10.1 Imperative clauses

Imperative clauses are employed to give commands and exhortations, and make requests. No special imperative marker exists. The imperative clause has the normal declarative clause structure, with the restrictions that the clause must be in irrealis mood, no preverbal topicalised argument may occur, and only second person or first inclusive subjects are possible. In addition, imperatives are typically distinguishable from declaratives by a clause-final rising-falling intonation.

10.1.1 Positive imperatives

As with positive irrealis declaratives, the subject indexed auxiliary may occur in positive imperatives (as in (10.1)a.), but is typically omitted ((10.1)b.):

(10.1) a.  
\[
\text{o la ka-ni-ña tagi-mi} \\
2.SBJ go look-3SGO-IMM RFL-2PLP \\
\text{Go and look at him yourselves!}
\]

b.  
\[
\text{ke mai ago tikani} \\
PRF come youSG PN \\
You come here, Tikani!
\]

The subject may be overtly expressed, as in (10.1), but is often unstated:

(10.2)  
\[
\text{zaho fea} \\
go INIT \\
Go away!
\]

First inclusive imperatives also have the form of an irrealis declarative clause:

(10.3)  
\[
\text{da agé kae-di-u} \\
1INC.SBJ go see-3PLO-PRG \\
Let's go and see \\
\text{hae ta au-re n-e hure-ri hinage-re maneri} \\
where SB exist-thoseN RL-3.SBJ carry-3PLO boat-thoseN they \\
where it is that they carried the boats!
\]

However, first inclusive imperatives typically commence with the particle *aria*:

(10.4)  
\[
\text{aria d-aşe nhura-i fituğu} \\
1INC.IMP1 1INC.SBJ-go destroy-3SGO PNLOC \\
Let's go and destroy Fitupogu!
\]

As with second person imperatives, first inclusive imperative subjects may be overtly stated.

Some aspect and tense modifiers may occur in imperative clauses. The progressive aspect enclitic occurs commonly with first inclusive imperatives, as (10.3) illustrates, though it is not obligatory. The perfective marker and present tense marker also occur:

\[\text{The gloss 1INC.IMP here is not meant to imply that the form is pronominal, merely that it is an imperative marker applicable only to first inclusive subjects.}\]
If that's so then let's go back!

Just tell some more [stories] [now]!

The use of present tense with irrealis modality, discussed in 8.5.2.8, gives the sense that the event will happen immediately. In (10.5)b. the use of present tense occurs because the speaker wants the addressee to tell further stories straight away. The future tense marker ginai appears not to occur in imperative clauses.

10.1.2 Negative imperatives

As discussed in 10.7, two negative constructions exist, one employing the negative particle ti, the other a subordinating negative construction with the negative existential verb teo. With second person negative imperatives both constructions occur:

(10.6) a. o-ti lao sare gïlu
   2.SBJ-NEG go thereP inside
   Don't go in there!

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

First inclusive irrealis negative imperatives appear to allow only the subordinating construction, as in (10.7)a. Clauses with the negative particle, as in (10.7)b., appear not to be interpretable as imperatives:

(10.7) a. teo ñe-da aûe-u
   be.not NT-1INC.SBJ go-PRG
   Let's not go!

b. da-ti teteû-ña gitu goinode
   1INC.SBJ-NEG go.fishing-IMM weINC today
   We won't go fishing today.

10.1.3 Politeness in imperatives

No specific politeness or respect marker exists comparable to the English please. However, where a second person pronoun subject is overtly realised it may be marked with the focus marker si. The absence of the focus marker in this situation, as in (10.6)b., is regarded as not respectful. This is discussed further in 9.5.2.4.

