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   ḡlepo   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. *ḡetu*   [**n-e-ke**   *mane   datau*]
             PN   RL-3.SBJ-PRF   man   chief
             Getu was the chief [at that time].

        b. *manei* [**n-e-ge**   *nakodou*]
             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   [nañha-ḡu-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-ḡu   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-ña-ro***
man   be.aggressive   FOC-IMM-thoseNV
These are fighting men.

b. *[e-ti   nañha-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)   ⎧ NPTOP   +   PRED
S   →   ⎨
⎩ PRED   +   NPFOC

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:

(9.7)   *suli ta fani fa dia puhi t-au-re*   [*suli ide*]
child SB often CS be.bad way SB-exist-thoseN child theseR
The children who make trouble are these children.

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 *tanhi* '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. *tanhi*   [*nihau*]   b. *tanhi*   [*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)   *tanhi*   [*naboto-ai ḡaha miniti 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)   *nañha-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 *nañha-* 'name' as its head:

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

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

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

(9.12)   *ḡ-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,

> *ka   gai...   momoru   **e-ni**   e-u*
> LOC   weEXC   turtle.net   3.SBJ-3SGO   3.SBJ-be.thus
> with us... it's called *momoru*, it's like that.

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) *ka   gai   tana nogoi naitu tahi **ke-ni**   nañha-na-na   e-u*
       LOC   weEXC   then   VOC   devil   sea   PRF-3SGO   name-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   t-au-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**   nañha-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-ḡu**   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-ḡu   buka   ara]*
           theseR-EMPH   RL-3.SBJ-PERF   GP-1SGP   book   I
           These used to be my books.

       b. *a-hi   [**ginai**   no-ḡu   vilai   ara]*
           thisT-EMPH   FUT   GP-1SGP   knife   I
           This will be my knife.

c. *tazi-ri*   *boboke-mu-are*   [***mala***   *no-ḡu*   *ara*]
   keep-3PLO   inner.thigh-2SGP-thoseN PURP GP-1SGP I
   Keep your inner thighs for me,

   n-o-ke-u-o
   RL-2.SBJ-PERF-be.thus-thatNV
   you said you would.

Only alienable relationships are expressable 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*   *ira*   *doli-mai*   *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-ḡu*   *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. *n-o-ge*   *mai*   *bl-**ago**,*   *vave*
          RL-2.SBJ-PRS come LMT-youSG in.law
          So you've come, in-law.

      b. *ginai* *lehe* *bla* ***gita***
          FUT   die   LMT weEXC
          We're going to die.

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

(9.20)   *n-o*   *fa-lehe-ri*   ***ago***   ***kokorako***   ***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.

(9.21)   *ara a   tu-turi tufa-nigo* [***ago***] [***keha mereseni ka   gai   ade   kokota***]
           I   1.SBJ RD-tell affect-2SGO youSG NSP medicine   LOC   weEXC here PNLOC
           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. *ḡ-e   lao-ña   ḡobilologu   **ka**   **faknoe***
           NT-3.SBJ go-IMM   PN   LOC   PN
           Gobilologu went to Faknoe.

        b. *ḡ-e   la   uf-i   ia   to-toi   **ka-ia**   **papaḡu**   **ḡazu***
           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 totoi* '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**]*
           PN   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.

b. *ara n-a   lao [**tarame-na** **pita**] [**ka-ia**   **sitoa**]
   I   RL-1.SBJ go   ASSC-3SGP PN   LOC-theSG store
   I went to the store with Peter.

(9.26) a. *ara   n-a   lao [**ka**   **sitoa**] [**le-legu**   **nare**]
        I   RL-1.SBJ go   LOC-theSG store   RD-behind day
        I go to the store every day.

        b. *ara n-a   lao [**le-legu**   **nare**] [**ka-ia**   **sitoa**]
        I   RL-1.SBJ go   RD-behind day   LOC-theSG store
        I go to the store every day.

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   **ḡobilologu***
           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-ña*
           go   FOC   SEQ and   RL-3.SBJ go-IMM
           Go, and then [he] went.

        5. *n-e   la piri-ni-u   **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* *manei*,
LOC-theSG snake-tail-3SGO-thatNV him
with that snake-tail of his,

6-7. *la piri fa-lehe-i-u sini-ge age ḡ-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. *n-e hage-u ḡ-e hage-u ḡ-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. *ḡ-e toke-u sara fate sini ge*
NT-3.SBJ reach-PRG thereD high FOC SEQ
[he] was arriving there on top and then

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

13. *age ḡ-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 teḡe 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. *ḡ-a koko-ni-ña **gai** momoru ana*
NT-1.SBJ leave-3SGO-IMM weEXC turtle.net thatN
We throw out that turtle net.

