

## Chapter 10 Imperative and interrogative constructions

### 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. *o la ka-ni-nā tagi-mi*  
 2.SBJ go look-3SGO-IMM RFL-2PLP  
 Go and look at him yourselves!
- b. *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) *zaho fea*  
 go INIT  
 Go away!

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

- (10.3) *da aḡe kae-di-u*  
 1INC.SBJ go see-3PLO-PRG  
 Let's go and see
- 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) *aria d-aḡe nhura-i fitupoḡu*  
 1INC.IMP<sup>1</sup> 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:

<sup>1</sup> 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.

- (10.5) a. *t-au la aria da-ke pulo*  
 SB-exist CND 1INC.IMP 1INC.SBJ-PRF return  
 If that's so then let's go back!
- b. *o-ge lao ge tahe la-ri bla*  
 2.SBJ-PRS go and tell go-3PLO LMT  
 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 ġilu*  
 2.SBJ-NEG go thereP inside  
 Don't go in there!
- b. *teo ġ-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 ġe-da aġe-u*  
 be.not NT-1INC.SBJ go-PRG  
 Let's not go!
- b. *da-ti teteġu-ṅa gita 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 aḡe-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 ḡ-e triki-nā 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, in a sense a single alternative, 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) *sisigā e ḡauai 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:

- (10.13) *liḡomo n-e salupu bo ba, n-e toga*  
 PN RL-3.SBJ pass CNT ALT RL-3.SBJ arrive  
 Did the Ligomo [a ship] go past or did it stop?

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:<sup>2</sup>

- (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':

<sup>2</sup> 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'.

- (10.16) a. *t-au-ne e tore-i ka hei manei*  
 SB-exist-thisR 3.SBJ ask-3SGO LOC who he  
 This [question] he will ask to whom?
- b. *ka hei n-o-ke hod-i-ri-re ago sileni are*  
 LOC who RL-2.SBJ-PRF take-TR-3PLO-thoseN youSG money thoseN  
 Who did you get that money from?
- c. *manei n-e lao buala tareme-na hei*  
 he RL-3.SBJ go PNLOC with-3SGP who  
 Who did he go to Buala with?

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 nan̄ha-mu-na ago*  
 who name-2SGP-thatN youSG  
 What is your name?

#### 10.2.2.1.1.2 *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 toḡla-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:

- (10.20) *maneri n-e gorha heve*  
 they RL-3.SBJ paddle what  
 What did they paddle?

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 fad-i-na ago memeha-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 manei no-g̃u 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 frin̄he-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 *n̄a*:

- (10.26) a. *niha-na ge da lao-nā buala*  
 when-thatN SEQ 1INC.SBJ go-IMM PNLOC  
 When will we go to Buala?
- b. *niha-na ge ḡ-e fa-lehe-i-nā manei zora ana*  
 when-thatN SEQ NT-3.SBJ CS-die-3SGO-IMM he pig thatN  
 When will he kill the pig?

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 manei 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 ḡlepo 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 liḡomo*  
 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.

#### 10.2.2.1.1.4 *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) *mane-na n-e gorha la hae*  
 man-thatN RL-3.SBJ paddle go where  
 Where is that man paddling to?

*Hae* occurs in this unmarked position in the standard Kokota greeting:

- (10.32) *lao hae (ago)*  
 go where you  
 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) *\*ka hae n-o-ke doli-na ago*  
 At where were you born?

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

- (10.34) *ka heve-o n-e lisa-i-na manei ia vilai*  
 LOC what-thatNV RL-3.SBJ put-3SGO-thatN he theSG knife  
 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, *hae* also forms a single complex interrogative proform with the deictic locative *sara* 'there (distal)':

- (10.35) *sara hae manei n-e-ke togla-i-na ia zora*  
 thereD where he RL-3.SBJ-PRF chase-3SGO-thatN theSG pig  
 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.

*Hae* is used to inquire about spatial locations with any function in the clause. Thus in (10.30) *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) *hae n-o-ke klisu mai-na gau*  
 where RL-2.SBJ-PRF start come-thatN youPL  
 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. *hae ta lao-n-ago*  
 where SB go-thatN-youSG  
 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 ġrui*  
 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 heve bo 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 *friñhe* 'work':

- (10.43) *heve n-o-ke friñhe-i-na 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 ḡazu*  
 pain-head thisR 1.SBJ use-3SGO weEXC wood  
 ...this headache, we use a tree.
- B. *ḡazu 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 foḡra-nau*  
 I RL-1.SBJ be.sick-1SGO  
 I'm sick.

- B. *n-o fog̃ra heve*  
 RL-2.SBJ be.sick what  
 What are you sick with?

Here it is the specific illness that is in question.

#### 10.2.2.2.2 *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 *g̃-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 g̃-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 g̃-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 g̃-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. *teteḡu g̃-e-la heve*  
 fish(V) NT-3.SBJ-go what  
 How did you fish? [ie. what fishing method] [lit. 'Fish like what?']

In the *g̃-e-la heve* construction the verb itself is the subject of the *g̃-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.

#### 10.2.2.2.3 *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 toḡla-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 manei*  
 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) *niha fata lao ago buala*  
 how.many occasion go youSG PNLOC  
 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*  
 man-be.big thatN RL-3.SBJ tell-affect tell-3PLO how.many children  
 That chief told stories [to] how many children?
- b. *suli are n-e faroh-i mheke-na ka-niha gazu*  
 child thoseN RL-3.SBJ strike-TR dog-thatN LOC-how.many wood  
 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) *niha komhu-mu-na ago*  
 how.many year-2SGP-thatN youSG  
 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 subordinate clause:

- (10.53) *heve n-e-u [meri tarai-na ka-man ta foḡra-na-o]*  
 what RL-3.SBJ-be.thus PN pray-thatN LOC-man SB be.sick-3SGP-thatNV  
 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 *ḡ-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. *ḡ-e-la heve e-u ge, ḡ-a fa-lehe-i-nā ḡobilologu*  
 NT-3.SBJ-go what 3.SBJ-be.thus SEQ NT-1.SBJ CS-die-3SGO-IMM PN  
 How will it be so I kill Gobilologu? [lit. Go what that will be then I kill Gobilologu?]

- b. *ḡ-e-la heve e-ni ara an-lau ge*  
 NT-3.SBJ-go what IRR-SGO I thatN-SPC SEQ  
 How will I do that so [lit. Go what [that] I will do that so...]
- ḡ-e bnakoa-n̄a fa ka-kave-i manei e-u ba-ine*  
 NT-3.SBJ be slow-IMM CS RD-descend-3SGO he 3.SBJ-be.thus ALT-thisR  
 he slowly takes it down?

In this construction the clause expressing the main event has a neutral auxiliary, and the predicate is marked with the immediacy marker *n̄a*.

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 *ge* present. The second clause expresses the main event in question and is marked with the immediacy marker *n̄a*. The first clause consists of *heve* 'what' and a 'be thus' clause:

- (10.55) a. *heve n-e-u ge n-o si-siko-n̄a ago*  
 what 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. *heve e-u ge ḡ-e lao-n̄a buala*  
 what 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) *heve bla ge ḡ-a lehe-n̄-ara*  
 what 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,<sup>3</sup> 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 *heve* 'what', marked with the immediacy marker *n̄a*, is the predicate. The resultant event is unexpressed:

- (10.57) *n-e heve-n̄a*  
 RL-3.SBJ what-IMM  
 Why?

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