10.2 Interrogation

Interrogative clauses in Kokota fall into three distinct types, on both formal and functional grounds:

1) Polar (yes/no) and option interrogatives - morphosyntactically identical to declarative clauses.
2) Constituent interrogatives - seek details of an event or its participants, using interrogative proforms.
3) Contextual interrogatives - 'how' and 'why' questions, involving the event expressed as a clause separate to the interrogative form.
10.2.1 Polar and option interrogatives

Polar interrogatives have the structure of a declarative clause, but are distinguished from declaratives by clause final rising intonation, in contrast with the falling intonation of declarative clauses. Thus the clauses in (10.8) are syntactically identical to declaratives:

(10.8) a. n-e fa mai-ni bo pita maneko ine
     RL-3.SBJ CS come-3SGO CNT PN pawpaw thisR
     Did Peter bring this pawpaw?

b. boka hoda aģe-nau bo ago
     be.able take go-1SGO CNT youSG
     Can you take me there?

No particles exist which mark only interrogation. However both the contrastive marker bo and the alternative marker ba (discussed in 9.8.1 and 9.8.2), occur commonly in polar interrogatives, as illustrated in (10.8) and (10.9) respectively.

(10.9) n-e-ge tor-i b-ana manei
     RL-3.SBJ-PRS be.open-TR ALT-thatN he
     Has he opened that?

Both the contrastive and alternative markers make explicit the existence of states or events other than that expressed by the marked clause, and emphasise the potential for polarity, and thus the interrogative nature of these clauses. However both also occur in declaratives, and are not obligatory in polar interrogatives:

(10.10) n-e-ge fa tor-i manei a-hi
     RL-3.SBJ-PRS CS be.open-TR he thisT-EMPH
     Has he opened this?

This illustrates that it is crucially the intonation pattern which marks polar interrogatives, not any morphosyntactic phenomena. All the examples in (10.8) to (10.10) could be declarative clauses with only an intonational change.

Not only full clauses may function as polar interrogatives. Any constituent may be presented for confirmation using rising intonation. In (10.11) a personal name alone is given rising intonation, thereby giving it an interrogative sense - the identity of the individual is presented for confirmation:

(10.11) ge ɡ-e triki-ña mane n-e-u, he-ba-ia, tikilave
     SEQ NT-3.SBJ trick-IMM man RL-3.SBJ-be.thus who-ALT-PRO PN
     Then a man played a trick. Who [was it]? [Was it] Tikilave?

Option interrogatives resemble polar interrogatives in that they also have the syntactic structure of a declarative clause. Functional similarities also exist. Neither elicit greater detail about the nature of a state or event or its participants, or the state or event's context. Polar interrogatives present a state or event, and seek confirmation of the veracity of the presented state or event. Option interrogatives present more than one alternative and seek identification of which alternative applies:

(10.12) sisiga e ĕauaia ba namo
     PNLOC 3.SBJ be.far ALT be.near
     Is Sisiga near or far?

As with polar interrogatives, intonation alone distinguishes the declarative reading from the interrogative. With falling intonation the clause in (10.12) would mean 'Sisiga is far or near.'

In option interrogatives at least the first option, sometimes both, are marked with the alternative marker ba, as in (10.12). The contrastive marker may also be present, although this is uncommon:
The alternatives presented in an option clause may be expressed as two predicates within a single clause, as in (10.12), or as separate clauses, as in (10.13).

10.2.2 Constituent interrogatives

Constituent interrogatives seek information about an event or state or its participants beyond confirming a proposition or selecting an option. These are of two functional types: those which seek the identity of a participant or the nature of a state or event; and those which seek more information about an established participant or state or event.

These involve the following interrogative proforms:

(10.14) heve 'what'
        hei 'who'
        hae 'where'
        niha-o 'when? (realis)'
        niha-na 'when? (irrealis)'
        niha 'how many/much?'

10.2.2.1 Identity interrogation

10.2.2.1.1 Argument identity interrogation

The locative interrogatives niha- ‘when?’ and hae ‘where’ function to inquire about the identity of spatial and temporal locations. All other arguments, core or peripheral, are referred to by the interrogative proforms, hei ‘who’ and heve ‘what’.

