

## 8 Complex sentences

### 8.1 Relative clauses

First, some terminology: subjects of intransitive clauses are said to be in S-function, subjects of transitive clauses are in A-function, and objects are in O-function. The ‘head’ of the relative clause will be taken to be the NP to which the relative clause ascribes an additional semantic property – so in *The man who came hit me*, the head is *the man* and it is in S function in the relative clause and A-function in the matrix clause.

In Yêlî Dnye, relative clauses have the following properties: they can have both restrictive and non-restrictive interpretations, they are marked by special relative pronouns, they are ‘internally headed’ in the sense of Keenan (1985) bearing the case of their role in the relative clause, and NPs in most grammatical relations can be relativized. Beyond this, they have special quirks to be discussed below.

Most, but not all, relative clauses are marked by the use of one of the relative pronouns: *n:ii* ‘that/which/who’, *mw:a* ‘who’, *kwéli* ‘the place where’. The pronoun *n:ii* also occurs with demonstrative adjectives, as in *kê n:ii*, ‘that one’, but the other forms are restricted to relatives. *N:ii* occurs more often than *mw:a* ‘the human who’ even for humans, but both are then possible:

- (369) *mu dmââdî mw:a/n:ii kee wo*  
That girl who/that ascend 3sREM.WEAK  
‘The girl who came up’

Certain structures do not require a relative pronoun at all (whether these are elided, or to be understood paratactically, is unclear):

- (370) *a tp:ee ka tuu nî y:ângo, pââ ndîi*  
my son DAT axe 1sPast give.to3REM body big  
‘The axe I gave to my son is a big one’

The relative clause normally precedes the rest of the matrix clause, but this is variable. Order of phrasal elements within the relative clause is free, as generally in Yêlî syntax. I will use square brackets to show the relative clause, and bold to demarcate the noun which the relative clause modifies, as in the following example:

- (371) [*tuu n:ii nî ndê ngê*] *nt:ee kî Ø*  
 axe REL 1sPAST made 3sOREM.PI sea CERT 3sREM  
*ghay wo*  
 fall.PI 3sS.REM.WEAK  
 ‘The axe which I made fell into the ocean’

Here the head NP *tuu* is both the subject of the main clause and the object of the relative clause – sometimes however, especially if the NP is oblique, it may be resumptively repeated (either as noun or pronoun) in the later clause. The head noun nearly always takes the case endings assigned to it by the role in the relative (modifying) clause – so that by case-marking criteria Yêlî Dnye can be said to have ‘internal’ relative clauses, where the head noun functions syntactically as part of the internal clause, a relatively rare pattern associated with A–O–V/S–V word order (Keenan 1985:163). Consider for example the following sentence where the head noun is the object of the main clause and the ergative agent of the relative clause, and carries the ergative case (note too how it is surrounded by elements of the relative clause rather than the main clause).

- (372) [*mbwêmê pi n:ii ngê dê vy:a kêdê vy:a*  
 pig person REL ERG 3sIMMPI hit CERT+3sIMM hit  
 ‘I hit the man who killed my pig’

However, an exception is experiencer relative clauses, that is, where the head noun plays a role as an experiencer in the relative clause. In that case, the head noun can occur inside the main clause with the case appropriate to the main clause, leaving a resumptive pronoun in the relative clause to carry the experiencer case appropriate to the relative clause:

- (373) *Mwonî ngê [pini n:ii Ø] dî vy:a [dómu*  
 Mwonî ERG man.SPEC REL ABS 3IMMPI hit hunger  
*u ngwo t:a]*  
 3sEXP hang  
 ‘Mwonî hit the man who was hungry (today)’

In this construction, the relative clause is discontinuous, but this can also happen without the experiencer construction – compare the minimal pair in examples (373) and (374):

- (374) *Mwonî ngê [pini n:ii Ø] dī vy:a [kî- Ø*  
Mwonî ERG man.SPEC REL ABS 3IMMPI hit CERT.3sCI.IMM  
*nod:enod:e]*  
become.angry.C  
'Mwonî hit the man who was angry (today)'

Here the head noun 'the man' is both Absolutive in the main and in the relative clause.

Since the relative clause normally comes first, it may introduce an NP not then repeated in the main clause. Thus both the following are possible, the second with a resumptive noun case-marked for its role in the main clause:

- (375) a. *[pini n:ii dê t:a], a mbwê mê dê*  
man.SPEC REL 3IMMPI arrive my pig3 IMMPI  
*t:âmo*  
stole  
'The man who came stole my pig'
- b. *[pini n:ii dê t:a], yi pini ngê a*  
man.SPEC REL 3IMMPI arrive ANAPH man ERG my  
*mbwê mê dê t:âmo*  
pig 3IMMPI stole  
'The man who came, he's the one who stole my pig'

NPs in most functions can be relativized. Following the terminology of A, S, and O roles or functions, the following (Table 8.1) are attested patterns of relativization:

**Table 8.1:** Patterns of relativization (✓ denotes NP is relativizable).

Role in Matrix	Role in Relative Clause			
	A	S	O	Oblique/ Experiencer
A	✓	✓	✓	✓
S	✓	✓	✓	
O	✓	✓	✓	
Oblique	✓	?	✓	
Equative	✓	✓	✓	✓
Experiencer		✓	✓	

The following sentences illustrate some of these patterns, with the relative clause in square brackets and the head noun bold, and a resumptive NP or pronoun (if any) underlined. By the side is an annotation of the case and grammatical role of the NP in the main clause and (shown in brackets) the relative clause (e.g. ABS [ERG] codes Absolutive in the main clause and Ergative in the relative clause, similarly A [O] codes A role in main, O role in relative). The first set of examples covers the nine core-case permutations:

### 8.1.1 Relative clauses with *n:ii* – CASE – grammatical relation

ERG[ERG] A[A]

- (376) [***pini*** ***n:ii*** ***ngê*** *a* *mbwêmê* *dê* *vy:a*], *myaa*  
 man.spec REL ERG my pig 3IMMPI hit, 3IMMREP  
*vy:a nê*  
 hit 1sO  
 ‘The man who killed my pig also hit me’

ERG[ABS] A[S]

- (377) [***pini*** ***n:ii*** *da* *lê*], *a* *mbwêmê* *dê* *t:âmo*  
 man.spec REL 3IMMCLS go my pig 3IMMPI steal  
 ‘The man who came stole my pig’

ERG[ABS] A[O]

- (378) [***pini*** ***n:ii*** *dî* *vy:a*], *a* *mbwêmê* (*yinê*)  
 man.spec REL 1sIMM hit my pig (the one)  
*dê t:âmo*  
 3IMMPI steal  
 ‘The man whom I hit, (he’s the one who) stole my pig’

ABS[ERG] S[A]

- (379) [***pini*** ***n:ii*** ***ngê*** *a* *mbwêmê* *dê* *t:âmo*], *dê* *mbêpê*  
 man.spec REL ERG my pig 3IMMPI steal 3IMM run  
 ‘The man who stole my pig ran away’

ABS[ABS] S[O]

- (380) [***pini*** ***n:ii*** *dî* *vy:a*], *dê* *mbêpê*  
 man.spec REL 1sIMM hit 3IMMPI run  
 ‘The man whom I hit ran away’

ABS[ABS] S[S]

- (381) [*pini*     *n:ii*     *dĩ*     *mbêpê*], *awêde*     *dê*     *pw:onu*  
 man.spec REL 3IMM run today 3IMM die  
 ‘The man who ran away died today’

ABS[ERG] O[A]

- (382) [*pini*     *n:ii*     *ngê*     *a*     *mbwêmê*     *dê*     *t:âmo*], *dê*     *vy:a*  
 man.spec REL ERG my pig 3IMM steal 3IMM hit  
 ‘I hit the man who stole my pig’

ABS[ABS] O[S]

- (383) [*pini*     *n:ii*     *dê*     *mbêpê*], *dĩ*     *vy:a*  
 man.spec REL 3IMM ran 1sIMM hit  
 ‘I hit the man who ran away’

ABS[ABS] O[O]

- (384) [*pini*     *n:ii*     *dê*     *vy:a*     *a*     *mbwó*] *yinê*     *dĩ*     *vy:a*  
 man.spec REL 3IMM hit my brother the.one 1sIMM hit  
 ‘I hit the man who my brother hit’

Some variant sentences with different word orders and also examples with oblique NPs follow:

ABS[ABS] O[O]

- (385) [*yi*     *pini*     *kêdê*     *vy:a*     *a*     *mbwó*     *ngê*     *m:a*     *pini*  
 that man CERT3IMM hit my brother ERG yesterday man  
*n:ii*] *vy:a*  
 REL hit  
 ‘I hit the man whom my brother hit yesterday’

ERG[ERG] A[A]

- (386) [*a*     *mbwêmê*     *n:ii*     *ngê*     *vy:a*], *dê*     *vy:a*     *nê*  
 my pig REL ERG hit 3IMM hit 1sO  
 ‘The man who killed my pig hit me’

ERG[ABS] A[O]

- (387) [*pini*     *n:ii*     *nê*     *vy:a*] *a*     *mbwêmê*     *dê*     *t:âmo*  
 man.spec REL 1s hit my pig 3IMM steal  
 ‘The man whom I hit stole my pig’

ERG[ABS] A[S]

- (388) [*pini n:ii dê t:aa*], *a mbwêmê dê t:âmo*  
 man.spec REL 3IMM arrive my pig 3IMM steal  
 ‘The man who came stole my pig’

DAT[ERG] Obl[A]

- (389) [*mbwêmê pini n:ii ngê dê châpwo*], *kê u kwo*  
 pig man.spec REL ERG 3IMM cut money to him  
*dê y:oo.*  
 1sIMM give.to.3  
 ‘I gave the shell money to the man who cut the pig’

ABS[ABS] O[O]

- (390) *yi pini ka kê kêdê y:oo,*  
 that man DAT money CERT3IMM give.to.3  
*[m:aam:aa ngê kê n:ii a ka dê kê].*  
 FZ ERG money REL 1sDAT 3IMM give.to.1  
 ‘I gave to the man the shell money which my auntie gave me’

ABS[ABS] O[S]

- (391) [*kê n:ii a péé k:oo tóó*], *yi pini ka*  
 money REL my basket inside sitting that man DAT  
*kêdê y:oo.*  
 CERT3IMM give.to.3  
 ‘I gave to the man the shell money which was in my basket’

ABS[ERG] O[A]

- (392) [*pini n:ii ngê a mbwêmê dê vy:a*], *kêdê*  
 man.spec REL ERG my pig 3IMM hit CERT3IMM  
*mbêpê.*  
 run  
 ‘The man who killed my pig ran away’

ABS[INST] O[Obl]

- (393) [*tuu n:ii ngê ngomo noo wuwó*] *Mwonî ngê*  
 axe REL INST house 1sREMCI construct Mwonî ERG  
*kê pwââ.*  
 CERT3IMM break  
 ‘John broke the axe which I used to make this house’

ABS[ABS] O[O]

- (394) [Mwonî ngê **dmââdî n:ii** mbwili ngê], kî nyââ.  
 Mwonî ERG girl REL impregnate MFS3sO CERT3 marry  
 ‘Mwonî married the girl whom he made pregnant’

ABS[ABS] O[O]

- (395) [Mwonî ngê **dmââdî n:ii** nyââ],  
 Mwonî ERG girl REL marry  
 Mwolâ ngê kî mbwili ngê.  
 Mwolâ ERG CERT3 impregnate MFS3sO  
 ‘Mwolâ made pregnant the girl whom Mwonî married’

ABS[ABS] O[O]

- (396) [Mwolâ ngê **dmââdî n:ii** mbwili ngê],  
 Mwolâ ERG girl REL impregnate MFS3sO  
 Mwonî ngê kî nyââ.  
 Mwonî ERG CERT3 marry  
 ‘Mwonî married the girl whom Mwola made pregnant’

ABS[ABS] O[S]

- (397) [Mwonî ngê **dmââdî n:ii** mbwili ngê] kn:aa  
 Mwonî ERG girl REL impregnate MFS3sO different  
 pini p:uu kî maa yéé.  
 man PP CERT REP3sIMMPI marry.intrans  
 ‘The girl Mwonî made pregnant got married to another man’

DAT[ABS] Obl[O]

- (398) [Mwonî ngê **dmââdî n:ii** mbwili ngê],  
 Mwonî ERG girl REL impregnate MFS3sO  
 Mwonî u kênê ngê ndapî yî dmââdî  
 Mwonî his uncle ERG shell.money ANAPH girl  
 ka dê y:oo.  
 DAT 3IMM give.to3  
 ‘Mwonî’s uncle gave ndap (shell money) to the girl whom Mwonî made pregnant’

COM[ABS] Obl[O]

- (399) [Mwonî ngê **dmââdî** **n:i** mwbili ngê]  
 Mwonî ERG girl REL impregnate MFS3sO  
 Alotau u k:i kî lee knâpwo.  
 Alotau 3s WITH CERT3 go.FOL dREM.IV  
 ‘Mwonî went to Alotau with the girl he made pregnant’

EXP[ABS] Obl[S]

- (400) [**pini** **n:i** Kêna da ndê] dómu u ngwo  
 man.spec REL Kêna CLS3IMM.PI come.from hunger 3sEXP  
 a t:a.  
 3PRS hanging  
 ‘The man who came from Kêna is hungry’

ERG[EXP] A [Obl]

- (401) [**pini** **n:i** ngê dómu t:a] Mwonî dê vy:a.  
 man.spec REL ERG hunger hanging Mwonî 3sIMM hit  
 ‘The man who was hungry hit Mwonî’

One clear generalization from these patterns is that if the head noun plays an oblique role in the main clause, requiring case-marking as Experiencer, Dative, or Comitative, then the external case is carried by a resumptive pronoun or a repeated NP.

