(9.109) liŋono n-e salupu bo ba, n-e toga
   PN RL-3.SBJ pass CNT ALT RL-3.SBJ arrive
   Did the Ligomo go past or did it stop?
9.8.3 Bla(u) Limiter

The particle *blau*, and its common reduced form *bla* mark constituents at a range of levels in the syntax, and function to constrain the marked constituent in some way. The effect is similar to that of forms such as *just, only* and *simply* in English. The functional and syntactic characteristics of *bla(u)* are more akin to those of *nomo* in Pijin.

The limiter constrains states and events by marking either the verb complex, as in (9.110)a.-b., or the entire clause ((9.110)c.):

(9.110) a. ginai lehe *bla* gita
   FUT die LMT weINC
   We are just going to die.

   b. ̣-e mai taf-r-i *bla* ia rere ko sa sebele ko sagali...
   NT-3.SBJ come defend-TR LMT theSG shield LOC axe LOC PN
   He came and defended with the shield against the axe of Sagali...

   c. ia pike mau-̣gu n-e-ke hod-i-o sala ge ru-ruboi *bla*...
   theSG piece taro-1SGP RL-3.SBJ-PRF take-TR-thatNV PN and PN LMT
   My piece of taro [was] just brought [by] Sala and Rurubongi...

As well as marking verbal clauses, *bla* also limits equative and possessive predicates:

(9.111) a. n-e ooe-vaka *bla* s-ide
   RL-3.SBJ talk-ship LMT FOC-theseR
   These [words] are only Pijin.

   b. keha pile-di-re no-na *bla* tagi-na
   NSP part-3PLP-thoseN GP-3SGP LMT RFL-3SGP
   Some copies will just belong to himself.

Nominals and other arguments of any kind may also be marked with *bla*. In (9.112) *bla* marks a full NP, a pronoun, a demonstrative, and a cardinal numeral:

(9.112) a. teo mereseni tehi-u ara, marha-pau-ana *bla* ta tahe ağa-i-na
   be.not medicine many-CRD I pain-head-thatN LMT SB tell go-3SGO-thatN
   I don't have [ie. know] many medicines, just that headache that [I] will tell.

   b. gai *bla* n-a hage tarai n-e-u nau logahaza
   weEXC LMT RL-1.SBJ ascend pray RL-3.SBJ-be.thus place PNLOC
   Only we go up to pray at the place Logahaza.

   c. a-hi *bla* fagilagila-na k-ara
   thisT-EMPH LMT be.sign-3SGP LOC-I
   This alone will be the sign of it to me.

   d. kaike-u *bla*
   one-CRD LMT
   Just one.

Peripheral arguments may also be marked with *bla*. In (9.113)a. a prepositional phrase is marked, in (9.113)b. a contextual argument:

(9.113) a. ka sala ge ru-ruboi *bla* n-a lehe-na ara
   LOC PN and PN LMT RL-1.SBJ die-thatN I
   Just from Sala and Rurubongi I will die.
b. ... teo boka-di-ña, n-e-u nafu-na ia parahaqala blau
   be.not be.able-3PLO-IMM RL-3.SBJ-be.thus base-3SGP theSG giant LMT
   ...[they] couldn't do those [things], it was like that simply because [it was] a giant.

9.8.4 Bai(u) Possibilitative

The particle baiu is postposed to constituents at various levels of the syntax, and marks constituents as being possible, rather than fact, corresponding roughly with the English might, perhaps or maybe:

(9.114) a. fifugo a ginai korho namhari baiu
    tomorrow 1.SBJ FUT pull fish PSBL
    Tomorrow I might catch fish.

b. ... teo ā-na-blō ooe-gau-na baiu maneĩ e-u
    be.not IMM-LMT talk-2PLO-thatN PSBL he 3.SBJ-be.thus
    ...maybe he hasn't told you all.

c. ... gai a la au ēlu-na kaike-u fata-na kaike-u wiki bai...
    weEXC 1.SBJ go exist inside-3SGP one-CRD occasion-3SGP one-CRD week PSBL
    We go and stay [there] for maybe a whole week.

By marking something as a possibility rather than a fact the speaker is implicitly expressing an opinion, and possibilitative marking is in fact the means by which opinions are expressed in Kokota. Opinions may be expressed using the possibilitative, with a first person subject 'be thus' clause explicitly indicating that the statement is the view of the speaker:

(9.115) e la puku bai si-ka tepi ana n-a-u
    3.SBJ go be.short PSBL FOC-LOC thatN RL-1.SBJ-be.thus
    It might go short on the tape, I'm like that [ie. ...I think].

However, often no 'be thus' clause is present. Instead the possibilitative alone indicates that the statement is not a fact but the opinion of the speaker.