10.2.2.1.1.1 Hei ‘who’

The proform hei has as its referent an argument whose identity is in question. Crucially, the participant referred to must be human. The argument in question may be any core argument - actor, intransitive subject, or object:

(10.15) a. hei n-e ravi-nau-na ka bakla-na
        who RL-3.SBJ hide.from-1SGO-thatN LOC flat.root-thatN
        Who is hiding from me in the roots?

b. n-e-u hei
       RL-3.SBJ-be.thus who
       Who was thus? [ie. Who said that?]

c. hei bili n-e fakae-ni-na
       who PN RL-3.SBJ see-3SGO-thatN
       Who did Billy see?

It is not clear whether hei may function as an incorporated interrogative object (as heve ‘what’ may). Possibly because human objects are rarely generic, no examples of hei incorporation occur in the corpus.

The argument in question may also be a peripheral argument, as the complement of the preposition ka or the associative noun tareme- ‘with’:

2 The translations given here of hae ‘where’, hei ‘who’ and heve ‘what’ are not glossed with question marks, as niha- is, as they may be used with non-interrogative functions, translatable as ‘wherever’, ‘whoever’ and ‘whatever’.
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The interrogative proform may occur in two possible positions in the clause. It may occur clause initially, as in (10.15)a. and c., and (10.16)b. It may occur in this position even when a topicalised preverbal argument is also present, as (10.15)c. shows. When the interrogative proform occurs clause initially, the verb complex obligatorily carries a demonstrative enclitic from the 'nearby' category. The proform may also occur in the unmarked clause position of the referent argument, as in (10.15)b. and (10.16)a. and c. When in this position no demonstrative enclitic occurs.

Realis interrogative clauses always have the main clause structure outlined above. Irrealis interrogatives may also have this structure, as (10.16)a. shows. However, irrealis interrogatives may also be expressed as an equative construction in which the interrogative proform is the subject, with a subordinate clause as predicate. This gives a pragmatically marked construction functionally somewhat akin to an English pseudo-cleft construction:

(10.17) hei ta kulu mhoko-na ka gita-palu
who SB be.first sit-thatN LOC weINC-two
Who [is it] that will sit first out of us two?

In this construction the predicate has the formal characteristics dictated by its status as a subordinate clause, rather than those otherwise required in an interrogative main clause predicate.

The proform may also function as subject of an ordinary equative construction with a nominal predicate:

(10.18) hei nariha-mu-na ago
who name-2SGP-thatN youSG
What is your name?

10.2.2.1.2 Heve 'what' (referring to arguments)

One of the functions of heve 'what' is to act as interrogative proform for nonhuman arguments. With this function heve parallels hei, the difference being only the nonhuman status of the referent. As with hei, heve can stand for any core argument:

(10.19) a. heve n-e-ke kati-nigo-na ago
what RL-3.SBJ-PRF bite-2SGO-thatN youSG
What bit you?

b. heve n-e zogu-na
what RL-3.SBJ drop-thatN
What fell?

c. heve manei n-e-ke toglia-i-na
what he RL-3.SBJ-PRF chase-3SGO-thatN
What did he chase?

Heve may occur as an incorporated interrogative object. In (10.20) the verb is in its intransitive form, with no object indexing present. The interrogative proform is located in the incorporated object position:
Because specific temporal and spatial locative interrogatives exist, heve occurs infrequently as a peripheral argument. However, such occurrences are possible, with heve functioning as the complement of the preposition ka. Often heve obliques are interpreted as non-locative arguments such as instruments:

(10.21) ka heve n-o-ke /sad-i-na/ ago meme-ha-na
  LOC what RL-2.SBJ-PRF shoot-TR-thatN youSG bird-thatN
  What did you shoot the bird with?

If a spatial locative is intended, it is often a marked kind of location. In (10.22) for example it is not the location in the village, for example, where the hitting happened, but the location on the dog's body:

(10.22) ka heve-na n-e /faroh-i-na/ suli-na mheke-na
  LOC what-thatN RL-3.SBJ strike-TR-thatN child-thatN dog-thatN
  Where [on its body] did that child hit that dog?