3. *ḡ-e mai kale-u **manei** 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. *ḡ-a zogu-ña **gai***
NT-1.SBJ fall-IMM weEXC
we drop [in to the water]

6. *ḡ-a   fa hage-i   ka   hinage*
   NT-1.SBJ CS ascend-3SGO LOC boat
   [We] lift it into the boat.

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-ḡazu*   *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 **ḡobilologu***
           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. *ḡ-e*   *toḡla-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 (*zaho* 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.)[2]

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.

	Overt pragmatically unmarked mentions	Overtly mentioned topicalised arguments	Zero mentions
A	1	3	4
S	18	4	23
O	7	0	0
OBL	11	2	0

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.[3] 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-ña*   *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. ***manei*** *e* *keha* *ñheñhe*
   he   3.SBJ NSP be.separate
   He is different.

Objects also occur as preverbal topics:

(9.32) a. ***ia***   *pike* *mau-ḡu*   *n-e-ke*   *hod-i-o*   *sala* *ge* *ruruboñi* *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.

	Preverbal topicalised arguments	Focused arguments	Arguments in unmarked position	Total
A	2 (28.5%)	0	5 (71.5%)	7 (100%)
S	8 (15.5%)	2 (4.0%)	41 (80.5%)	51 (100%)
O	1 (5.5%)	0	17 (94.5%)	18 (100%)

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 Kokota men used to come [to pray].

      2. ***huhurañi*** *tana* *teo*   *e-u*
          PNLOC   then be.not 3.SBJ-be.thus
          [The] Huhurangi [people] didn't.

3. *e-u*   ***mane ide***   ***kokota***   *n-e-ke*   *kulu*   *tarai...*
   3.SBJ-be.thus   man   theseR   PNLOC   RL-3.SBJ-PRF   be.first   pray
   So these Kokota men were the first to start praying...

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   ***ḡobilologu***   *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*   *ḡerona*
           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 backgrounded through topicalisation. However the new nature of the reference to it means it must receive an overt mention.

(9.35)   1. *n-e*   *teo*   *ña*   *ḡe*   *aḡe*   *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*   *ḡe*   *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 background 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.

	Preverbal topicalised arguments	Focused arguments	Arguments in unmarked position	Total
1SG	2 (40.0%)	0	3 (60.0%)	5 (100%)
2SG	1 (14.5%)	2 (28.5%)	4 (57.0%)	7 (100%)
1INC	2 (100%)	0	0	2 (100%)
1EXC	1			

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]...[4]

    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   foḡra   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] *Ḡuanha* 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

       ḡ-e   tetu- n̄a   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

       'teo,   isa-ni   ge   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 foḡra-na   manei, 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-be.thus 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 *n̄a* 'immediate mood' and *la* (the function of which is unclear), but only when in combination with an argument. Thus **si-la* and **si-n̄a* 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** *ḡ-o* *tahe-i-ña* *t-au-ana* *ba*
later evening FOC-SEQ NT-2.SBJ tell-3SGO-IMM SB-exist-thatN ALT
This evening then you tell them to do that instead [of now].

B. *ehe* **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. *...ḡ-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

ḡ-a zogu-i-ña gai ḡ-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].

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

age ḡ-e mai-ña ḡ-e ñhau-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*

Si attaches to the final constituent of a clause, and cannot occur clause finally alone. However, the variant form *sini* does occur clause finally:

236

(9.43) *ka-t-au-ana*   *ḡ-e-la*   *lehe*   *no-ḡu*   *bo*   **sini**
        LOC-SB-exist-thatN   NT-3.SBJ-go   die   GP-1SGP   CNT   FOC
        At that I was nearly dead!

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. *ḡ-a*   *kaike*   *fa-lehe-ri*   *gudu*   *ña*   *gai*   *teḡe*   *are-lau,*
            NT-1.SBJ   one   CS-die-3PLO   EXHST   IMM   weEXC   turtle   thoseN-SP
            We kill every one of those turtles

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

            an-lau   **sini**   *ge*   *ḡe*   *tufa-ña*   *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*
            go   exist   own   come-3PLO-thoseN   RL-3.SBJ-PRF-be.thus
            ...and stopped them from coming.

            ka-t-au-ana   **sini**   *ge*   *ḡ-e*   *tetu-ña*   *solomoni*
            LOC-SB-exist-thatN   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:

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

        sini   *ge*   *age*   *ḡ-e*   *tetu-ña*   *ira*   *man-dou*   *kutai*   *kava*
        FOC   SEQ   and   NT-3.SBJ   stand-IMM   thePL   man-be.big   own.land   land
        Then the old man landowners stood up [ie. spoke out]...