It is also possible to relativize an NP inside a PP, as in the following where a resumptive or appositive NP is required in the main clause:

- (402) *Nkéli* *n:i* *k:oo* *woo* *wo*, *yi* *nkéli* *mb:aamb:aa*  
 boat REL inside embark 3sREM.WEAK ANAPH boat good  
 ‘The boat into which he embarked is a good one’

Finally, ‘the place where’ relatives with *kwéli* fall into the same pattern as *n:i*-relatives with heads which play an oblique role in the main clause. In this case, the head noun is typically a locative of course in both clauses. Following the pattern for obliques, the relative clause requires a resumptive adverb in the main clause (recollect that locatives take zero case-marking):



(403) *kwéli* ‘The place where’

- a. [*kwéli*        *nê* *tóó*],    *yi*        *pini*        *y:i*  
      place.where 1s    sitting    ANAPH    man.spec    ANAPH.LOC  
      *kêdê*        *lê*  
      CERT3IMM    go  
      ‘The man came to where I was’
- b. *ye*        *doo*        *vyîmî*,        *mudu*        *y:i*,  
      ANAPH    3sREMCi    climbing    upper        ANAPH.LOC  
      [*d:aa*    *dmi*        *kwéli*        *doo*        *ya*]  
      moss       CLF        place.where    3sREMCi    sitting  
      ‘He was climbing, up there, where the moss covering  
      was’ (1997\_v8g.txt, l.11)
- c. [*kwéli*        *wumê*                            *lêpî*],    *w:ââ*    *y:i*  
      place.where    3HAB.PROXCI.MOT    going    dog        ANAPH.LOC  
      *a*                *lêpî*  
      3HAB.PROX    going  
      ‘Wherever the people go, the dogs go there’

Many temporal clauses (see also §8.5) are built using relativization. For example:

- (404) *dini*    *ghi*    *n:ii*    *ngê*    *nê*    *wédi*,        *yed:oo*    *dê*        *lê*  
      time    part    REL    ADV    1s    sago.making    then        3IMM    go  
      ‘At the time at which I was making sago, he left’

## 8.2 Indicative conditionals

Indicative conditionals are formed in a quite unrelated way to Counterfactual conditionals, which are marked on the verbal proclitic of both antecedent and consequent, for which see §8.3 below. Indicative conditionals are marked on the antecedent of the conditional only, by replacement of the normal post-verbal inflectional enclitic, for example,

- (405) *ngmê* (PFSubj.3sObjPI&CI.PROX) → *knomomê*  
      *té* (MFSubj3PIObj.PI&CI.PROX) → *tomomê*

The protasis, the marked clause, always seems to come first, and there is a particle *ye* ‘then’ that often heads the apodosis or consequent.

In some tense/aspect/person/number conditions, another enclitic can follow the base form *knomomê*, as in:

- (406) *m:iituwo*                      *Kostka mbwémi*                      *vyee knomomê dê*,  
 day.before.yesterday Kostka brother.dyad hit COND Dual  
*n:aa*                      *vyee*  
 1s.FUT.CI hit.CI  
 ‘If he hit Kostka and brother the day before yesterday, I will hit him’

Many conditionals are expressed without these special forms, by using a dubitative particle like *apê* or *ndoo apê*, and increasingly by formation with English *if*, so that a sentence like a. below is increasingly being replaced with b. (to an extent that there is some inconsistency in the usage of the paradigms below):

- (407) a. *m:iituwo*                      *Kostka vyee knomomê*, *n:aa*                      *vyee*  
 day.before.yesterday Kostka hit.CI COND 1s.FUT.CI hit.CI  
 ‘If he hit Kostka the day before yesterday, I will hit him’  
 b. *If Kostka vyee ngê*,                      *n:aa*                      *vyee*  
 if Kostka hit.CI MFS3sOREM 1s.FUT.CI hit.CI  
 ‘If he hit Kostka, I will hit him’

Positive and negative conditionals are built essentially on the same forms, but there are distinct conditional enclitics for intransitive and transitive clauses, as always in the enclitic paradigms. We take the positive indicatives first.

### 8.2.1 Positive conditionals

The intransitive conditional paradigm (Table 8.2) collapses all person/number/tense distinctions, by replacing the normal enclitic with indeclinable *knomomê*, except with Continuous aspect Habituals where the two combine.

**Table 8.2:** Intransitive Conditional enclitics (bold) with non-conditional forms (non-bold) for comparison.

	SUBJECT NUMBER		
	Sing	Dual	Plural
PI REM, Hab	Ø (strong roots) wo (weak roots) <b>knomomê</b>	<i>knâpwo</i> <b>knomomê</b>	<i>dniye</i> <b>knomomê</b>

Table 8.2 (continued)

	SUBJECT NUMBER		
	Sing	Dual	Plural
PI FUT/Tod/Yest	Ø <i>knomomê</i>	<i>knî</i> <i>knomomê</i>	<i>dmi</i> <i>knomomê</i>
CI now/Today (proximal)	Ø <i>knomomê</i>	<i>mo</i> <i>knomomê</i>	<i>té</i> <i>knomomê</i>
CI Yester/Rem/Tomorr (distal)	Ø	Ø	Ø
CI Hab Discontinued	<i>knomomê</i>	<i>knomomê</i>	<i>knomomê</i>
CI HabPROX	<i>yédi</i> <i>knomomê yédi</i>	<i>nódó</i> <i>knomomê nódó</i>	<i>nyédi</i> <i>knomomê nyédi</i>

The consequent can be in any mood or tense, as illustrated by the following.

- (408) a. *da lee knomomê, a ka dpò lee*  
 3ImmPast.CLS go.FOL COND 1s DAT 3IMP.PI go.FOL  
*wee*  
 3sS.PI.IMPIntrans  
 ‘If he comes, he must come to me’
- b. *Alotau wanyi lee knomomê, Diakonós k:oo*  
 Alotau 1d.FUTPI go.fol COND (boat name) inside  
*wanyi wo knî*  
 1d.FUTPI embark d.S.Intrans  
 ‘If we two go to Alotau, we will embark on Diakonós’
- c. *Alotau wadpî lee knomomê, a letter Titus ka*  
 Alotau FUT2d go.FOL COND my letter Titus DAT  
*dpî y:ee nyoo*  
 2d.IMP.PI give.to.3 2dS.3sO.IMP.Trans  
 ‘If you2 go to Alotau, give my letter to Titus’

The following examples illustrate how, even though tense/aspect information is neutralized in the conditional intransitive enclitic, it is preserved in the proclitic which carries the same information (except where it is neutralized there too):

- (409) a. *m:iitwuwó Ø lee knomomê, ye*  
 day.before.yesterday 3REM.PI go.FOL COND then  
*n:aa lêpî*  
 1sImmFUTCI going  
 ‘If he went the day before yesterday, then I will be going’

- b. *dê lee knomomê, ye n:aa lêpî*  
 3IMMPI go.FOL COND then 1sImmFUTCI going  
 ‘If he went (today), then I will be going’
- c. *w-a lee knomomê, w-anî lê*  
 IRR-3FUTPI go.FOL COND IRR-1sFUTPI go  
 ‘If he goes, I will go’
- d. *a lêpî knomome, n:aa lêpî*  
 3PRS/FUTCI going COND 1sImmFUTCI going  
 ‘If he goes (today), I’ll go’
- e. *wa dpî lêpî knomomê, wanî lê*  
 2dFUTDIST.CI going COND 1sFUT.PI go  
 ‘If you2 will be going to that feast, then I will come’
- f. *wa dê lêpî knomomê, w:a nê lêpî*  
 dSFUTDIST.CI going COND 1sFUTDIST.CI going  
 ‘If they2 are going, I will go’

Loss of information does take place though, as shown by the following distinct 3<sup>rd</sup> person intransitive enclitics with borrowed *if* which all collapse onto the same intransitive conditional enclitic:

- (410) a. *if Ø lee knâpwo → lee knomomê*  
 if 3PAST.PI go.FOL 3d.PI.REM/HAB.Intrans  
 ‘If they2 have gone (day before yesterday) . . .’
- b. *if dê lee knî → lee knomomê*  
 if 3IMMPI go.FOL 3d.PI.PROX.Intrans  
 ‘If they2 have gone (earlier today). . .’
- c. *if Ø lee dniye → lee knomomê*  
 if 3PAST.PI go.FOL 3PIREM.PI  
 ‘If they3 have gone (the day before yesterday)’
- d. *if Ø lee dmi → lee knomomê*  
 if 3PAST.PI go.FOL 3PIPROX  
 ‘If they3 have gone (today or yesterday) . . .’

Given the extensive conflations, it is perhaps not surprising that the conditional enclitics are the only verbal enclitics that can be doubled up, e.g. to mark the intransitive Habitual Continuous. The following examples demonstrate that these second enclitics follow the rules for the normal indicative Habitual forms:

- (411) a. *Alotau a lêpî knomomê yédi, ye Titus*  
 Alotau 3CI going COND sSHABCI.IV then Titus  
*u kpêê*  
 his direct.experience  
 ‘If he used to go to Alotau, then he knows Titus’
- b. *mumdoo Alotau a lêpî knomomê nó dó, Titus*  
 really Alotau 3CI going COND dS.HABCI.IV Titus  
*yi kpêê*  
 3d/plPOSS direct.experience  
 ‘If they2 really used to go to Alotau, they2 (must) know Titus’
- c. *mumdoo Alotau a lêpî knomomê nyédi, Titus*  
 really Alotau 3CI going COND plSHABCI.IV Titus  
*yi kpêê*  
 3d/plPOSS direct.experience  
 ‘If they3 really used to go to Alotau, they3 (must) know Titus’
- d. *Alotau nye lêpî knomomê yédi, Titus*  
 Alotau 2sImmFUTCI going COND sS.HABCI.IV Titus  
*ngmêê*  
 (N)2s.experience  
 ‘If you1 used to go to Alotau, you1 (must) know Titus’
- e. *Alotau nmye lêpî knomomê nyédi, Titus*  
 Alotau 2plImmFUTCI going COND plS.HABCI.IV Titus  
*nmyi kpêê*  
 2plPOSS direct.experience  
 ‘If you3 used to go to Alotau, you3 (must) know Titus’
- f. *Alotau dpo lêpî knomomê nó dó, Titus*  
 Alotau 2d.ImmFUTCI going COND dS.HABCI.IV Titus  
*dpî kpêê*  
 2dPOSS direct.experience  
 ‘If you2 used to go to Alotau, you2 (must) know Titus’

In nonconditional intransitive sentences, the enclitic normally merely redundantly marks and sometimes disambiguates information in the proclitic, but in the transitive clause the enclitic alone carries cross-referencing of the object properties. Not surprisingly, then, the Transitive conditional enclitic paradigm is more complex, with the retention of some subject and object person/number, as well as some tense distinctions, as shown in Table 8.3. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> person forms there is an approximation to the Monofocal/Polyfocal distinction, with the same form used for Singular and 1<sup>st</sup> person except for 3<sup>rd</sup> person Plural. Note that though it is tempting to isolate a conditional morpheme *-momê-* which then combines with

person/number information, that information has no regular form (e.g. there is no regular morph *kno* as in *knomomê*), and may combine either side of *momê* in particular cases – as usual, then, the forms have to be learnt for each combination of subject, object and tense/aspect information.