Alternatively, a specific kind of location may be intended. In (10.23), for example, the anticipated answer is not a broad kind of a location (such as 'in Goveo'), but something like 'on the table' or 'in that room', responses that will involve a prepositional phrase:

(10.23) ka heve-o n-e /lisa-i-na/ mane i no-ţu vilai ana
  LOC what-thatNV RL-3.SBJ put-3SGO-thatN he GP-1SGP knife thatN
  Where did he put that knife of mine?

The more literal translation of (10.23) would be something like 'On or in that what did he put...'. When heve is used with this spatial locative sense it typically carries a cliticised demonstrative, as in these examples.

Like hei, heve may occur clause initially (including before a preverbal argument), or it may occur in the referent argument's unmarked clause position. Also as with hei, when the proform occurs clause initially the verb complex is marked with a demonstrative enclitic, but when the proform occurs in its unmarked position there is no verb complex enclitic.

Again, irrealis interrogatives may be expressed by an equative construction in which the interrogative proform is the subject of a subordinate clause:

(10.24) heve ta /frin-e-i-na/ ago
  what SB work-3SGO-thatN youSG
  What [is it] that you will be doing?

Heve also occurs as the subject of an equative clause with a nominal predicate:

(10.25) heve b-ana
  what ALT-that
  What's that?

10.2.2.1.1.3 Niha- 'when'

The form niha- is used to form questions about the temporal location of the event expressed in the clause. Formally and conceptually this interrogative proform is interesting in that it must occur with one of two cliticised demonstratives: -na 'that (nearby)' and -o 'that (non-visible)', which assign irrealis and realis status respectively to the temporal location inquired about.

In an interrogative verbal main clause the irrealis 'when' must be followed by the sequencing particle ge. In addition, the verb complex must be marked with the immediacy marker ūa:
The cliticisation of the demonstrative -na is obligatory - the independent demonstrative marking *niha ana is impossible.

The realis interrogative occurs without the sequencer. The verb does not carry the immediacy marker, but is obligatorily marked with a 'nearby' category demonstrative enclitic (following the pattern discussed in 10.2.2.1.1):

(10.27) a. niha-o maneí n-e-ke fad-i-na memeha-na
when-thatNV he RL-3.SBJ-PRF shoot-TR-thatN bird-thatN
When did he shoot that bird?

b. niha-o n-e-ke posa-re glepo are
when-thatNV RL-3.SBJ-PRF emerge-thoseN thing thoseN
When did those things occur?

The temporal interrogative proform always occurs clause initially. As with hei and heve, there is no restriction on another argument occurring in topicalised preverbal position, as (10.27)a. illustrates.

Temporal interrogatives may be the subject of an equative construction in which the event inquired about is expressed as a subordinate clause. This construction does not occur commonly, and is a way of foregrounding the time inquired about.

(10.28) niha-na ta mai-na ligomo
when-thatN SB come-thatN PN
When [is it] that the Ligomo will come?

In this equative construction the irrealis interrogative does not require the sequencer, and the predicate is marked in ways determined by its status within a subordinate clause, rather than in keeping with the interrogative clause predicate restrictions discussed above.

The interrogative particle itself functions as a nonverbal predicate in the standard form of asking the time, a construction involving an equative clause:

(10.29) tanhi niha-o
time when-thatNV
The time [is] when? [ie. What's the time?]

The interrogative form used in this construction requires the demonstrative -o. Since the question relates to the moment of speaking it illustrates that the interrogative form nihao is realis, and does not simply refer to past locations in time.