Here *sini* is not occurring finally in the first clause. Admissible pauses indicate clearly that the forms *sini ge* open the second sentence in the example. Its pre-clausal position is clearly demonstrated by its occurrence with reported speech:

(9.46) *'teo,*   *le-legu*   *k-ago.'*   **sini**   *ge*   *ke*   *hage-ña*
        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 *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. *o-ti*   *dupa-i*   *manei*   ***si-ago***
    2.SBJ-NEG punch-3SGO he   FOC-youSG
    Don't you hit him!

    b. *ara*   *n-a*   *toka* *fizi-ni*   ***si-ḡazu***   ***ana***   *ba*
    I   RL-1.SBJ chop cut.up-3SGO FOC-wood thatN ALT
    I chopped up that wood.

    c. *n-o-ke*   *mai*   ***si-ago***
    RL-2.SBJ-PRF   come   FOC-youSG
    You've come.

    d. *n-e*   *keha*   *ñheñhe*   ***si-za-zaho-na-na***
    RL-3.SBJ NSP   be.separate   FOC-RD-go -3SGP-thatN
    That way of it is different.

    e. *n-o*   *bula-nigo*   ***si-ago***
    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)   *e*   *la*   *puku*   *bai*   ***si-ka***   *tepi-ana*   *n-a-u*
      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)   *mala* *fa-lehe-i-u*   *n-e-ke-u-o*   *b-ara,*
      PURP CS-die-3SGO-PRG RL-3.SBJ-PRF-be.thus-thatNV ALT-I
      I intended to kill him,

      teo   *bla*   ***si-boka-ḡu-na***   *ka*   *kuiti* *aro-hi*
      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 *goi* may also be focused:

(9.50)   *ago*   *n-o*   *tore*   *ḡlehe*   ***si-goi***
      youSG RL-2.SBJ ask   very   FOC-VOC
      You're asking a lot, man!

When the focal particle cliticises to a vowel initial form a reduced form occasionally occurs. So *si* + *ana* may have the surface form /sana/ and *si* + *ide* the form /side/:

(9.51) a. *mai*   ***s-ago***
    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-ñ̄-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*   *ḡrugu*   ***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* *gau-palu* *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).), *ḡela* '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-ñ̄-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* *nañha-di* *nakoni* ***si-l-are***
   3.SBJ-NEG name-3PLP person FOC-??-thoseN
   They're not the names of people.

  d. *ḡ-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-ñā,* *no-ḡu* *nau-ro* ***s-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. *hei* ***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-na**   **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-thatNV   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   *aḡe*   *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*   *aḡe*   *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*   *teḡe*   *ine*
            SB-PRF   CS   stop-3SGO   INIT   SB-exist-thatN   SB-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-di**   **ira**   **ge-mai**   **no-mai**...
            base-3SGP   RL-1.SBJ-PRS   go   leave-3PLO   thePL   CP-1EXCP   GP-1EXCP
            because we would leave behind our food and our things...

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

            ka-ia   *fufunu-na*   *ia*   *kastom*   *ka*   *gai*
            LOC-theSG   begin-3SGP   theSG   custom   LOC   weEXC
            in the origins of our custom

nafu-na **are** **bla** **ḡ-e-la** **ge-mai** **mitia**...
base-3SGP   thoseN   LMT   NT-3.SBJ-go   CP-1EXCP   meat
because those were our meat...

d. **n-e-ke**   **kave**   **mai-ña**   **fate**   **gu-da**   **gita**   **ira**   **huḡru nakoni**
RL-3.SBJ-PRF   descend   come-IMM   above   CNTX-1INCP   weINC   thePL   all   person
He came down from heaven, for us people.