(9.116) ginai mai gudu bla baiu ka sikolu-ne bla
    FUT come EXHST LMT PSBL LOC school-thisR LMT
    I think they will simply come just to this school.

While the opinions expressed in this way are usually those of the speaker, opinions can be attributed to others using the same construction:

(9.117) ... ga-gato-mu-na ago n-e-ge nhigo tarai baiu n-e-u
    RD-think-2SGP-thatN youSG RL-3.SBJ-PRS be.finished pray PSBL RL-3.SBJ-be.thus
    ...that thought of yours was that prayer is finished, like that?
    [ie. ...did you think prayer was finished?]

This use of the possibilitative to express opinions is mirrored in the Pijin and Solomons' English used by Kokota speakers, where opinions are typically expressed as a statement introduced by might be...

As the above examples illustrate, bai(u) most commonly modifies the verb complex. However it may also mark a complete clause:

(9.118) ginai a korh-i-ri ara palu ba tilo namhari baiu
    FUT 1.SBJ pull-TR-3PLO I two ALT three fish PSBL
    I might catch two or three fish.

Bai(u) also may mark nominal or other peripheral constituents, as (9.114)c. and the first clause in (9.119) illustrate.
The particle *ńa* is postposed to the constituent it marks, and assigns to a state, event or argument an immediacy in relation to either the moment of speaking, or some other specified or established moment, or some particular salience in relation to the specified or established situation. In conversational discourse the immediacy or salience is typically in relation to the moment of speaking.

The immediacy may be in relation to an already established moment in the past or future, or some established moment the exact location in time of which is irrelevant:

(9.121) a. *ge n-e la fa zogu-i-ńa man-t-au-ao*
    SEQ RL-3.SBJ go CS drop-3SGO-IMM man-SB-exist-thisT
    Then he threw down that man,
    
    *n-e-ke-u ńa gobilologu kota mai-na t-au-ao ge*
    RL-3.SBJ-PRF-be.thus PN go.ashore come-thatN SB-exist-thisT SEQ
    Gobilologu, did that. [He] came down,
    
    *ńa ge-ke mai-ńa, ńa ge-ke mai ńhau...*
    NT-3.SBJ-PRF come-IMM NT-3.SBJ-PRF come eat
    he came, he came and ate...
    
    b. *...fafa mai gu-na nhigo n-e-u pati ao-hi*
    be.quick come CNTX-3SGP be.finished RL-3.SBJ-be.thus feast this-EMPH
    ...come quickly, because when this feast is finished
    
    *ke baibel stadi-ńa bo e-u*
    PRF Bible.Study-IMM CNT 3.SBJ-be.thus
    there will be Bible Study.
    
    c. *n-a la fakae-ni-u ka tahi are tege ine e-u,*
    RL-1.SBJ go see-3SGO-PRG LOC sea thoseN turtle thisR 3.SBJ-be.thus
    We go and see in the sea this turtle
    
    *tana nogoi age g-ńa koko-ni-ńa gai momoru ana*
    then VOC SEQ NT-1.SBJ leave-3SGO-IMM weEXC turtle.net thatN
    then, man!, we throw down that turtle net.

The immediacy assigned by *ńa* often gives a sense equivalent to the English *still* or *yet*. Marking a preexisting state or event with *ńa* indicates that the state or event still applies at the time of speaking. With the negative existential verb *ńa* indicates that the state or event has not yet happened:

(9.122) a. *manei teo-ńa g-e mai-u*
    he be.not-IMM NT-3.SBJ come-PRG
    He hasn't come yet./He still hasn't come.
b. *lao* si-ago
go  FOC-youSG
You go ahead!

teo-ña
Not yet!

Typically *ña* marks the verb complex, as the above examples illustrate. However, it does not appear to mark entire clauses. A series of clauses in a clause chain may all be marked to indicate that the chained events occur simultaneously, as shown in the second line of (9.123):

(9.123)  
\[ \text{an-lau si-ge } \tilde{g}-a \ rara\= go-ña \ ira \ hinage} \]
\[ \text{thatN-SPC FOC-SEQ NT-1.SBJ decorate-IMM thePL boat} \]
That, then we decorate the boat,

\[ \text{age } \tilde{g}-a \ kaze-ña \ tavuli-ña \ rehai-ña} \]
\[ \text{SEQ NT-1.SBJ sing-IMM blow.conch-IMM shout-IMM} \]
then we sing and blow the conch and call out.

\[ \tilde{g}-a-u-ña \ \tilde{g}-a \ la \ mai-u} \]
\[ \text{NT-1.SBJ-be.thus-IMM NT-1.SBJ go come-PRG} \]
we're like that as we are coming [home].