10.2.2.1.4 Hae 'where'

Spatial locative interrogation is expressed by hae 'where', which typically occurs clause initially:

(10.30) hae n-o-ke doli-na ago
where RL-2.SBJ-PRF be.alive-thatN youSG
Where were you born?
When the spatial interrogative hae is clause initial, the verb complex must be marked with a 'nearby' category demonstrative enclitic, as in (10.30). Less commonly, hae may occur in the unmarked clause position of the locative argument it is replacing. In the latter construction the demonstrative enclitic is not present:

(10.31) \text{mane-na n-e gorha la hae} \quad \text{man-thatN RL-3.SBJ paddle go where}
\text{Where is that man paddling to?}

\textit{Hae} occurs in this unmarked position in the standard Kokota greeting:

(10.32) \text{lao hae (ago)}
\text{go where you}
\text{Where are you going?}

The proform replaces an entire locative argument, including prepositional phrases. Consequently it does not function as the complement of the preposition:

(10.33) *\text{ka hae n-o-ke doli-na ago}
\text{At where were you born?}

However, spatial locative interrogation may be performed by a prepositional phrase with \textit{heve} 'what' as the prepositional complement:

(10.34) \text{ka heve-o n-e lisa-i-na mane i ia vilai}
\text{LOC what-thatNV RL-3.SBJ put-3SGO-thatN he theSG knife}
\text{At what [location] did he put the knife? [ie. Where did he put the knife?]}

In this construction it is the preposition that expresses the locative component of the interrogation.

In addition to its simple form, \textit{hae} also forms a single complex interrogative proform with the deictic locative \textit{sara} 'there (distal)':

(10.35) \text{sara hae mane i n-e-ke toglia-i-na i a zora}
\text{thereD where he RL-3.SBJ-PRF chase-3SGO-thatN theSG pig}
\text{Where did he chase the pig?}

The example in (10.35) also illustrates that the spatial locative interrogative proform may occur in clause initial position when a topicalised preverbal argument is also present.

\textit{Hae} is used to inquire about spatial locations with any function in the clause. Thus in (10.30) \textit{hae} refers to the location at which an event took place. In (10.31) it refers to a goal. The clause in (10.35) is ambiguous as to whether it refers to a location or a goal (ie. 'in what location did he chase the pig' versus 'where did he chase the pig to'). The form may equally be used to refer to sources:

(10.36) \text{hae n-o-ke klisu mai-na gau}
\text{where RL-2.SBJ-PRF start come-thatN youPL}
\text{Where did you start [ie. come] from?}

With irrealis event questions of spatial location are typically formed using an equative construction in which the interrogative proform is the subject of a clause, the predicate of which is a subordinated clause. This applies equally to events that are irrealis because they have yet to occur, and those which are irrealis because they are habitual:

(10.37) a. \text{hae ta lao-n-ago}
\text{where SB go-thatN-youSG}
\text{Where [is it] that you will go?}
b. **hae** ta **au-na** ago
   where SB exist-thatN youSG
   Where [is it] that you live?

An equative construction also occurs with nominal predicates identifying the participant whose location is sought:

(10.38) **hae** **belama**
   where PN
   Where [is] Belama?

### 10.2.2.1.2 Event identification

In addition to interrogatives questioning the identity of participants in a predication, there are others which inquire about the identity of the state or event itself. Just as participant interrogation involves replacing the relevant argument with a proform, in event interrogation the predicate itself is replaced with an interrogative. However, the entire predicate is not replaced, as the auxiliary remains expressed:

(10.39) a. **n-e** **heve** ia **zora**
   RL-3.SBJ what theSG pig
   What did the pig do?/What happened to the pig?

b. **n-e** **heve** ia **grui**
   RL-3.SBJ what theSG garden
   What happened to/in the garden?