**Table 8.3:** Transitive Conditional enclitics (bold), with non-conditional forms for comparison (nonbold).

TENSE/ ASPECT/ MOOD	SUBJECT Person&No	OBJECT			
		Person	Sing	Dual	Plural
PI & CI Prox/P.Hab	all	1	<i>nê</i> → <b><i>nêmomê</i></b>	<i>nyo</i> → <b><i>nyemomê</i></b> → <b><i>knomony:o</i></b>	<i>nmo</i> → <b><i>nmomomê</i></b>
PI & CI Prox/P.Hab	all	2	<i>ngi</i> → <b><i>nyimomê</i></b>	<i>dp:o</i> → <b><i>dpîmomê</i></b>	<i>nmyo</i> → <b><i>nmyemomê</i></b>
PI & CI Prox/P.Hab	MF: (1/s)	3	∅ → <b><i>knomomê</i></b>	<i>dê</i> → <b><i>knomomê dê</i></b>	<i>tê</i> → <b><i>tomomê</i></b>
	PF: (2/3/pl)		<i>ngmê</i> → <b><i>knomomê</i></b>	<i>d:oo</i> → <b><i>tomomê</i></b>	<i>t:oo</i> → <b><i>tomomê</i></b>
PI Rem/C. Hab.Prox	all	1	<i>noo</i> → <b><i>nonîmê</i></b>	<i>nyópu</i> → <b><i>nyópumê</i></b>	<i>nmo</i> → <b><i>nmîmomê</i></b>
	all	2	<i>nyoo</i> → <b><i>nyipumê</i></b>	<i>dpo</i> → <b><i>dpumomê</i></b>	<i>nmyoo</i> → <b><i>nmyimomê</i></b>
PI Rem/C. Hab.Prox	MF: 1/s	3	<i>ngê</i> (weak) → <b><i>knomomê</i></b>	<i>doo</i> → <b><i>dumomê</i></b>	<i>too</i> → <b><i>tomomê</i></b>
	PF: 2/3/pl		<i>ngópu</i> → <b><i>knomomê</i></b>	<i>dumo</i> → <b><i>dumomê</i></b>	<i>tumo</i> → <b><i>tomomê</i></b>
C Non-Prox	all	3	∅ → <b><i>knomomê</i></b>	<i>dê</i> → <b><i>dumomê</i></b>	<i>dé</i> → <b><i>tomomê</i></b>

Some neutralization of enclitic information takes place here, as it does with intransitives, especially of number in 3<sup>rd</sup> person where the proclitics are often zero, as in the following where the subject information is coded in the non-conditional enclitic but not in the conditional one:

- (412) a.  $\emptyset$  vyee ngê → vyee knomomê  
 3IMMCI hit.CI MFS3sO  
 'He hit him ...' 'If he hit him ...'
- b.  $\emptyset$  vyee ngópu → vyee knomomê  
 3IMMCI hit.CI PFS3sO  
 'They hit him ...' 'If they hit him'

Again, it is useful to compare sentences with borrowed English *if* and their counterparts with proper Yéli Dnye conditional enclitics, because the comparison shows to what extent the inflectional information is retained in the conditional form:

- (413) a. *if*  $\emptyset$  mgaa noo → mgaa nonîmê  
 if 3PastPI sorcerize 1sREM.PI sorcerize 1sREM.PI.COND  
 'If he has sorcerized me (day before yesterday) ...'
- b. *if*  $\emptyset$  mgaa nyópu → mgaa nyópumê  
 if 3PastPI sorcerize 1d.REM.PI sorcerize 1d.REM.PI.COND  
 'If he has sorcerized us2 (day before yesterday) ...'
- c. *if*  $\emptyset$  mgaa nmoo → mgaa nmîmomê  
 if 3PastPI sorcerize 1PIREM.PI sorcerize 1PIREM.PI.COND  
 'If he has sorcerized us3 (day before yesterday) ...'
- (414) a. *m:iituw:o* Kostka  $\emptyset$  vyee knomomê,  
 day.before.yesterday Kostka 3PastPI hit.CI 3sO.COND  
*n:aa* vyee  
 1sImmFUTCI hit.CI  
 'If he was hitting Kostka the day before yesterday, I will hit him'
- b. *if* Kostka Conrad vyee doo → vyee **dumomê**  
 if Kostka Conrad hit.CI MFS3sObject hit.CI 3dO.COND  
 'If he hit Kostka and Conrad ...' (Idem)
- c. *if* vyee too → vyee **tomomê**<sup>41</sup>  
 if hit.CI MFS.3pIO.PI.REM/CI? hit.CI 3pIO.COND  
 'If he hit them3' (Idem)
- d. *if* doo vyee → doo vyee **knomomê**  
 if 3sREMCI hit.CI 3sREMCI hit.CI 3sO.COND  
 'If they3 hit him. . .' (Idem)

<sup>41</sup> I should record with regard to example (414)c., that I initially thought the verb form *vyee* is unambiguously continuous aspect, but in fact this is not necessarily the case. Thus *Yidika Weta y:oo dê vyee d:oo* – they2 hit them2 today – can in fact only be punctual indicative. The forms above are correct and double-checked, but the interpretation of forms with *vyee* may sometimes be in question.

- e. *if doo vyee dé* → *doo vyee tomomê*  
 if 3sREMCi hit.CI 3plO.PROXCI 3sREMCi hit.CI 3plO.COND  
 ‘If he hit them3. . .’ (Idem)
- f. *if doo vyee dê* → *doo vyee*  
 if 3sREMCi hit.CI MFS.3dO.CINonPROX 3sREMCi hit.CI  
**dumomê**  
 Subj.3dO.COND  
 ‘If they two were hitting them (before yesterday) (Idem)  
*aka vyi ngi*  
 me.to tell 2sIMP  
 then tell me’

Because the conditional construction, and particularly the transitive forms, are being lost to language change, I record here some more examples with a further range of person/number objects:

- (415) a. *a vyee nmomomê,* *nmo vyee*  
 3ImmFUT hit.CI 1PlObjectPROXCOND 1plImmFUTCI hit.CI  
 ‘If he hits us3 today, we will hit him’
- b. *w-a vy:a nmomomê,* *a nmî vy:a*  
 Uncert-3FUTPI hit.PI.FOL 1Pl..PROXCOND 1PIFUTPI hit.PI  
 ‘If he will hit us3, we will hit him’
- c. *a vyee nyimomê,* *n:aa vyee*  
 3ImmFUT hit.CI 2sObjectPROXCOND 1sImmFUTCI hit.CI  
 ‘If he hits you1, I will hit him’
- d. *a vyee dpîmomê,* *n:aa vyee*  
 3ImmFUT hit.CI 2sObjectPROXCOND 1sImmFUTCI hit.CI  
 ‘If he hits you2, I will hit him’
- e. *a vyee nêmomê,* *n:aa mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUT hit.CI 1sObjectPROXCOND 1sImm FUTCI run.CI  
 ‘If he hits me, I’ll run’
- f. *a vyee nmyemomê,* *dpî mbêpê*  
 3ImmFUT hit.CI 2PlObjectPROXCOND 2IMPDefd.PI run  
*dmyino*  
 2PIIMPIntransitive  
 ‘If he hits you3, then run away!’
- g. *a vyee knomomê,* *a mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUT hit.CI 3sObjectCOND 3ImmFUTCI run.CI  
 ‘If he/they hits him, he will run away’



- h. *a vyee knomomê dê, a mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUT hit.CI 3O.COND MFS.d3O 3ImmFUTCI run.CI  
*mo*  
 dS.CI.PROX  
 ‘If he/they hits them2, they2 will run away’
- i. *a vyee knomony:o, nye mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUT hit.CI 1dO.COND 2d.ImmFUTCI run.CI  
*mo*  
 dS.CI.PROX.Intrans  
 ‘If he hits us2, we two will run away’
- j. *a vyee nyemomê, nye mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUT hit.CI 1dO.COND 2dImmFUTCI run.CI  
*mo*  
 dS.CI.PROX.Intrans  
 ‘If he hits us2, we two will run away’ (alternative conditional enclitic to prior example)
- k. *a vyee tomomê, a mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUTCI hit.CI 3PIO.COND 3ImmFUTCI run.CI  
*té*  
 PlSubj.CI.PROX.Intrans  
 ‘If he hits they3, they3 will run away’
- l. *∅ vy:a nyipumê, n:aa vyee*  
 3PastPI hit.FOL 2sO.REM.PI.COND 1sImmFUTCI hit.CI  
*∅*  
 3sO.PROX  
 ‘If he hit you2 (day before yesterday), I’ll be hitting him’
- m. *∅ vy:a dpumomê, n:aa vyee*  
 3PastPI hit.FOL 2dO.REM.PI.COND 1sImmFUTCI hit.CI  
*∅*  
 3sO.PROX  
 ‘If he hit you2 (day before yesterday), I’ll be hitting him’
- n. *a vyee knomomê, a mbêpê ∅*  
 3ImmFUTCI hit.CI 3sO.COND 3ImmFUTCI run.CI 3sCI.PROX  
 ‘If he/they will hit him, he’ll run away’
- o. *a vyee tomomê, a mbêpê mo*  
 3ImmFUTCI hit.CI PFS.3dO.COND 3ImmFUTCI run.CI d.CI.PROX  
 ‘If they2 will hit them2, they2 will run away’

As illustrated, the antecedent of a conditional can be in the Indicative or Habitual Mood, either aspect, while the consequent can be in either aspect and any mood,

including Imperative. There is no control (or specified anaphoric relations) across antecedent and consequent.

### 8.2.2 Negative conditionals

Both antecedent and consequent can be negated. These negations are partially analytic, that is a separate negative particle *daa* precedes the proclitics before the verb. Where that proclitic in the positive counterpart would be *a* it is preceded and elided with *wu* ‘irrealis, uncertain’ (thus forming *wa*), the epistemic modifier associated with future, interrogative and negative forms. The conditional enclitic however has special forms encoding object number/person, while subject information is mostly lost (note however the retention of Monofocal/Polyfocal subject information in e.g. the case of dual objects in proximal tenses). The following are some examples of transitive positive conditionals with the negative counterparts (in bold). The forms of the verb ‘to hit’ are:

- (416) proximal tenses *vy:a*  
 remote past *vyâ*  
 followed root *vya / vy:a*  
 continuous root *vye*

– note that a positive continuous aspect form is often more idiomatically converted into a negative punctual counterpart, which I give first (the continuous form is often idiomatically restricted to the antecedent clause). The following examples (417) to (426) provide the positives in italics and corresponding negatives (punctual, and where OK, continuous forms) in bold. Note that negative forms have the tense shifted into the past as noted in §6.1.4 (and see also §10.1), and also may have enclitics shifted from the other aspect. Because these complexities are hard to compute I illustrate extensively.