As the second clause in (9.120) illustrates, *ña* may also mark an argument. This assigns a particular immediacy or saliency to the argument in relation to the moment of speaking or a previously established situation or event. This may function to assert the saliency of a participant to an event. For example the clause in (9.124) is a typically response to exclusion of a potential participant:

(9.124)  
\[ \text{ara-ña} \]
\[ \text{I-IMM} \]
Me too!

In other instances a speaker may emphasise an asserted relationship with an event or entity by using *ña*. In (9.125) the speaker is claiming ownership of disputed land:

(9.125)  
\[ \text{ara-ña no-\=gu nau-ro } s-aro} \]
\[ \text{I-IMM GP-1SGP place-theseT FOC-theseT} \]
Me! These are my places.

In addition, the immediate marker may occur with a focussed pronoun or demonstrative in the construction discussed in 9.5.2.2:

(9.126)  
\[ \text{n-a bakora } si-ña-aru \ goi} \]
\[ \text{RL-1.SBJ be.cut FOC-IMM-I VOC} \]
I've been cut, man! [repeating (9.54)]

In other instances the immediacy or saliency of the marked argument is in relation to the time or place of speaking. In (9.127), for example, the relationship between the temporal location marked with *ña* and the moment of speaking is emphasised as a way of expressing a desire for the event to occur soon:

(9.127)  
\[ \text{ginai saigona-ña, kaike saigona-ña} \]
\[ \text{todayIRR evening-IMM one evening-IMM} \]
This evening, one evening,
The particle fea indicates that the referent of the marked constituent must hold initially in relation to some other entity or event. The form typically marks the verb complex, and may indicate that the event will occur before any other events:

(9.128) a. ke pulo **fea** ara
   PRF return INIT  I
   I'll go back first.

   b. ara fa kraño-ri **fea** no-ğu pohe ide
   I CS be.dry-3PLO INIT GP-1SGP clothes theseR
   I am drying my clothes first.

In this sense it may cooccur with the verb kulu/kusu 'be first':

(9.129)  ...ge kulu friñe-nifea ia suğa
   SEQ be.first work-3SGO INIT theSG house
   ...then first they build the house.

The form occurs very commonly with individual verbs in imperative clauses, emphasising that the speaker wants the action to occur immediately:

(9.130) a. tuku **fea**
   wait INIT
   [Just] wait [here]!

   b. zaho **fea**
   go INIT
   Out of the way!

Fea also may indicate that the marked event will occur before a specified subsequent event:

(9.131)  **au** **fea** gau da zuke-ri
   exist INIT youPL 1INC.SBJ seek-3PLO
   Stay [here] first, [then] we will go and look for them.

In this sense it frequently cooccurs with the sequencer ge:

(9.132)  gita da-ke turi **fea**, ge da lao friñe-ña
   weINC 1INC.SBJ-PRF tell INIT SEQ 1INC.SBJ go work-IMM
   We talked first, then worked.

The fact that the form typically marks the verb complex suggests that it is a post-core adverbial modifier. However, it is not limited to marking verb complexes, but may also mark other constituent types, such as the temporal locative in (9.133):

(9.133)  ginai **fea** da toi-ña
   todayIRR INIT 1INC.SBJ cook-IMM
   [Later] today first [and then] we will cook.

Moreover, when marking a verb complex fea typically follows other constituent modifiers present:
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(9.134) a. fa gigila-ni
bla  fea
CS try-3SGO LMT INIT
[Let's] just try it first.

b. ara lao  bo  fea
I go CNT INIT
I'll go first instead.

9.8.7 The particle la

Like the limiter bla(u), the particle la appears to mark the verb complex (as in (9.135)a.-b.) and other predicate types (for example (9.135)c.), as well as various kinds of arguments (for example (9.135)d.).

(9.135) a. maľra t-au-la  mane  kame-g n-e au-de  bla  la  bo...
fight SB-exist-CND he hand-1SGP RL-3.SBJ exist-theseR LMT ?? CNT
If there is a fight, my hands are here... [repeating (8.91)b.]

b. e  au-i  la  bla  keha ta faktilo-ni  tritmenti  ka-iu  ooe-vaka
3.SBJ exist-3SGO ?? LMT NSP SB name(V)-3SGO treatment LOC-theSG talk-ship
...they have something that [they] call treatment in Pijin. [repeating in part (9.68)a.]

c. visi  ľ-e-la  heve  la  ba...
play NT-3.SBJ-go what ?? ALT
A game that goes how...? [repeating (9.100)b.]

d. ka  tema-na  la  bla  n-e faroh-i-na  sala  mane.
LOC hut-thatN ?? LMT RL-3.SBJ smite-TR-thatN PN he
At that small house he killed Sala. [repeating (8.31)]

In addition the particle occurs in the focus construction discussed in 9.5.2.2:

(9.136) fafra  si-gau-palu  ba,  ginai  ľrugu  si-la-ine
be.quick FOC-youPL-two ALT FUT be.dark FOC-??-thisR
Hurry up, you two, or this [day] will get dark. [repeating (9.55)a.]