As **heve** has no predicate argument structure, no grammatical relation or semantic role is assigned to an overtly expressed argument in this construction. Thus in (10.39)a. the sole argument is animate and therefore may be an actor or an unergative subject. Consequently the question is interpretable as an inquiry about the actions of the pig, as well as about what may have happened to it (in which it is potentially the undergoer of the event). As most states and qualities are expressed by stative verbs in Kokota, the question is also interpretable as an inquiry about the pig's state or what qualities may be ascribed to it (in which case the overt argument would be an unaccusative subject). In (10.39)b. the overt argument is one which most commonly occurs as a location, or less commonly as an object. Consequently those are the argument relations that would normally inform the interpretation of the question, with the state or quality of the participant a further possible reading. The crucial point is that the absence of a predicate argument structure leaves entirely open the relations and roles of any overt argument.

No argument need be expressed, however. This construction occurs commonly with no argument as a general event inquiry:

(10.40) **n-e** **heve**
   RL-3.SBJ what
   What happened?

As well as a general event inquiry, this commonly occurs as a generalised response to any approach, functionally equivalent to English questions like *what do you want?* (The use of **ehe** 'yes' is not an appropriate response to an approach, in the way that *yes?* is in English.) The use of this construction as a response to a conversational opening often involves a reduction of the clause to the interrogative alone, as in (10.41)a. An equally common alternative involves **heve** as the subject of **-u** 'be thus', as in (10.41)b.

(10.41) a. **heve**
   what
   What [is it]?

b. **heve-u**
   what-be.thus
   What is it?/How is it?
The use of *heve* as a proform replacing the predicate occurs in another common conversational opener:

(10.42) \[ n-o \quad heve \quad bo \quad ago \]
RL-2.SBJ what CNT youSG

How are you?

Not all event interrogation involves an interrogative proform replacing the predicate, however. The function is often performed instead by what is formally participant interrogation. In this strategy the event in question is expressed as an argument, typically the complement of the verb *frinhe* 'work':

(10.43) \[ heve \quad n-o-ke \quad friinhe-i-na \quad ago \]
what RL-2.SBJ-PRF work-3SGO-thaN youSG

What were you doing?

10.2.2.2 Supplementary detail interrogation

Certain interrogative constructions are used to seek further information about a participant or state or event, the general identity or nature of which is already established. There are three kinds of such questions: those seeking to identify the specific relevant member or subclass of an established class of entities ('which' questions, with the interrogative proform *heve*); those seeking to identify the manner in which an established event takes place (also with *heve*); and those seeking to identify the number or quantity of an established entity (using *niha* 'how many/much').

10.2.2.2.1 *Heve* 'which' questions

Questions which seek to identify the specific identity of a member or subclass of a class of entities have the interrogative proform *heve* 'what' in post-head core modifier position in an NP with the relevant nominal as head, as in speaker B's question in (10.44).

(10.44) A. ...marha-pau ine, a iusi-ni gai ġazu
    pain-head thisR 1.SBJ use-3SGO weEXC wood
    ...this headache, we use a tree.

B. ġazu heve ba-ia
    wood what ALT-PRO
    Which tree?

The presence of the alternative marker *ba* in (10.44) is typical in questions of this kind, but not obligatory. Arguments of any kind may be questioned in this way, including peripherals:

(10.45) ka nare heve ta lao-na buala
    LOC day what SB go-thatN PNLOC
    On which day [is it] that [you] will go to Buala?'

Questions of this kind may be used to identify specific class members, as in (10.45), where a unique date is sought. They are also used to identify a subclass, as in (10.44), where the information sought is the species of tree used, not the specific instantiation of that species.

*Heve* is used most commonly to specify participants. However it may also be used to seek specification of a predicate. With this function it occurs in immediate post-head adverbial modifier position:

(10.46) A. ara n-a foğra-nau
    I RL-1.SBJ be.sick-1SGO
    I'm sick.
B. n-o foğra heve
RL-2.SBJ be.sick what
What are you sick with?

Here it is the specific illness that is in question.