- (417) a. *a* *vye* *nmomomê*, *nmo* *vye*  
 3PRSCI hitting 1pLOCOND 1plSFUTCI hitting  
 ‘If he hits us (continuously) today, we will hit him’ (continuous forms)
- b. ***daa wa vya/vy:a nmomomê, daa nmî vy:a***  
 NEG 3SFUT hit 1pLOCOND NEG 1plFUTPI hit  
 ‘If he doesn’t hit us, we will not hit him’ (punctual)
- c. ***daa dî vye nmomomê, daa nmî vye***  
 NEG 3NrPST hitting 1pLOCOND NEG 1plSNrPST hitting  
 ‘If he was hitting us, we would hit him’ (continuous)

- (418) a. *wa vy:a nmomomê, a nmî vy:a*  
3FUTPI hit 1pLOCOND 1plSFUTCI hitting  
'If he hits us tomorrow, we will hit him' (with punctual forms)
- b. *daa wa vya/vy:a nmomomê, daa a nmî vy:a*  
NEG 3sFUT hit 1pLOCOND NEG 1plSFUTPI hit  
'If he doesn't hit us, we will not hit him'
- c. *daa dî vyee nmomomê, daa nmî vyee*  
NEG 3NrPSTCI hitting 1pLOCOND NEG 1plS hitting  
'If he is isn't hitting us, we won't be hitting him'
- (419) a. *a vyee nyimomê, n:aa vyee*  
3IMMFUTCI hitting 2sOCOND 1sFUT.MOT hitting  
'If he hits you1 today, I will hit him' (cf. *a vyee ngi* – he will hit you today)
- b. *daa wa vya/vy:a nyimomê, daa nê vy:a*  
NEG 3sFUTPI hit 2sOCOND NEG 1sFUTPI hit  
'If he doesn't hit you2 today, I won't hit him' (punctual)
- c. *daa dî vyee nyimomê, daa nî vyee*  
NEG 3NrPST hitting 2dOCOND NEG 1sNrPST hitting  
'If he isn't hitting you2 today, I won't be hitting him' (continuous forms)
- (420) a. *a vyee dpîmomê, n:aa vyee*  
3ImmFUTCI hitting 2dCOND 1sImmFUTCI hitting  
'Today, if he hits you2, I'll hit him'
- b. *daa wa vya/vy:a dpîmomê, daa nî vy:a*  
NEG 3FUTPI hit 2plCOND NEG 1sFUTPI hit  
'If he doesn't hit you2 today, I won't hit him' (punctual)
- c. *daa wa vyee dpîmomê, daa nî*  
NEG 3ImmFUTCI hitting 2plCOND CI NEG 1sFUTPI  
*vy:a*  
hit (continuous antecedent)
- (421) a. *a vyee nêmomê, n:aa mbêpêmbêpê*  
3ImmFUTCI hitting 1sCOND 1sImmFUTCI hitting  
'If he hits me I'll be running off, today'
- b. *daa wa vy:a nêmomê, daa nê mbêpê*  
NEG 3FUTPI hit 1sOCOND, NEG 1sPRSCI running  
'If he doesn't hit me, I won't be running off' (continuous consequent)

- c. *daa wa vyee nêmomê, daa nê vy:a*  
 NEG 3ImmFUTCI hitting 1slCOND, NEG 1sFUT hit  
 ‘If he won’t be hitting me, I won’t hit him’ (continuous antecedent)
- (422) a. *a vyee nmyemomê, dpi mbêpê dmyino*  
 3ImmFUTCI hitting 2plOCOND, 2IMPDefPI run 2plIMP.IV  
 ‘If he hits you3, then you should run away (today)!’  
 b. *daa wa vy:a nmyemomê, n:aa ngmê mbêpê*  
 NEG 3sFUTPI hit 2plOCOND NEG.IMP run  
 ‘If he doesn’t hit you3, then don’t run away (today)!’
- (423) a. *a vyee knomomê, a mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3FUTPI hit 3sOCOND, 3ImmFUTCI running  
 ‘If he hits him, he will run away (today)’  
 b. *daa wa vy:a knomomê, daa wa mbêpê*  
 NEG 3FUTPI hit 3sOCOND, NEG 3FUTCI running  
 ‘If he doesn’t hit him, he won’t run away’  
 c. *da wa vyee knomomê, daa wa mbêpê*  
 NEG 3ImmFUTCI hitting 3sOCOND NEG 3FUTCI running  
 ‘If he doesn’t hit him, he won’t run away’ (continuous antecedent)
- (424) a. *a vyee tomomê, a mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUTCI hitting 3plOCOND 3ImmFUTCI running  
*té*  
 plS.CI.IV  
 ‘If he hits them3, they will be running away today’  
 b. *daa wa vy:a tomomê, daa wa mbêpê dmi*  
 NEG 3FUTPI hit 3plOCOND NEG 3ImmFUTPI run plS.IV  
 ‘If he doesn’t hit them3, they won’t run away (today)’  
 c. *daa wa vyee tomomê, daa wa mbêpê dmi*  
 NEG 3ImmFUTCI hitting 3plOCOND, NEG 3FUTPI run plS.IV  
 ‘If he won’t be hitting them, they won’t run away’ (continuous antecedent)
- (425) a. *a vyee knomomê dê, a mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUTCI hitting 3OCOND Dual 3ImmFUTCI running  
*mo*  
 dualFUT.CI  
 ‘If he hits them2, they2 will run away (today)’

- b. *daa wa vy:a knomomê dê, daa wa mbêpê knî*  
 NEG 3FUTPI hit 3OCOND Dual NEG 3FUTPI run 3dS.IV  
 ‘If he doesn’t hit them<sub>2</sub>, they<sub>2</sub> will not run away (today)’
- c. *daa wa vyee knomomê dê, daa wa mbêpê knî*  
 NEG 3ImmFUT hitting 3OCOND Dual, NEG 3FUT run 3dS.IV  
 ‘If he won’t be hitting them<sub>2</sub>, they<sub>2</sub> won’t run away’  
 (continuous antecedent)
- (426) a. *a vyee knomony:o, nye mbêpêmbêpê mo*  
 3ImmFUTCI hitting 1dOCOND 1dImmFUTCI running DualS.IV  
 ‘If he hits us<sub>2</sub>, we<sub>2</sub> will run away (today)’
- b. *a vyee nyemomê, nye mbêpêmbêpê mo*  
 3ImmFUTCI hitting 1dOCOND, 1dImmFUTCI running DualS.IV  
 ‘If he hits us<sub>2</sub>, we<sub>2</sub> will run away (today)’ (alternative form of conditional)
- c. *daa wa vy:a knomony:o, daa nyi mbêpê knî*  
 NEG 3FUTPI hit 1dOCOND NEG 1dS run DualS.PI.IV  
 / \* *daa nyi mbêpêmbêpê mo*  
 NEG 1dS running DualS.CI  
 (continuous consequent not possible)  
 ‘If he doesn’t hit us<sub>2</sub>, we’ll not run away’
- d. *daa wa vyee knomony:o, daa nyi mbêpê knî*  
 NEG 3ImmFUT hitting 1dOCOND NEG 1dS run DualS.PI.IV  
 (continuous antecedent)  
 ‘If he won’t be hitting us, we won’t run away’
- e. *daa wa vy:a nyimomê, daa nyi mbêpê knî*  
 NEG 3FUTPI hit 1dOCOND NEG 1dS run DualS.PI.IV  
 (alternative form to c.)

So far we have illustrated forms with a singular subject in the antecedent. Varying the subject number and object number, we have the following examples (427) to (432) illustrating the partial Monofocal/Polyfocal pattern of confections (note how the negative in these cases preserves the positive enclitic, and thus the information):

- (427) a. *a* *vyee* *tomomê*, *a* *mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUTCI hitting MFS3plOCOND 3ImmFUTCI running  
*té*  
 PLS.CI.IV  
 ‘If he hits them3 today, they will run away’
- b. *daa wa* *vy:a tomomê*, *daa wa* *mbêpê dmi*  
 NEG 3FUTPI hit MFS3plOCOND NEG 3FUTPI run PLS.IV  
 ‘If he doesn’t hit them3, they will not run away’
- (428) a. *a* *vyee* *knomomê*, *a* *mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUTCI hitting MF/PFS3sOCOND 3ImmFUTCI running  
 ‘If he/they hit him, he will run away’
- b. *daa wa* *vy:a knomomê*, *daa wa* *mbêpê*  
 NEG 3FUTPI hit MF/PFS3sOCOND, NEG 3FUT run  
 ‘If he/they didn’t hit him, he won’t run away’
- (429) a. *a* *vyee* *tomomê*, *a*  
 3ImmFUTCI hitting MF/PFS3d/plOCOND 3ImmFUTCI  
*mbêpêmbêpê mo*  
 running DUAL.S.IV  
 ‘If they2 hit them2, they2 will run away’
- b. *daa wa* *vy:a tomomê*, *daa wa* *mbêpê*  
 NEG 3FUTPI hit MF/PFS3d/plOCOND NEG 3FUTPI run  
*knî*  
 DUAL.S.IV  
 ‘If they2 didn’t hit them2, they2 will not run away’
- (430) a. *a* *vyee* *knomomê* *dê*, *a* *mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUT hitting MF/PFS3OCOND Dual 3ImmFUT running  
*mo*  
 PLURAL.S.IV  
 ‘If they3 hit them2, they2 will run away’
- (431) *daa wa* *vy:a knomomê* *dê*, *daa wa*  
 NEG 3FUTPI hit MF/PFS3sOCOND DUAL NEG 3FUTPI  
*mbêpê knî*  
 run DUAL.S.IV  
 ‘If they3 didn’t hit them2, they2 will not run away’

- (432) a. *a vyee tomomê, a mbêpêmbêpê*  
 3ImmFUTC hitting MF/PFS3d/ploCOND 3ImmFUTCI running  
*té*  
 PLURAL.S.IV  
 ‘If they<sub>3</sub> hit them<sub>3</sub>, they<sub>3</sub> will run away’
- b. *daa wa vye tomomê, daa wa*  
 NEG 3ImmFUTCI hitting MF/PFS3d/ploCOND NEG 3FUTPI  
*mbêpê dmi*  
 run PLURAL.S.IV  
 ‘If they<sub>3</sub> did not hit them<sub>3</sub>, they<sub>3</sub> will not run away’

Illustrating the remote tense oppositions, in examples (433) and (434), a. provides the positive conditional, b. the negative version of a., while example (433)c. shows the currently favoured version of a. with English *if*:

- (433) a. *vy:a nyipumê, n:aa vyee*  
 hit 3sOCOND.REM 1sImmFUT.MOT.CI hitting  
 ‘If he hit you (the day before yesterday), I’ll hit him (today)’
- b. *daa vy:a nyipumê, daa nê vy:a*  
 NEG hit 2sOCOND.REMPI NEG 1sFUTPI hit  
 ‘If he didn’t hit him (the day before yesterday), I won’t hit him (today)’
- c. *if a vy:a nyoo, n:aa vy:ee*  
 if CLS hit 2sOCOND.REMPI 1sImmFUT.MOT.CI hitting
- (434) a. *vy:a dpumomê, n:aa vyee*  
 hit 2doCOND.REM 1sImmFUT.MOT hitting  
 ‘If he hit you<sub>2</sub> (the day before yesterday), I’ll be hitting him (today)’
- b. *daa vy:a dpumomê, daa nê vy:a*  
 NEG hit 2doCOND.REM NEG 1sFUTPI hit  
 ‘If he didn’t hit you<sub>2</sub> (the day before yesterday), I won’t hit him (today)’

The simpler intransitives follow similar patterns to their positive counterparts (with mostly invariant enclitic *knomomê*), as illustrated below:

- (435) a. *m:iitwuwó lee knomomê, y:i n:aa lêpî*  
 day.before.yesterday go.fol COND there 1sImmFUTCI going  
 ‘If he went (the day before yesterday), then I will be going there’
- b. *y:i daa lee knomomê, daa nê lê / lêpî*  
 there NEG go.fol COND NEG 1sFUT go / going  
 ‘If he didn’t go there, I won’t go/be going’ (latter OK but less natural)

- (436) a. *a*                    *lêpi*    *knomome*, *n:aa*                    *lêpî*  
 3ImmFUTCI    going    COND,            1sImmFUTCI.MOT    going  
 ‘(Today) if he is going, I’ll be going’
- b. *daa*   *wa*            *lee*    *knomomê*, *daa*   *nê*            *lê*  
 NEG   3FUTPI   go.fol   COND            NEG   1sFUTPI   go  
 ‘If he doesn’t go, I will not go (today, tomorrow)’
- c. *daa*   *đi*                    *lêpî*    *knomomê*, *daa*   *nê*                    *lêpî*  
 NEG   3sNrPSTCI   going   COND            NEG   1sImmFUTCI   going  
 ‘If he isn’t going, then I’m not going’

However, one elicited sentence hints at special negatives in some parts of the paradigm, now being lost through language change, with the a. form replacing the b. form for example (437):

- (437) a. *If*   *lee*            *dmi*,    *n:aa*                    *lêpî*  
 if   go.fol   plS.IV   1sImmFUT.MOT    going  
 ‘If they3 come, I’ll go’ (positive with English *if*)
- b. *lee*    *knomomê*, *n:aa*                    *lêpî*  
 go.fol   COND            1sImmFUT.MOT    going  
 ‘If they3 come, I’ll go’
- c. *daa*   *lee*            *dnyimomê*, *daa*   *nê*                    *lê*  
 NEG   go.fol   3plSCOND   NEG   1sFUTPI   go  
 ‘If they3 do not come, I won’t go’

Here the negative retains the plural subject information lost in the positive conditional, but which is also preserved in the conditional with borrowed English *if*. Since all these forms are becoming much less used in favour of the borrowed *if*, it is hard to know whether this is a remnant of a much richer idiosyncratic negative paradigm used in the past, or just evidence of a current garbled system.