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. **ḡ-e**   **lao**   **ia-hi**   **la**   **kamo**   **ia-hi**   **lego**
NT-3.SBJ   go   thatPV-EMPH   go   cross   thatPV-EMPH   PNLOC
So he went there and crossed over there to Lego,

n-e-ke-u
RL-3.SBJ-PRF-be.thus
it was like that.

sare   **n-e**   **la**   **koko**   **kamo-u**
thereP   RL-3.SBJ   go   leave   cross-PRG
There he was going across further.

b. **tifaro**   **ara**   **a**   **lao**   **tarai**   **fakamo**   **le-legu**   **sade**   **ña**   **goinode**   **teo**
before   I   1.SBJ   go   pray   always   RD-behind   Sunday   but   todayRL   be.not
I used to always go to prayer every Sunday, but now I don't.

c. ...**huhurañi**   *au-re*   *keha-re*   *n-e-ke-u*   *gai*
   PNLOC   exist-thoseN   NSP-thoseN   RL-3.SBJ-PRF-be.thus   weEXC
...[and] some lived at Huhurangi. We were like that.

d. **ka**   **nare**   **sade**   **ḡ-e**   **lao-u**   **ḡ-e**   **la**   **tarai-u**...
LOC   day   Sunday   NT-3.SBJ   go-PRG   NT-3.SBJ   go   pray-PRG
On Sundays they were going, they were going and praying...

e. **tareme-na**   **kodere**   *n-a*   *toḡla-ni*   *ara*   *ia*   *zora*
with-3SGP   PN   RL-1.SBJ   chase-3SGO   I   theSG   pig
With Kodere I chased the pig.

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

(9.63)   a. *mhoko*   *bla*   *fea*   *au-gu*   *ago*   **sare**
sit   LMT   INIT   exist-PRG   youSG   thereP
You sit down first there.

b. *ara*   *n-a-ke*   *fakae-ni*   *kaike* *baesu* *ta* *dou* *ḡlehe* ***nhorao***
   I   RL-1.SBJ-PRF   see-3SGO one   shark   SB be.big very   yesterday
   I saw a shark that was very big yesterday.

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

d. *e-u*   *friñhe* *n-e-ke*   *friñhe-ni-na*   *palu* *mane* *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-ḡu*   *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* *mane* *aro* *n-e-ke*   *au*   ⁻•••••
       LOC   exist-3PLP-thoseN 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** *manei*
      boro LMT exist thereP she
      She just stays *boro* there.

    b. *n-e-ke*   *aḡe* **tareme-na** *keha foḡra* **n̄hen̄he-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** *manei*
       SB-exist-thisR 3.SBJ ask-3SGO LOC who he
       Who will he ask this [question] to?

    e. *n-e*   *aḡe-na la-ni*   **ka** *keha* **hobo-ḡazu-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* **fufugo** *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...

b. *a   boka   ñha-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-ña   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   ḡrui***]   [***tareme-na   kodere***]   *ara   n-a   toḡla-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   nogoi   ke   aḡe
then   VOC   PRF   go
man!, it's gone,

ke   aḡe   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-1INCP   weINC
        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) *ḡ-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   puhi   boñihehe*]
        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   aḡe-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-a-ke   turi* [*tareme-na gase   ana*] [*ka   kaike 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   sitoa*]   [*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   friñhe-di-re   ka   maneri
        RL-3.SBJ-be.thus   thoseN-SPC   RD-go-3PLP-thoseN   work-3PLO-thoseN   LOC   they
        That's how they are, those ways of making them with them.

        b. ***o-ti***   *ḡela   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   velepuhi*
        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***   *ḡazu   hogo-na*
            RL-3.SBJ-NEG   wood   be.true-3SGP
            They're not true sticks.

        b. ***e-ti***   *nañha-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.

b. **teo**   *ḡ-o*   *mai*   *ago*
    be.not   NT-2.SBJ   come   youSG
    Don't you come!

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) *ge*   *e*   *teo*   *ḡe*   *faete*   *gai*   *ḡ-e-la*   *teḡe*   *heve*   *bo*
        SEQ   IRR   be.not   NT   choose   weEXC   NT-3.SBJ-go   turtle   what   CNT
        So we didn't choose what kind of turtles

        ta   *hod-i-na*   **ta-ti**   *hod-i-na...*
        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. *ara-hi*   **a-ti-ke**   *fufunu-di-bo*   *t-au-de*
            I-EMPH   1.SBJ-NEG-PRF   begin-3PLO-CNT   SB-exist-theseR
            I didn't start these [arguments].'

        b. **n-o-ti**   *noto*   *fa-nomho*
            RL-2.SBJ-NEG   stop   CS-hear
            You didn't stop and be quiet.