10.2.2.2 Gela heve 'in what manner/to what extent' questions

Questions of manner and extent may be formed using a construction in which a clause initial verb is modified by a subordinate clause with the predicate g-e-la (the neutral auxiliary plus 'go') and heve as its complement. When the verb modified is a stative verb the clause questions the extent to which the state applies:

(10.47) a. dou g-e-la heve are e-u
be.big NT-3.SBJ-go what thoseN 3.SBJ-be.thus
How big were they? [lit. 'Those are/were big like what?']

b. mañava g-e-la heve
be.hot NT-3.SBJ-go what
How hot? [lit. 'Hot like what?]'

When it occurs with a dynamic verb it is the manner in which the event takes place that is in question:

(10.48) a. lao g-e-la heve sara buala
go NT-3.SBJ-go what thereD PNLOC
How will you get to Buala? [ie. what means of travel] [lit. 'Go like what to Buala?]'

b. tetegu g-e-la heve
fish(V) NT-3.SBJ-go what
How did you fish? [ie. what fishing method] [lit. 'Fish like what?]'

In the g-e-la heve construction the verb itself is the subject of the g-e-la predicate. The verb alone fulfils this function and not a verb complex, so no auxiliary precedes the verb and no other verb complex elements occur. Nor can the verb be accompanied by a complement or adjunct.

This is not the only strategy available for manner interrogation, however. Two constructions with the 'be thus' verb -u also occur. These are discussed in 10.2.3.1.

10.2.2.3 Niha 'how many/much' questions

In inquiries about the quantity of a participant the interrogative proform niha 'how many/much' occurs in pre-head quantifier position:

(10.49) a. niha mane n-e-ke toğla-i-na zora ine
how.many man RL-3.SBJ-PRF chase-3SGO-thatN pig thisR
How many men chased the pig?

niha maneko n-e hod-i-ri-re mane
how.many pawpaw RL-3.SBJ take-TR-3PLO-thoseN he
How many pawpaw has he brought?

Any argument type may be modified in this way. Typically the interrogative argument is located clause initially, and as with argument interrogation (discussed above), this requires a postverbal demonstrative enclitic. The exception to this is where the quantity in question is not of a participant, but of the event itself. In this case the construction is formally identical to that for questions of participant quantity, except
that the nominal modified by *niha* must be *fata* 'occasion', and that there is no postverbal demonstrative enclitic:

(10.50)  

\[
\text{niha fata lao ago buala} \\
\text{how many occasion go youSG PNLOC} \\
\text{How many times did you go to Buala?}
\]

With participant quantity, although the relevant argument is typically located clause initially, it may occur in the unmarked clause position for that argument. Again as with argument interrogation, this does not require a postverbal demonstrative enclitic:

(10.51)  

a. *mane-dou ana n-e turi-tufa turi-ri niha suli*

\[
\text{man-be.big thatN RL-3.SBJ tell-affect tell-3PLO how many children} \\
\text{That chief told stories [to] how many children?}
\]

b. *suli are n-e faroh-i mheke-na ka-niha ţazu*

\[
\text{child thoseN RL-3.SBJ strike-TR dog-thatN LOC how many wood} \\
\text{Those children hit the dog with how many sticks?}
\]

As with other interrogative types, the interrogative form, in this case with its nominal head, may function as the subject of an equative clause. In (10.52) the predicate is *ago* 'youSG':

(10.52)  

\[
\text{niha komhu-mu-na ago} \\
\text{how many year-2SGP thatN youSG} \\
\text{How old are you? [lit. How many years [are] you?]}
\]

### 10.2.3 Contextual interrogation

Functionally, two types of context interrogatives exist: manner ('how') questions and cause ('why') questions. Both involve subordinating constructions.