### 8.3 Counterfactual conditionals

Counterfactual conditionals express a conditional relation between two events that did not occur, or are not projectable. Unlike the Conditionals, the Counterfactuals are in frequent use, in part because the independent clauses have deontic uses. This is true despite the fact that counterfactuality can be expressed pragmatically:



- (438) *mââ daa nî lê, daa n:uu m:uu*  
 tomorrow NEG 1sFUTP go NEG 1sFUT.MOT see  
 ‘If I don’t go tomorrow, I won’t see it’ (Lit. ‘I’ll not go tomorrow (then) I won’t see it’)

Counterfactual conditionals have distinctive marking in both antecedent and consequent. Both clauses are marked by substituting the normal TAMP pre-verbal proclitics with special counterfactual proclitics (in contrast to indicative conditionals which mark just the antecedent, and mark the conditionality in the post-verbal enclitics). The antecedent is marked with a form plausibly derived from conflation with *wu*, the ‘epistemically uncertain’ or ‘irrealis’ marker, and the consequent with a form just possibly related to the deferred imperative (1<sup>st</sup> person) marker *paa*. Note that these proclitics occur in the normal slot for pre-verbal clitics, so the structure of the whole counterfactual conditional looks like this:

- (439) [<sub>CountF</sub> [<sub>Ante</sub> X Y Z **antecedent-proclitic** verb enclitic],  
 [<sub>Consq</sub> XYZ **consequent-proclitic** verb enclitic] ]

where X Y Z are constituents like subject/object noun phrases, postposition phrases, adverbials, possibly null, and the enclitics are also possibly null as defined by the paradigms. The clauses can disagree in aspect, transitivity or subject. Most of the examples I will give are reduced by anaphora to the minimum, namely two verbs and their flanking clitics.

To further complicate matters, there are special negative forms of the proclitics. This amounts to a substantial investment of specialized forms just for marking counterfactuals: the matrix of person/number/tense/aspect/mood intersections (minus the imperative, which does not apply) is 126 \*2 (for each clause) \*2 (for negatives) = 504 cells. With an additional 18 cells for equational sentences, this makes a total of 522 cells. Just as with the non-counterfactual proclitics, this matrix is filled by a smaller number of distinctive forms, due to various conflations. There are tense conflations, so that (1) in the punctual aspect, near past and remote past are grouped – this grouping cross-cuts the distinction proximal/distal tenses marked in the enclitics and is thus disambiguated by the enclitics, (2) in the same punctual aspect future and immediate past are grouped, (3) in the continuous aspect the two futures are grouped with the present. In addition there are similar person/number conflations to those observable in the basic proclitic system.

A further wrinkle is that both clauses (antecedent, consequent) of the counterfactuals have independent main-clause uses with modal meanings. However, these sometimes depart slightly from the counterfactual paradigm in form or

person/number/tense assignment. In essence, the use of either clause independently conveys a ‘should have’ meaning, with the difference one of focus:

- (440) a. *wudî*                      *lê*  
           CFAnt1sIMM go.PI  
           ‘I should have gone (on reflection, I missed a chance)’  
       b. *pîdî*                      *lê*  
           CFCons1sIMM go.PI  
           ‘I should have gone (something happened, so I didn’t)’

These deontic uses parallel the deontic uses of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person imperatives, so counterfactual *pêdê lê* ‘He should have gone’ parallels imperative *dpi lee wee* ‘He should go (later)’. One can of course try reversing the perspective, and think of the counterfactual conditionals as built out of two ‘should have’ clauses, but little is gained from that analytical perspective – obviously the antecedent forms in *wu* might be related to the UNCERTAIN or irrealis evidential proclitic element, but it has proved hard to elicit any such full *wu* paradigm, while it is comparatively easy to elicit the counterfactuals. There is also no obvious source for the *pê* element in the consequent. The following is a textual example of such a single clause use of the consequent clause:

- (441) *ló dini*    *p:aa*                      *kpo*  
           long.ago CFAnt1sNrPST give.to.2<sup>nd</sup>  
           ‘I should have given it to you long ago’ (of shell-money debt)

It should be emphasized that these counterfactual elements are verbal proclitics (not sentential conjunctions), and occur next to the verb after all other elements, as in:

- (442) a. *Mwolâ ngê pimb:a wo*                      *y:ângo, Weta Dêl:ââ*  
           Mwolâ ERG pimb:a CFAnt3REM.PI give.to.3 Weta Dêl:ââ  
           *y:oo*  
           ERG.PL  
           ‘If Mwola had given a pimb:a shell coin (before yesterday),  
           *pî*                      ‘*nuw:o*                      *ngópu*  
           CFCons3REM.PI take                      PFS3sOREMPI  
           Weta and Dêl:ââ would have taken it (before yesterday)’

- b. *Mwolâ nêêdî ka wudî vyuwo, ngmê*  
 Mwolâ possum DAT CFAnt3sNrPST.C look.for INDF  
*pî vy:a*  
 CFCon3NrPST.PI kill  
 ‘If Mwolâ had looked for possum (yesterday), he would have killed one’

Just like other verbal proclitics, verbs which incorporate objects or (like *vyuwo* ‘look for’) prepositional phrases, allow the incorporated element (bold) to occur between proclitic and verb:

- c. *Mwolâ wudî nêêdî ka vyuwo, ngmê pî*  
 Mwolâ CFAnt3sNrPSTCI possum DAT looking.for INDF CFCons  
*vy:a*  
 kill  
 ‘If Mwolâ had been possum-hunting (yesterday), he would have killed one’

Many of the examples below occur without explicit noun phrases, as they would so often in actual use.

There are distinct paradigms of counterfactual proclitics for positive and negative verbs, and within each of these classes, distinct sets for punctual and continuous aspect.

Counterfactuals are heavily used in discourse, which explains the maintenance of large paradigms (for a parallel Papuan flourishing of counterfactuals see Kulick & Terrill 2019 on Tayap). Before proceeding, here is an example of usage from a myth (from recording r99\_v7\_s2):

- (443) *Kwo, kakê mê u kwo w:ii ch:amê*  
 3QUOT distinguishing.features to him CFAnt2sPROXPast explain  
*ngê,*  
 MFS.3sO.Trans  
 ‘The snake said: You (old lady) should have explained to him (your son, about me) / If you had explained it to him  
*kwo, u kwo w:ii kêma noo,*  
 3QUOT to him CFAnt2sPROXPast point.to 1sOREM.PI/HAB.PROX  
*kwo,*  
 3QUOT  
 he said: You should have pointed me out to him / If you had pointed me (sacred snake) out to him

*kêê*            *u ngwo daa pêê*                            *t:ângo*  
 arm/hand 3sEXP NEG 1sFUT/PRS.CFCons put.something.on  
 then I would not have touched him'

### 8.3.1 Positive counterfactuals

Like the normal TAMP proclitics, there are two series, one for the Punctual and one for the Continuous aspect. (Other properties like transitivity are irrelevant.) We will take them in turn.

#### 8.3.1.1 Punctual aspect

The following table (8.4) gives the basic forms for each of the clauses, antecedent and consequent. These proclitics of course replace the normal TAMP proclitics and largely carry the same meaning distinctions plus the marking of counterfactual conditionality. Thus the first form below *wudî* means 'If I had earlier today . . .', and the corresponding consequent form *pîdî* means 'then I would have . . . earlier today'. I should record that there seem to be alternate forms for some of these cells, but these forms (and in succeeding tables) are the ones most readily elicited.

**Table 8.4:** Counterfactual Conditional proclitics – Punctual aspect.

Tense/Mood	Subject Person	Antecedent			Consequent		
		Subject Number			Subject Number		
		Sing	Dual	Plural	Sing	Dual	Plural
<b>Future</b>	<b>Same as Immediate Past</b>						
<b>Imm Past</b>	1	<i>wudî</i>	<i>wu dnye</i>	<i>wudu</i>	<i>pîdî</i>	<i>pîdnye</i>	<i>pudu</i>
	2	<i>wuchi</i>	<i>wudu</i>	<i>wudmyo</i>	<i>pichi</i>	<i>pudu</i>	<i>pîdmyi</i>
	3	<i>waa</i>	<i>waa</i>	<i>waa</i>	<i>paa</i>	<i>paa</i>	<i>paa</i>
<b>Near Past</b>	1	<i>w:aa</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>w:oo</i>	<i>p:aa</i>	<i>p:ee</i>	<i>p:oo</i>
	2	<i>w:ii</i>	<i>woo</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>p:ii</i>	<i>poo</i>	<i>p:ee</i>
	3	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>pî</i>	<i>pî</i>	<i>pî</i>
<b>Rem Past</b>	1	<i>w:aa</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>w:oo</i>	<i>p:aa</i>	<i>p:ee</i>	<i>p:oo</i>
	2	<i>w:ii</i>	<i>woo</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>p:ii</i>	<i>poo</i>	<i>p:ee</i>
	3	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>pî</i>	<i>pî</i>	<i>pî</i>
<b>Habitual</b>	<b>(Apparently few forms, with the sense covered by Continuous Habitual counterfactuals*)</b>						

\*as in *ntê mb:aamb:aa ngê w:ee pîpî ngê*, *mb:aamb:aa ngê pichi k:aa* 'If you had habitually eaten well (Continuous), you would have grown up well (Punctual)'

Note that Future and Immediate Past are conflated, and so unless disambiguated by post-verbal clitics the following is ambiguous (recollect that 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular subjects and objects often get zero enclitics according to tense/aspect/mood):

- (444) a. *wudî*                      *lê,*      *pîdî*                      *m:uu*  
                  CFAnt1sFUT/IMM   go.PI   CFCo1sFUT/IMM.P.   see.PI  
       b. ‘If I would go, I would see it’  
       c. ‘If I had gone (earlier today), I would have seen it’, also ‘I should have gone to see it’

Similar remarks hold for the conflation of Near Past (yesterday) and Remote Past (before yesterday). There follow some examples to show how the forms are used, grouped by the two main tense distinctions. These exemplifications will make clear the disambiguating role of the post-verbal clitics and the verb suppletions. For example, the conditional proclitic *w:ee* itself has a range of meanings including Near Past or Remote Past, 1<sup>st</sup> Dual or 2<sup>nd</sup> Plural, but in *w:ee lee dmi* (‘If you3 had gone yesterday’) the interpretation must be Near Past because the enclitic *dmi* is restricted to the three proximal tenses, and it must be 2<sup>nd</sup> person because *dmi* is plural not dual. Or take *p:ee*, Counterfactual consequent with Near Past or Remote Past, 1<sup>st</sup> person Dual or 2<sup>nd</sup> person Plural interpretation; in *p:ee m:uu ngmê* (‘Then you3 would have seen it yesterday’) it can only mean Near Past 2<sup>nd</sup> person because transitive enclitic *ngmê* requires a proximal tense, and a Polyfocal (non 1<sup>st</sup> person) subject (and 3<sup>rd</sup> singular object). Sometimes too the suppletive verb root serves an essential purpose: *wo* could mean 3<sup>rd</sup> person Near or Remote Past, but *wo lê* indicates Near Past because the Remote Past would require *loo* as the suppletive form of the verb. Note that Remote Past suppletions may be lost if the verb belongs to a class with ‘followed roots’ (i.e. a special root if there is a following enclitic) – but in that case the following enclitic is likely to carry the tense information. For example, compare *pî módu* ‘then he would have seen it before yesterday’ with a Remote Past root *módu*, and *pî m:uu ngópu* ‘then they would have seen it before yesterday’ with a tenseless followed root *m:uu* but a Remote Past enclitic for a polyfocal subject. Such computations – calculations of intersecting marking strategies – lie at the heart of the language, and are very nicely illustrated in the Counterfactual forms.