        c. *buka*   *are-lau*   **e-ti-ke**   *mala*   *fa*   *za-zaho*   *hae*   *ge*   *hae*
            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*   *la*   **teo**   *ira*   *nakoni*   *n-e-u*
            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*   **teo**   *kaike*   *ihei*
            3.SBJ   be.not   one   someone
            There is not anyone

            ta   *ḡ-e*   *boka*   *fa-lehe-i-na*   *ia*   *to-toi*
            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) *ara*   *n-a*   **teo**-*nau*   *sileni*
        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)   *gai*   **teo**   [*ḡ-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)   *mane*   *t-au-ana*   **teo**   [*ḡ-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**   [*ḡ-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**   [*ḡ-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**-*ña*   [*ḡ-e*   *mai-u*   *mane huhurañi*   *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:

(9.86)　　*ḡ-e*　　　　**teo**　　　[*boka-i-na*]
　　　　　　NT-3.SBJ　be.not　be.able-3SGO-thatN
　　　　　　They couldn't do it...

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**　　[*ḡ-e*　　　　*boka*　　　*turi-di*　　　*manei*
　　　　　　be.not　NT-3.SBJ　be.able　tell-3PLO　he
　　　　　　...he can't tell [about]

　　　　　　heve　　*ḡlepo*　　*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 *ña*, the limiter *bla*, or the possibilitative *bai(u)*:

(9.88)　　a.　*n-e*　　　**teo-ña**　　　*ḡe*　*aḡe*　*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 you don't go and sit and kill this fire,

　　　　　　　ago　　**teo**　**bla**　*ḡe*　*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**　*aḡe-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:

(9.89)   *ba*   Alternative
         bo   Contrastive
         bla(u)   Limiter
         bai(u)   Possibilitative
         n̄a   Immediacy
         fea   Initially
         la   (function unclear)

9.8.1 *Ba* Alternative marker

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   frin̄he   tan̄ano,*
            PRF   arrive-3PLO   CNT   thePL   GP-1EXCP   work   food
            [The times] arrive for our making food,

            ba   *ira*   *nare-di*   *suḡa,*   ***ba***   *ira*   *krismas,*   ***ba***   *ira*   *esta*
            ALT   thePL   day-3PLP   house   ALT   thePL   Christmas   ALT   thePL   Easter
            like festival days, or Christmas, or Easter.

        b. *...ḡ-e-la   naboto-u   **ba**,   varedake-u   **ba**,   tulufulu   teḡe*
            NT-3.SBJ-go   ten-CRD   ALT   twenty-CRD   ALT   thirty   turtle
            ...it might be ten, or twenty, or thirty turtles

            ta   la   hod-i-di-re   gai
            SB   go   take-TR-3PLO-thoseN   weEXC
            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   ḡ-e   turi-n̄a   gita*
            3.SBJ-be.thus   SEQ   NT-3.SBJ   tell-IMM   weINC
            Before we talk

            *da   koze-i   kaike   **ba**   tilo   koze*
            1INC.SBJ   sing-3SGO   one   ALT   three   sing
            we'll sing one or three songs.

b. *...ḡ-e   ta ikoa,   **ba**   dou,   **ba** midiam... kaike hod-i-ri   gudu   bla*
NT-3.SBJ   SB be.small   ALT   be.big ALT medium one   take-TR-3PLO EXHST LMT
...whether small or big, or medium... we just take them all...

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-I
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 ḡrugu   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   suḡa ine   ago **ba**,   ago mai ka   suḡa-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

*ḡazu 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   maleria
LOC   person   SB-exist-NV SB arrive-3SGO SB-exist-thatNV malaria
to that person who has caught malaria,

boka   ke   aḡe 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:

(9.95) A. *ginai   saigona   si-ge   ḡ-o   tahe-i-ña   t-au-ana   **ba***
　　　　todayIRR   evening   FOC-SEQ   NT-2.SBJ   tell-3SGO-IMM   SB-exist-thatN   ALT
　　　　This evening then you tell [them] that instead [of now]

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

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...*
　　　　　　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   aḡe   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**-ana   manei*
　　　　　　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)　　*...ge   pulo   mai   gau-palu   fufugo   **ba***
　　　　　　SEQ   return   come   youPL-two   tomorrow   ALT
　　　　　　...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-foḡra-di-re...*
              be.thus   what   ALT   RL-3.SBJ   CS RD-be.sick-3PLO-thoseN
              What is making them sick...?

      b. *visi ḡ-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   ḡobilologu   **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. *fufugo   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   ḡ-a   lase-i   ara*
              man-SB-exist-thatN   be.not   NT-1.SBJ   know-3SGO   I
              That man I don't know his name,