#### 10.2.3.1 Manner questions

Three strategies exist in the language for forming questions regarding the manner in which an event took place. One, also an interrogative of extent, is discussed in 10.2.2.2.2. The remaining two strategies require the verb *-u* 'be thus'. In one of these the interrogative proform *heve* 'what' occurs as the subject of *-u*, with the event in question expressed as a subordinated clause:

(10.53)  

\[
\text{heve n-e-u [meri tarai-na ka-man ta fo̱ra-na-o]} \\
\text{what RL-3.SBJ be.thus PN pray-thatN LOC-man SB be.sick-3SGP thatNV} \\
\text{How did Mary pray for the man who is sick? [lit. What was so, that Mary prayed...?]
}\]

In this construction the 'be thus' main clause always occurs sentence initially. The subordinate clause is of the type that has no auxiliary and no subordinating particle. (The *ta* subordinator in (10.53) heads a relative clause on the adjunct of the subordinate event clause.) The structure of the subordinate clause is dictated by the constraints applicable to a subordinate clause of this type.

In the second manner interrogative constructions two clauses are coordinated, and the sequencer *ge* is present. The form *g-e-la heve* 'in what manner' (lit. 'go what') occurs in an initial clause which is relatively bleached semantically, typically with *-u* 'be thus' or auxiliary alone as predicate. The second clause expresses the event in question:

(10.54)  

a. *g-e-la heve e-u ge, ġ-a fa-lehe-i-řfa ģobilologu*

\[
\text{NT-3.SBJ go what 3.SBJ be.thus SEQ NT-1.SBJ CS-die-3SGO-IMM PN} \\
\text{How will it be so I kill Gobilologu? [lit. Go what that will be then I kill Gobilologu?]}
\]
In this construction the clause expressing the main event has a neutral auxiliary, and the predicate is marked with the immediacy marker $\text{i\text{\textbar\text{}}a}$. In both constructions order of the elements is iconic, as is the use of the sequencer in the second construction. Both constructions involve an expression of some action or event which is the manner by which the main event will be brought to realisation. The Kokota concept equivalent to the English how is one in which an action is performed or state exists that provides the means by which the main event occurs, and is the context in which it occurs.

10.2.3.2 Cause questions

Questions of cause have a similar structure to those of manner, with two clauses conjoined and the sequencer $\text{ge}$ present. The second clause expresses the main event in question and is marked with the immediacy marker $\text{i\text{\textbar\text{}}a}$. The first clause consists of $\text{heve}$ 'what' and a 'be thus' clause:

(10.55) a. $\text{heve n-e-u ge n-o si-siko-\text{i\textbar\text{}}a}$ ago

$\text{RL-3.SBJ-be.thus SEQ RL-2.SBJ RD-steal-IMM youSG}$

Why are you stealing? [lit. What is thus so you are stealing?] b. $\text{heve e-u ge g-e lao-\text{i\textbar\text{}}a buala}$

$\text{3.SBJ-be.thus SEQ NT-3.SBJ go-IMM PNLOC}$

Why will he go to Buala?

In this construction the clause expressing the main event has a realis auxiliary if the event is realis, and a neutral auxiliary if it is irrealis. In the first of the conjoined clauses the auxiliary plus 'be thus' is optional. Or to be more precise, the first element of this construction need not be a 'be thus' clause, it may be the interrogative proform alone:

(10.56) $\text{heve bla ge g-a lehe-\text{i\textbar\text{}}a ara}$

$\text{LMT SEQ NT-1.SBJ die-IMM-I}$

Why will I die? [lit. Just what so I die?]

As with manner interrogatives, the order of the components is iconic, reflecting the order of events in which an action takes place or state exists which causes the event of the second clause to take place. Notions of 'why' and 'how' in Kokota are closer than in English, with, in effect, three constructions available to inquire about an event or state which provides the context for a further event or state.

In addition to constructions in which the resultant event is expressed, it is possible to make a 'why' inquiry with a single clause in which $\text{heve}$ 'what', marked with the immediacy marker $\text{i\textbar\text{}}a$, is the predicate. The resultant event is unexpressed:

(10.57) $\text{n-e heve-\text{i\textbar\text{}}a}$

$\text{RL-3.SBJ what-IMM}$

Why?

3 Although as Pawley (pers. comm.) points out, English has how come as a 'why?' interrogation strategy.