(445) **Future/Immediate Past** (Today/Tomorrow)

- a. *wuchi*                      *lê,*      *pichi*                      *m:uu*  
                  CFAnt2sFUT/IMM.P.   go.PI   CFCon2sFUT/IMM.P.   see.PI  
                  ‘If you had come, you would have seen it’

- b. *waa* *lê*, *paa* *m:uu*  
 CFAnt3FUT/IMM.P. go.PI CCon3FUT/IMM.P. see.PI  
 ‘If he had come, he would have seen it’
- c. *wu dnye* *lee knî*, *pîdnye* *m:uu*  
 CFAnt1d.FUT/IMM.P. go.PI PROXPI.d CCon1d.FUT/IMM.P. see.PI  
 ‘If we2 had come, we would have seen it’
- d. *wudu* *lee knî*, *pudu*  
 CFAnt.2d.FUT/IMM.P. go.PI d.Intrans CCon2d.FUT/IMM.P.  
*m:uu ngmê*  
 seePI PFS3sOPROXTrans  
 ‘If you had come, you2 would have seen it’
- e. *wudmyo* *lee dmi*,  
 CFAnt3PIFUT/IMM.P. go.PI plS.Intrans  
*pîdmyi* *m:uu ngmê*  
 CCon3PIFUT/IMM.P. see PFS.3sObject.WEAK  
 ‘If you3 had come, you3 would have seen it’
- f. *wudu* *lee dmi*, *pudu*  
 CFAnt1pl.FUT/IMM.P. go.PI plSIntrans CCon1PIFUT/IMM.P.  
*m:uu*  
 see  
 ‘If we3 had come, we3 would have seen it’
- g. *waa* *lê*, *paa* *m:uu*  
 3IMM/FUT.P.CF.Ante go.PI 3IMM/FUT.P.CF.Consq see  
 ‘If he had gone, he would have seen it’
- h. *waa* *lee knî*, *paa* *m:uu*  
 CFAnt3IMM/FUT.P. go.PI dS.Intrans CCon3IMM/FUT.P. see  
*ngmê*  
 PFS3sO  
 ‘If they2 had gone, they2 would have seen it’
- i. *waa* *lee dmi*, *paa* *m:uu*  
 CFAnt3IMM/FUT.P. go.PI plS.Intrans CCon3IMM/FUT.P. see  
*ngmê*  
 PFS3sO  
 ‘If they3 had gone, they would have seen it’

(446) **Near Past** (Yesterday – as disambiguated by verb root and enclitic)

- a. *w:aa* *lê*, *p:aa* *m:uu*  
 CFAnt1sNrPST/REMP. go.PI CCon1sNrPST/REMP. see  
 ‘If I had gone (yesterday), I would have seen it’

- b. *w:ee* *lê* *knî*,  
 CF.Ant1d.NrPST/REMP. go.PI dS.IntransPROX  
*p:ee* *m:uu*  
 CFCons1d.NrPST/REMP. see  
 ‘If we2 had gone (yesterday), we2 would have seen it’
- c. *w:oo* *lee* *dmi*,  
 CFAnt1PINrPST/REMP. go.FOL plSIntransPROX  
*p:oo* *m:uu*  
 CFCons1PINrPST/REMP. see  
 ‘If we3 had gone (yesterday), we3 would have seen it’
- d. *w:ii* *lê*, *p:ii* *m:uu*  
 CFAnt2sNrPST/REMP. go CFCons2sNrPST/REMP. see  
 ‘If you1 had gone (yesterday or before), you would have seen it’
- e. *woo* *lee* *knî*,  
 CFAnt2d.NrPST/REMP. go.FOL dS.IntransPROX  
*poo* *m:uu* *ngmê*  
 CFCons2d.NrPST/REMP. see PFS3sO  
 ‘If you2 had gone (yesterday), you2 would have seen it’
- f. *w:ee* *lee* *dmi*,  
 CFAnt2PINrPST/REMP. go.FOL plSIntransPROX  
*p:ee* *m:uu* *ngmê*  
 CFCons2PINrPST/REMP. see PFS3sOPROX  
 ‘If you3 had gone (yesterday), you3 would have seen it’
- g. *wo* *lê*, *pî* *m:uu*  
 CFAnt3sNrPST/REMP. go CFCon3sNrPST/REMP see  
 ‘If he had gone (yesterday), he would have seen it’
- h. *wo* *lee* *knî*,  
 CFAnt3NrPST/REMP. go.FOL dS.IntransPROX  
*pî* *m:uu* *ngmê*  
 CFCons3NrPST/REMP see PFS3sOPROX  
 ‘If they2 had gone (yesterday), they2 would have seen it’
- i. *wo* *lee* *dmi*,  
 CFAnt3NrPST/REMP. go.FOL plSIntransPROX  
*pî* *m:uu* *ngmê*  
 CFCon3NrPST/REMP see PFS3sObjPROXTrans  
 ‘If they3 had gone (yesterday), they3 would have seen it’

The Remote Past is often disambiguated not only by the post-verbal clitics but also by verb root suppletion:

- (447) a. *w:aa* *loo,* *p:aa* *módu*  
 CFAnt1sNrPST/REMP go.REM CFCons1sNrPST/REMP seeREM  
 ‘If I had gone (before yesterday), I would have seen it’
- b. *w:ee* *lee* *knâpwo,*  
 CFAnt1d.NrPST/REMP go.FOL dS.IntransPROX  
*p:ee* *módu*  
 CFCons1d.NrPST/REMP. see.REM  
 ‘If we2 had gone (before yesterday), we2 would have seen it’
- c. *w:oo* *lee* *dniye,*  
 CFAnt1PlNrPST/REMP go.FOL plSIntransREM/HAB  
*p:oo* *módu*  
 CFCons1PlNrPST/REMP see.REM  
 ‘If we3 had gone (before yesterday), we3 would have seen it’
- d. *w:ii* *loo,* *p:ii* *módu*  
 CFAnt2sNrPST/REMP. goREM CFCons2sNrPST/REMP. seeREM  
 ‘If you1 had gone (before yesterday), you1 would have seen it’
- e. *woo* *lee* *knâpwo,*  
 CFAnt2d.NrPST/REMP. go.FOL dS.IntransREM  
*poo* *m:uu* *ngópu*  
 CFCons2d.NrPST/REMP. see PFS.3sO.PI.REM  
 ‘If you2 had gone (before yesterday), you2 would have seen it’
- f. *w:ee* *lee* *dniye,*  
 CFAnt2PlNrPST/REMP go.follow PFS.IntransREM  
*p:ee* *m:uu* *ngópu*  
 CFCons2PlNrPST/REMP. see PFS.3sO.REM  
 ‘If you3 had gone (before yesterday), you3 would have seen it’
- g. *wo* *loo,* *pî* *módu*  
 CFAnt3NrPST/REMP. go.REM CFCons3NrPST/REMP see.REM  
 ‘If he had gone (before yesterday), he would have seen it’
- h. *wo* *lee* *knâpwo,*  
 CFAnt3NrPST/REMP. go.REM dS.IntransREM  
*pî* *m:uu* *ngópu*  
 CFCons3NrPST/REMP see PFS.3sO.REM  
 ‘If they2 had gone (before yesterday), they2/3 would have seen it’
- i. *wo* *lee* *dniye,*  
 CFAnt3PlNrPST/REMP. go.REM PFSIntransREM  
*pî* *m:uu* *ngópu*  
 CFCons3NrPST/REMP see PFS.3sO.REM  
 ‘If they3 had gone (before yesterday), they2/3 would have seen it’



There are at least some forms for the Habitual Mood which may be more analytic, but I have no full paradigm, partly because it is hard to concoct plausible scenarios, unlike the corresponding forms for the Continuous aspect:

- (448) *Mass wo d:uu dpî dóó, kópu nmî lama daa*  
*Mass CFAnt3PAST.HAB do affairs 1plPOSS knowledge NEG*  
*pî tóó*  
*CFCons3IMMC sitting*  
 ‘If (the priest) didn’t say mass, we would know nothing’

The consequent here is in the continuous aspect, our next subject, indicating that a punctual antecedent can go with a continuous consequent.

### 8.3.1.2 Continuous aspect

The continuous aspect distinguishes the full range of tenses, and there are also some special forms for equational sentences of the form ‘If you were an X’. The following table (8.5) gives the forms.

**Table 8.5:** Counterfactual Conditional proclitics – Continuous aspect.

Tense/ Mood	Subject Person	Antecedent			Consequent		
		Subject Number			Subject Number		
		Singular	Dual	Plural	Singular	Dual	Plural
Future/ Present	1	<i>wunê</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>w:oo</i>	<i>pênê</i>	<i>p:ee</i>	<i>pun:oo</i>
	2	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>wodo</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>p:ee</i>	<i>po</i>	<i>pînmyi</i>
	3	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>pê</i>	<i>pê</i>	<i>pê</i>
Immediate Past	1	<i>w:aa</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>w:oo</i>	<i>p:aa</i>	<i>p:ee</i>	<i>p:oo</i>
	2	<i>w:ii</i>	<i>woo</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>p:ii</i>	<i>poo</i>	<i>p:ee</i>
	3	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>pî</i>	<i>pî</i>	<i>pî</i>
Near Past	1	<i>w:aa</i>	<i>wony:oo</i>	<i>wunê</i>	<i>p:aa</i>	<i>pêny:oo</i>	<i>pênmi</i>
	2	<i>w:ii</i>	<i>wudu</i>	<i>wunmyi</i>	<i>p:ii</i>	<i>pudu</i>	<i>pînmyi</i>
	3	<i>wudî/waa</i>	<i>wudu</i>	<i>wudnyi</i>	<i>paa</i>	<i>pudu</i>	<i>pêdnyi</i>
Remote Past	1	<i>wonoo</i>	<i>wonyipu</i>	<i>wonmee</i>	<i>ponoo</i>	<i>pênyipu</i>	<i>pênmee</i>
	2	<i>wonyoo</i>	<i>wodpîmo</i>	<i>wonmyee</i>	<i>pênyoo</i>	<i>pêdpîmo</i>	<i>pênmyee</i>
	3	<i>wodoo</i>	<i>wodpîmo</i>	<i>wudnye</i>	<i>podoo</i>	<i>pêdpîmo</i>	<i>pîdnye</i>
Habitual	1	<i>wunê</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>w:oo</i>	<i>pênê</i>	<i>p:ee</i>	<i>p:oo</i>
	2	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>wodo</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>p:ee</i>	<i>podo</i>	<i>p:ee</i>
	3	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>pê</i>	<i>pê</i>	<i>pê</i>

Table 8.5 (continued)

Tense/ Mood	Subject Person	Antecedent			Consequent		
		Subject Number			Subject Number		
		Singular	Dual	Plural	Singular	Dual	Plural
Equational	1	<i>w:aa</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>w:oo</i>	<i>p:aa</i>	<i>p:ee</i>	<i>p:oo</i>
'If you were ...'	2	<i>w:ii</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>w:ee</i>	<i>p:ii</i>	<i>p:ee</i>	<i>p:ee</i>
	3	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>pê</i>	<i>pê</i>	<i>pê</i>

Notice certain features of this paradigm. An antecedent form like *w:oo* can be both Future (1<sup>st</sup> plural) and Immediate Past (same person/number), but the consequent form is different in the two tenses (*pun:oo* vs. *p:oo*) – so disambiguating the whole conditional. Similarly for many other forms – once again, economy of form achieves gestalt signalling success, but at the expense of compositionality of the overall structure (as pointed out in §2.3). Notice too that person/number confluents follow the somewhat unpredictable patterns encountered in the general proclitics, with e.g. 3<sup>rd</sup> person especially likely to go with loss of number, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Dual to conflate, etc. In general, as we have seen so often before, this is a paradigm that must be learned.

Once again, we need some examples to bring this to life. The following illustrate future/present uses, but they also illustrate the nature of the counterfactual clitics as strictly preverbal – nominals occurring between them and the verb must be incorporated, and the verb detransitivized. The phrase *mbwo tpapê* ‘native-betel chewing’ forms a complex intransitive verb with incorporated object – where the enclitic is non-null (as with dual subjects in proximate tenses as in d. below), one can see that the verb *tpapê* takes an intransitive enclitic. This verb however is a curious intransitive verb which can incorporate its ‘object’ – it has counterpart transitive *kuwo* exemplified below.

## (449) Present/Future

- a. *wunê*                      *mdono, pêê*                      *mdono*  
 CFAnt1sFUT/PRS.C. doCI    CFCons1sFUT/PRS.C. doCI  
 ‘If I were doing it, I would be doing it (but I’m not, so why are you blaming me)?’
- b. *wunê*                      *dpodo, pêê*                      *mbwo*  
 CFAnt1sFUT/PRS.C. doCI    CFCons1sFUT/PRS.C. betel.sp  
*tpapê*  
 chewing  
 ‘If I were working, I would be chewing betel’

- c. *w:ee* *dpodo, p:ee* *mbwo*  
 CFAnt2sFUT/PRS.C. doCI CFCONS2sFUT/PRS.C. betel.sp  
*tpapê*  
 chewing  
 'If you1 were working, you would be chewing betel'
- d. *wodo* *dpodo mo,*  
 CFANT2dFUT/PRS.C. doCI dS.PROXIntrans  
*po mbwo tpapê mo*  
 CFANT2dFUT/PRS.C. betel.sp chewing d.CIPRS/FUT.Intrans  
 'If you2 were working, you2 would be chewing betel'
- e. *wodpîmo dpodo, pêdpîmo mbwo tpapê*  
 CFANT2dREM.C. doCI CFCons2dREMC betel.sp chewing  
 'If you2 had been working (before yesterday), you2 would have been chewing betel'

Although the main point here is that the counterfactual proclitics operate just like indicative proclitics, the alternation between incorporated and non-incorporated objects also makes clear the special position of incorporated objects between proclitic and verb (§7.9.4). In example (450)a. below one has the minimal sentence without NPs, in b. we have an Absolutive subject NP in the antecedent outside the verbal complex of course, and an Object NP incorporated inside the complex in the consequent. In c. we have a non-incorporated version with a quantified NP object.