        *ña   ira   naitu toke   aro   **bo**   ta   au   kuru   nañha-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   ña   zemesi teo   ḡ-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 maḡoho 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**, ña 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 aḡe-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 aḡe **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)   *liḡomo 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. *ḡ-e   mai   tafr-i   **bla**   ia   rereo   ka   sebele   ka   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-ḡu   n-e-ke   hod-i-o   sala ge ruruboñi   **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 aḡe-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 ruruboñi   **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   parahaḡala **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. *fufugo   a   ginai   korho   namhari   **baiu***
         tomorrow   1.SBJ   FUT   pull   fish   PSBL
         Tomorrow I might catch fish.

   b. *...teo   ña-bla   ooe-ḡau-na   **baiu**   manei   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   ḡilu-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   tape   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 all 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.

(9.119) *an-lau*   *bla* **baiu** *puku-na*   *bla* **bai** *s-ana-ba*
         thatN-SPC   LMT   PSBL   be.short-thatN LMT   PSBL   FOC-thatN-ALT
         Maybe that one. I think that's short.

9.8.5 *Ña* Immediacy marker

The particle *ña* 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.

(9.120) *lehe-**ña***   *gita*   *ia*   *tara-**ña***   *n-e*   *mai-ne*
         die-IMM   weINC   theSG   enemy-IMM   RL-3.SBJ   come-thisR
         We are going to die. The enemy has come.

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-**ña***   *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   *ḡobilologu*   *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,

           ḡ-e-ke   *mai-**ña***,   *ḡ-e-ke*   *mai*   *ñhau...*
           NT-3.SBJ-PRF   come-IMM   NT-3.SBJ-PRF   come   eat
           he came, he came and ate...

        b. *...fafra*   *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-**ña***   *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*   *teḡe*   *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*   *ḡ-a*   *koko-ni-**ña***   *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 *ña* often gives a sense equivalent to the English *still* or *yet*. Marking a preexisting state or event with *ña* indicates that the state or event still applies at the time of speaking. With the negative existential verb *ña* indicates that the state or event has not yet happened:

(9.122) a. *manei*   *teo-**ña***   *ḡ-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) *an-lau   si-ge   ḡ-a   raraḡoso-**ña** ira   hinage*
         thatN-SPC   FOC-SEQ   NT-1.SBJ   decorate-IMM thePL   boat
         That, then we decorate the boat,

         *age   ḡ-a   koze-**ña**   tavuli-**ña***   *rehai-**ña***
         SEQ   NT-1.SBJ   sing-IMM   blow.conch-IMM   shout-IMM
         then we sing and blow the conch and call out.

         *ḡ-a-u-**ña***   *ḡ-a   la   mai-u*
         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) *ara-**ña***
         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) *ara-**ña***   *no-ḡu*   *nau-ro*   *s-aro*
         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) *n-a*   *bakora*   ***si-ñ̄-ara***   *goi*
         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) *ginai   saigona-**ña**,   kaike   saigona-**ña***
         todayIRR   evening-IMM   one   evening-IMM
         This evening, one evening,

ta-ke	*hoda*	*toke-ḡai-na*	*gai-palu*	*tati*
SB-PRF	take	arrive-1EXCO-thatN	weEXC-two	mother&baby

that [you] will take back we two, mother and baby.

9.8.6 *Fea* 'initially'

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-ḡu   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   friñhe-ni**fea**   ia   suḡa*
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   friñhe-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:

(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. *maḡra t-au-la   manei   kame-ḡu 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 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. [repeating in part (9.68)a.]

c. *visi ḡ-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 manei.*
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 ḡrugu   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 **nogoi** age   ḡ-e   tetu-n̄a   manei   ge
         then VOC   SEQ   NT-3.SBJ   stand-IMM   he   SEQ
         Then, man!, he stood up and

         nogoi ḡ-e   kaike maḡra **nogoi** ḡ-e   fa-rogoho fa   teo-ri   mane
         VOC   NT-3.SBJ   one   fight VOC   NT-3.SBJ   CS-smite   CS   be.not-3PLO   man
         he fought everyone [and], man!, he killed all [the men]

         n-e-ke   au-ro   ka   ḡilu-na   tema-na   e-u
         RL-3.SBJ-PRF   exist-thoseNV LOC   inside-3SGP   hut-thatN   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**...
         CS   RD-be.short-3PLO   LMT   youSG 3.SBJ-be.thus LMT   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 *tana* shown in line 2 of (9.137) is particularly common. Although it occurs at the beginning or end of clauses, it may follow extraclausal material, such as recapping constituents:

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