Apart from this focus construction, la appears to normally cooccur with other constituent modifiers, as (9.135) illustrates.

This particle occurs infrequently, and its function is not clear. The form la also functions as a conditional marker, however the constituent modifying behaviour illustrated in (9.135) and (9.136) does not seem to have any conditional sense, suggesting that the relationship between the conditional marker and constituent modifier is simple homophony. It is seems more plausible that a relationship exists between this constituent modifier and the deictic specifier suffix -lau discussed in 4.1.4.2 (paralleling the frequent use of the limiter bla(u) with pronouns and determiners). This too, however, remains unclear.

9.9 Vocative particle nogoi ~ goi

The particle nogoi ~ goi occurs with an emphatic vocative function. It is not a vocative in the sense of being a form of address, although speakers regard it as "meaning" 'you' (and indeed it appears to be derived from an earlier form of the second person singular pronoun, and thus cognate with the synchronic pronoun ago). However, its synchronic function is to strongly engage the listener to what the speaker is saying. In narratives and discourse declarative clauses it occurs when the speaker is excited or agitated by what they are saying, and occurs with increasing frequency commensurate with the level of excitement or agitation. In narratives this typically occurs at the most exciting parts of the story, when a text may become littered with occurrences of the particle.
(9.137) ka tema-na la bla n-e faroh-i-na sala manei
LOC hut-thatN ?? LMT RL-3.SBJ smite-TR-thatN PN he
At that small house he killed Sala.

\[ tana \text{ } \text{nogoi} \text{ } age \text{ } \tilde{g}-e \text{ } tetu-\tilde{n}a \text{ } mane \text{ } ge \]
\[ \text{then} \text{ } \text{VOC} \text{ } \text{SEQ} \text{ } \text{NT-3.SBJ} \text{ } \text{stand-IMM} \text{ } \text{he} \text{ } \text{SEQ} \]
Then, man!, he stood up and

\[ \text{nogoi} \text{ } \tilde{g}-e \text{ } kaike \text{ } ma\text{\textgra} \text{nogra} \text{ } \text{nogoi} \text{ } \tilde{g}-e \text{ } \text{fa-rogoho} \text{ } \text{fa} \text{ } \text{teo-ri} \text{ } \text{mane} \]
\[ \text{VOC} \text{ } \text{NT-3.SBJ} \text{ } \text{one} \text{ } \text{fight} \text{ } \text{VOC} \text{ } \text{NT-3.SBJ} \text{ } \text{CS-smite} \text{ } \text{CS} \text{ } \text{be.not-3PLO} \text{ } \text{man} \]
he fought everyone [and], man!, he killed all [the men]

\[ n-e-ke \text{ } au-ro \text{ } ka \text{ } \tilde{g}ulu-na \text{ } tema-na \text{ } e-u \]
\[ \text{RL-3.SBJ-PRF} \text{ } \text{exist-thoseNV} \text{ } \text{LOC} \text{ } \text{inside-3SGP} \text{ } \text{hut-thatN} \text{ } \text{3.SBJ-be.thus} \]
who were inside the small house.

The particle also occurs commonly in imperatives.

(9.138) fa puku-puku-ri bla ago e-u bla goi...
\[ \text{CS} \text{ } \text{RD-be.short-3PLO} \text{ } \text{LMT} \text{ } \text{youSG} \text{ } \text{3.SBJ-be.thus} \text{ } \text{LMT} \text{ } \text{VOC} \]
You make it short, man!...

Although the shorter form of the particle shown in (9.138) occurs in an imperative and the longer form in (9.137) in declarative clauses, there is in fact no functional distinction between the two. Most individual speakers use both, although it appears that younger speakers display a higher proportionate use of the shorter form than older speakers.

The particle normally occurs at clause boundaries. The collocation of the particle with the temporal marker \textit{tana} shown in line 2 of (9.137) is particularly common. Although it occurs at the beginning or end of clauses, it may follow extrapausal material, such as recapping constituents:

(9.139) an-bla nogoi n-e-ge fa-roho fa teo-ri are bla
\[ \text{thatN-LMT} \text{ } \text{VOC} \text{ } \text{RL-3.SBJ-PRS} \text{ } \text{CS-smite} \text{ } \text{CS} \text{ } \text{be.not-3PLO} \text{ } \text{thoseN} \text{ } \text{LMT} \]
That, man!, [and] he killed them all.