- (450) a. *wo dpodo, pê mbwo tpapê*  
 CFAnt3PRS/IMMC workCI CFCons3PRS/IMMC betel.sp chewing  
 'If he were working he would chewing betel'
- b. *Father Mathew awedê wo*  
 Father Mathew today CFAnt3PRS/IMMC  
*dpodo, pê mbwo tpapê*  
 workCI CFCons3PRS/IMMC betel.sp chewing  
 'If Father Mathew would have been working today, he would have been betel-chewing away'
- c. *Father Mathew awedê wo dpodo,*  
 Father Mathew today CFAnt3PRS/IMMC workCI  
*mbwo yilî pê kuwo*  
 betel.sp much CFCons3PRS/IMMC chewing  
 'If Father Mathew would have been working today, he would have been chewing much native betel'

The following example shows that continuous aspect antecedents can have punctual consequents:

- (451) a. *Father Mathew Tili awedê wo dpodo*  
 Father Mathew Tili today CFAnt3PRS/IMMC working  
 ‘If Father Matthew and Tilly were working today,  
*mo, nkéli mbwaa paa chedê*  
 dS.CIProx boat water CFCon3IMMP finish  
 they would have used up the fuel’
- b. *wodpîmo dpodo, Alotau pî lee*  
 CFAnt2/3dREM.C working Alotau CFCons3REM.P go.FOL  
*knâpwo*  
 dS.REM.  
 ‘If they2 had been working, they would have gone to Alotau’ (PI)

The following examples illustrate different person/number configurations in the Remote Past tense in the continuous aspect. Notice for example that in the Remote Past cases with e.g. dual subjects there are no corresponding verbal enclitics – this follows the general rule that Remote Past Continuous Indicative Intransitive sentences don’t take postverbal enclitics (Table 6.35).

- (452) a. *wonoo dpodo, ponoo mbwo tpapê*  
 CFAnt1sREMCI working CFCons1sREMCI betel.sp chewing  
 ‘If I had been working, I would have been chewing (whatever the rules)’  
 (Remote Past)
- b. *wonoo dpodo, school fees p:aa módu*  
 CFAnt1sREMCI working school fees CFCons1sREMCI see.REM  
 ‘If I had been working, I would have been putting school fees aside’  
 (Remote Past)
- c. *wonyipu dpodo, pênyipu nkéli mbwaa ndanî*  
 CFAnt1dREMCI working CFCons1dREMCI boat water drinking  
 ‘If we2 had been working, we would have been drinking beer’  
 (Remote Past)
- d. *wodpîmo dpodo, pêdpîmo nkéli mbwaa ndanî*  
 CFANT2dREMCI working CFCons boat water drinking  
 ‘If you2 had been working, you2 would have been drinking  
 beer’ (Remote Past)
- e. *wodoo dpodo, podoo nkéli mbwaa ndanê*  
 CFAnt3sREMCI working CFCons3sREMCI boat water drinking  
 ‘If he had been working he would have been drinking beer’ (Remote Past)

- f. *wodpîmo dpodo, pêdpîmo nkéli mwaa ndanê*  
 CFAnt3dREMCi working CFCons3dREMCi boat water drinking  
 ‘If they<sub>2</sub> had been working, they<sub>2</sub> would have been drinking beer’  
 (Remote Past)

The following examples illustrate other tenses. Note the two small vowel changes in example (453)h. vs. i., which make the contrast Near vs. Remote Past (the same alternation as in the non-counterfactual paradigm).

- (453) a. *w:oo dpodo té, pun:oo nkéli*  
 CFAnt1plIMMCi work PLURAL.IV CFCons1plPRSCi boat  
*mbwaa ndanî té*  
 water drinking pl.S.IV  
 ‘If we<sub>3</sub> were now working (earlier today), we would be drinking beer (now)’ (Immediate Past)
- b. *w:ee dpodo mo, p:ee nkéli mbwaa*  
 CFAnt1dPRSCi work dS.IV CFCons1dPRSCi boat water  
*ndanî mo*  
 drinking d.S.IV  
 ‘If we<sub>2</sub> were (now) working, we would be (now) drinking beer’  
 (Present)
- c. *wunmyi dpodo té, pînmyi mbwaa*  
 CF2plNrPSTCi working plS.IV CFCons2plPRS/NrPST water  
*ndanî*  
 drinking  
 ‘If you<sub>3</sub> (yesterday) had been working, you<sub>3</sub> would be drinking beer (now)’ (Near Past)
- d. *w:ee dpodo té, p:ee mbwaa*  
 CFAnt2plImmPSTCi working plS.IV CFCons2ImmPSTCi water  
*ndanî té*  
 drinking plS.IV  
 ‘If you<sub>3</sub> were working (earlier today), you<sub>3</sub> would have drunk beer (earlier today)’ (Immediate Past)
- e. *wo dpodo té, pê mbwaa ndanî*  
 CFAnt3PRS.Ci working plS.IV CFCons3PRS.Ci water drinking  
*té*  
 plS.IV  
 ‘If they<sub>3</sub> were working (now), they<sub>3</sub> would be drinking beer (now)’ (Present)

- f. *ma wunê dpodo, pênmi mbwaa*  
 yesterday CFAnt1plNrPSTCI working CFCons1plNrPSTCI water  
*ndanî*  
 drinking  
 ‘If we3 (yesterday) had been working, we3 would have been drinking  
 beer (yesterday)’ (Near Past)
- g. *wunmyi dpodo, pînmyi mbwaa ndanî*  
 CFAnt2plNrPSTCI working CFCons2plNrPST water drinking  
 ‘If you3 (yesterday) had been working, you would have been drinking  
 beer (yesterday)’ (Near Past)
- h. *wudnyi dpodo, pêdnyi mbwaa ndanî*  
 CFAnt3plNrPSTCI working CFCons3plNrPSTCI water drinking  
 ‘If they3 (yesterday) had been working, they3 would have been  
 drinking beer (yesterday)’ (Near Past)
- i. *wudnye dpodo, pîdnye mbwaa ndanî*  
 CFAnt3plIREMCI working CFCons3plIREMCI water drinking  
 ‘If they3 had worked (day before yesterday), they3 would have  
 drunk beer (day before yesterday)’ (Remote Past)
- j. *wonmee dpodo, pênmee mwaa ndanî*  
 CFAnt1plIREMCI working CFCons1plIREMCI water drinking  
 ‘If we3 had worked (day before yesterday), we3 would have drunk  
 beer (day before yesterday)’ (Remote Past)
- k. *wonmyee dpodo, pênmyee mbwaa*  
 CFAnt2plIREMCI working CFCons2plIREMCI water  
*ndanî*  
 drinking  
 ‘If you3 had been working (day before yesterday), you3 would have  
 drunk beer (day before yesterday)’ (Remote Past)

There are also forms for the Habitual mood, as indicated in the table. Here are some examples:

- (454) a. *wo lêpî yédi, pê mumu*  
 CFAnt3HABC going sSHABIV CFCons3HABC seeing  
*ngê*  
 MFS3sOHABC  
 ‘If it had been the case that he habitually went, he would have  
 habitually seen it’

- b. *wodo dpodo mo, podo nkéli mbwaa*  
 CFAnt2dHABC working plSIV CFCons2dHABC boat water  
*ndanî mo*  
 drinking plSIV  
 ‘If you2 were habitually working, you2 would be habitually drinking beer’
- c. *w:oo dpodo té, p:oo nkéli mbwaa*  
 CFAnt1plHABC working plSIV CFCons1plHABC boat water  
*ndanî té*  
 drinking plSIV  
 ‘If we3 were habitually working, then we3 would be habitually drinking beer’

In addition, equative sentences could be construed as having a similar aspect to Continuous aspect sentences. Some examples of equational counterfactuals follow.

- (455) a. *w:aa council, p:aa mââwe*  
 CFAnt(Equ)1s councillor CFCons(Equ)1s big.man  
 ‘If I was councillor, I would be a big man’
- b. *wo council, pê mââwe*  
 CFAnt(Equ)3 councillor CFCons(Equ)3 big.man  
 ‘If he was councillor, he would be a big man’
- c. *w:ii mââwe, p:ii ndeepi*  
 CFAnt(Equ)2s big.man CFCons(Equ)2s rich.man  
 ‘If you1 were a mââwe, you would be rich in ndap’
- d. *w:oo pi ngmêmî dé, p:oo*  
 CFAnt(Equ)1pl man unmarried PL CFCons(Equ)1pl  
*vyipi dé*  
 good.fisherman PL  
 ‘If we3 were young men, we would be good fishermen’
- e. *w:ee pyââ dé, p:ee dpodo módó*  
 CFAnt(Equ)2pl woman PL CFCons(Equ)2pl working girl  
*mb:aa yoo*  
 good PL(Hum)  
 ‘If you3 were women, you would be good working girls’

Finally, as mentioned, the individual clauses have deontic uses, similar to the imperatives, but also ‘should’ in the sense of ‘it would have been rational if’ as in example (456)c.:

- (456) a. *w:ee tp:ee knî ye vyuwo*  
 CFAnt2s child AUG to them look after  
 ‘You should/must look after the children’
- b. *p:ee tp:ee knî ye vyuwo*  
 CFCons2s child AUG to them look after  
 ‘You should/must look after the children’
- c. *Y:oonkigha yâpwo u mênê ngmê pê tóó,*  
 Yonga.Bay sacred.area inside INDF CFAnt3EQU sitting  
*yâpwo mê pyeede té,*  
 gods also sitting.pl plSPRSC.IV  
 ‘At Yonga there should have been a sacred area, (because) there are many gods there’

### 8.3.2 Negative counterfactuals

The negative counterfactuals have their own paradigms, provided below in two tables, one for the punctual (Table 8.6) and one for the continuous aspect (Table 8.7), treated in the following sections. After each table there follows a complete set of examples exemplifying the paradigm – it is important to see how negative counterfactual proclitics which sometimes collapse tenses are disambiguated by the enclitics and verb stems. Note that negation is analytic (marked by NEG *daa*) in many but not all of the Punctual antecedents (cf. Table 6.27 in §6.1.4.1) and consequents, and in most of the Continuous paradigm, but there are exceptions so the paradigms nevertheless have to be learnt.

#### 8.3.2.1 Punctual aspect, negative counterfactuals

**Table 8.6:** Negative Counterfactual proclitics – Punctual aspect (Positive form in *non-bold*, Negative in *bold* for comparison).

IF	sing	dual	pl	THEN	sing	dual	pl
Distal FUT							
SAME as							
Imm Past*							
Imm Past	<i>wudî/</i>	<i>wu dnye</i>	<i>wudu</i>		<i>pîdî</i>	<i>pîdnye</i>	<i>pudu</i>
1	<b><i>wud:oo/</i></b>	<b><i>wo</i></b>	<b><i>wo</i></b>		<b><i>daa pîdî</i></b>	<b><i>daa pê</i></b>	<b><i>daa pudu</i></b>
	<b><i>wud:aa</i></b>	<b><i>dny:oo</i></b>	<b><i>dp:oo</i></b>				
	<b><i>(+close?)</i></b>						



Table 8.6 (continued)

IF	sing	dual	pl	THEN	sing	dual	pl
<b>Distal FUT</b> <b>SAME as</b> <b>Imm Past*</b>							
2	<i>wuchi</i> <b><i>wuchoo</i></b>	<i>wudu</i> <b><i>wo dpo</i></b>	<i>wudmyo</i> <b><i>wo</i></b> <i>dmy:oo</i>		<i>pichi</i> <b><i>daa</i></b> <i>pichi</i>	<i>pudu</i> <b><i>daa</i></b> <i>pudu</i>	<i>pîdmyi</i> <b><i>daa pîdmyi</i></b>
3	<i>waa</i> <b><i>wudoo</i></b>	<i>waa</i> <b><i>wodoo</i></b>	<i>waa</i> <b><i>wodoo</i></b>		<i>paa</i> <b><i>daa paa</i></b>	<i>paa</i> <b><i>daa paa</i></b>	<i>paa</i> <b><i>daa paa</i></b>
<b>Near Past</b>							
1	<i>w:aa</i> <b><i>wo dîpî</i></b>	<i>w:ee</i> <b><i>wo dipi</i></b>	<i>w:oo</i> <b><i>wo dpîpî</i></b>		<i>p:aa</i> <b><i>daa p:aa</i></b>	<i>p:ee</i> <b><i>daa p:ee</i></b>	<i>p:oo</i> <b><i>daa p:oo</i></b>
2	<i>w:ii</i> <b><i>wo dîpî</i></b>	<i>woo</i> <b><i>wo dpîpî</i></b>	<i>w:ee</i> <b><i>wo dpîpî</i></b>		<i>p:ii</i> <b><i>daa p:ee</i></b>	<i>poo</i> <b><i>daa poo</i></b>	<i>p:ee</i> <b><i>daa p:ee</i></b>
3	<i>wo</i> <b><i>wudaa</i></b>	<i>wo</i> <b><i>wodaa</i></b>	<i>wo</i> <b><i>wodaa</i></b>		<i>pî</i> <b><i>daa pê</i></b>	<i>pî</i> <b><i>daa pê</i></b>	<i>pî</i> <b><i>daa pê</i></b>
<b>Rempast</b>							
1	<i>w:aa</i> <b><i>wo dîpî</i></b>	<i>w:ee</i> <b><i>wo dîp:ee</i></b>	<i>w:oo</i> <b><i>wo dpîpî</i></b>		<i>p:aa</i> <b><i>daa p:aa</i></b>	<i>p:ee</i> <b><i>daa p:ee</i></b>	<i>p:oo</i> <b><i>daa p:oo</i></b>
2	<i>w:ii</i> <b><i>wo dipi</i></b>	<i>woo</i> <b><i>wo dpîpî</i></b>	<i>woo</i> <i>/?w:ee</i> <b><i>wo dpîpî</i></b>		<i>p:ii</i> <b><i>daa p:ee</i></b>	<i>poo</i> <b><i>daa poo</i></b>	<i>p:ee</i> <b><i>daa p:ee</i></b>
3	<i>wo</i> <b><i>wo daa</i></b>	<i>wo</i> <b><i>wo daa</i></b>	<i>wo</i> <b><i>wo daa</i></b>		<i>pî</i> <b><i>daa pî</i></b>	<i>pî</i> <b><i>daa pê</i></b>	<i>pî</i> <b><i>daa pê</i></b>

The following examples exemplify parts of the paradigm. Negative counterparts in bold follow positive examples. Recollect that negation often shifts tense, so that Remote Past verb stems and enclitics can collocate with Immediate Past (if there is an enclitic it will carry the tense shift, since the verb may have the followed root form). For example:

- (457) *wudu*                      *lee*    *dmi*                      → ***wo dp:oo***  
           CFAnt1plIMMP    go.fol    plSIMMP.IV                      CFAnt1plIMMP  
    ***lee***    ***dniye***  
    go.fol    plSREMP  
    ‘If we3 had gone today’                      ‘If we3 had not gone today’

The following forms are in the Immediate Past tense, which is equally used for the Present and Future (as disambiguated by temporal adverbials). Positives are given first, with negative counterparts in bold, for comparison. Recollect in this tense negatives shift to Remote Past tense (cf. example (458)b. to b’. below):

- (458) a. *wudî*                      *lê, pîdî*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt1sIMM.P go CFCons1sIMMP see  
 ‘If I had come (today) I would have seen it (I should have gone and seen it)’
- b. ***wud:oo/wud:a***                      ***loo, daa pîdî***                      ***m:uu***  
 NEGCFAnt1sIMM.P go.REM NEG CFCons1sIMM.P see  
 ‘If I had not gone today, I would not have seen it’
- b’. ***wud:a***                      ***lê, daa pîdê***                      ***m:uu***  
 NEGCFAnt1sNrPST.P go NEG CFCons1sIMM.P see  
 ‘If I had not come yesterday, I would not have seen it’
- c. *wuchi*                      *lê, pichi*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt2sIMM.P go CFCons2sIMM.P see  
 ‘If you had come (today) you would have seen it’
- d. ***wuchoo***                      ***loo, daa pichi***                      ***m:uu***  
 NEG.CFAnt2sIMMP go.REM NEG CFCons2sIMM.P see  
 ‘If you had not come (today) you would not have seen it’
- e. *waa*                      *lê, paa*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt3sIMM.P go CFCons3s see  
 ‘If he had come (today), he would have seen it’
- f. ***wudoo***                      ***loo, daa paa***                      ***m:uu***  
 NEG.CFAnt3sIMM.P go.REM NEG CFCons3IMM.P see  
 ‘If he had not come today he would not have seen it’
- g. *wu dnye*                      *lee knî, pîdnye*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt1dIMM.P go.fol d.PI.IV CFCons1dIMM.P see  
 ‘If we2 had gone (today) we would have seen it’
- h. ***wo dny:oo***                      ***lee knâpwo, daa pê dnye***                      ***m:uu***  
 NEG.CFAnt1dIMM.P go.fol dREM.P.IV NEG CFCons1dIMM.P see  
 ‘If we2 hadn’t gone (today) we wouldn’t have seen it’
- i. *wudu*                      *lee knî, pudu*                      *m:uu ngmê*  
 CFAnt2dIMM.P go.fol d.PI.IV CFCons2dIMM.P see PFS.3sO  
 ‘If you2 had gone (today), you2 would have seen it’
- j. ***wo dpo***                      ***lee knâpwo, daa pudu***                      ***m:uu***  
 NEG.CFAnt2dIMM.P go.fol dREM.P.IV NEG CFCons2dIMM.P see  
***ngmê***  
 PFS.3sO  
 ‘If you2 had not gone (today), you2 would not have seen it’

- k. *wudmyo lee dmi, pîdmyi m:uu*  
 CFAnt2plIMM.P go.fol plS.P.IV CFCons2plIMM. see  
*ngmê* (you3)  
 PFS.3sO  
 ‘If you3 had gone (today), you would have seen it’
- l. ***wo dmy:oo lee dniye, daa pîdmye m:uu***  
 CFAnt2plIMM.P go.fol plS.REM.IV NEG CFCons2plIMM.P see  
*ngmê*  
 PFS.3sO  
 ‘If you3 had not gone (today), you3 would not have seen it’
- m. *wudu lee dmi, pudu m:uu* (we3)  
 CFAnt1plIMM.P go.fol plS.P.IV CFCons1plIMM.P see  
 ‘If we3 had gone (today) we would have seen it’
- n. ***wo dp:o lee dniye, daa pudu***  
 NEG.CFAnt1plIMM.P go.fol plS.REM.IV NEG CFCons1plIMM.P  
***m:uu***  
 see  
 ‘If we3 had not gone (today), we would not have seen it’
- o. *waa lee knî, paa nm:uu ngmê*  
 CFAnt3dIMM.P go.fol dSPI.IV CFCons3dIMM.P see PFS.3sO  
 ‘If they2 had gone (today), they2 would have seen it’
- p. ***wodoo lee knâpwo, daa paa***  
 NEGCFAnt3dIMM.P go dSREMPL.IV NEG CFCons3dIMM.P  
***m:uu ngmê***  
 see PFS.3sO  
 ‘If they2 hadn’t gone (today) they would not have seen it’
- q. *waa lee dmi, paa m:uu*  
 CFAnt3plIMM.P go.fol plSIMM.IV CFCons3plIMMP see  
*ngmê*  
 PFS.3sO  
 ‘If they3 had gone, they would have seen it’
- r. ***wodoo lee dniye, daa paa***  
 NEGCFAnt3IMM.P go.fol plS.REM.IV NEG CFCons3dIMM.P  
***m:uu ngmê***  
 see PFS.3sO  
 ‘If they3 had not gone, they would not have seen it’

Examples for the Near Past tense (yesterday) follow (here there is no tense shift):

- (459) a. *w:aa*                      *lê, p:aa*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt1sNrPSTP go, CFCons1sNrPSTP see  
 ‘If I had gone yesterday, I would have seen it’
- b. ***wo dîpî***                      ***lê, daa p:aa***                      ***m:uu***  
 NEGCFAnt1NrPSTP go NEG CFCons1dNrPSTP see  
 ‘If I had not gone yesterday I would not have seen it’
- c. *w:ee*                      *lee knî,*                      *p:ee*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt1dNrPSTP go dSNrPST.IV CFCons1dNrPSTP see  
 ‘If we2 had gone yesterday we would have seen it’
- d. ***wo dîpî***                      ***lee knî,***                      ***daa p:ee***  
 NEGCFAnt1NrPSTP go.fol dSNrPST.IV NEG CFCons1dNrPSTP  
***m:uu***  
 see  
 ‘If we2 hadn’t gone yesterday we2 wouldn’t have seen it’
- e. *w:oo*                      *lee dmi,*                      *p:oo*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt1plNrPSTP go plSNrPSTIV CFCons1plNrPSTP see  
 ‘If we3 hadn’t gone yesterday, we would not have seen it’
- f. ***wo dîpî***                      ***lee dmi,***                      ***daa p:oo***  
 NEG.CFAnt1plNrPST go.fol plSNrPSTIV, NEG CFCons1plNrPSTP  
***m:uu***  
 see  
 ‘If we3 had not gone yesterday, we wouldn’t have seen it’
- g. *w:ii*                      *lê, p:ii*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt2sNrPSTP go CFCons2sNrPSTP see  
 ‘If you1 had gone yesterday you would have seen it’
- h. ***wo dîpî***                      ***lê, daa p:ee***                      ***m:uu***  
 NEG.CFAnt2sNrPSTP go NEG CFCons2NrPSTP see  
 ‘If you1 hadn’t gone yesterday, you wouldn’t have seen it’
- i. *woo*                      *lee knî,*                      *poo*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt2dNrPSTP go.fol dSNrPST.IV CFCons2dNrPSTP see  
*ngmê*  
 PFS.3sO  
 ‘If you2 had gone yesterday you2 would have seen it’
- j. ***wo dîpî***                      ***lee knî,***                      ***daa poo***  
 NEGCFAnt2dNrPSTP go.fol dSNrPST.IV NEG CFCons2dNrPSTP  
***m:uu ngmê***  
 see PFS.3sO  
 ‘If you2 hadn’t gone yesterday you2 wouldn’t have seen it’

- k. *w:ee*                      *lee*    *dmi*,                      *p:ee*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt2plNrPSTP   go.fol   plSNrPSTIV   CFCons2plNrPSTP   see  
*ngmê*  
 PFS.3so  
 ‘If you3 had gone yesterday you3 would have seen it’
- l. ***wo dpîpî***                      *lee*    *dmi*,                      ***daa p:ee***  
 CFAnt2plNrPSTP   go.fol   plSNrPSTIV   NEG   CFCons2plNrPSTP  
***m:uu ngmê***  
 see    PFS.3sO  
 ‘If you3 had not gone yesterday, you3 would not have seen it’
- m. *wo*                      *lê*,    *pî*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt3NrPSTP   go,   CFCons3NrPSTP   see  
 ‘If he had gone, he would have seen it’
- n. ***wudaa***                      *lê*,    ***daa pê***                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt3NrPSTP   go   NEG.CFCons3NrPSTP   see  
 ‘If he hadn’t gone he wouldn’t have seen it (yesterday)’
- o. *wo*                      *lee*    *knî*,                      *pî*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt3NrPSTP   go.fol   dSNrPST.IV   CFCons3NrPSTP   see  
*ngmê*  
 PFS.3sO  
 ‘If they2 had gone, they2/3 would have seen it’
- p. ***wodaa***                      *lee*    *knî*,                      ***daa pê***  
 CFAnt3d/plNrPSTP   go.fol   dSNrPST.IV   NEG   CFCons3NrPSTP  
***m:uu ngmê***  
 see    PFS.3sO  
 ‘If they2 hadn’t gone they wouldn’t have seen it’
- q. *wo*                      *lee*    *dmi*,                      *pî*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt3NrPSTP   go.fol   plSNrPSTIV   CFCons3NrPSTP   see  
*ngmê* (they3)  
 PFS.3sO  
 ‘If they3 had gone yesterday they would have seen it’
- r. ***wodaa***                      *lee*    *dmi*,                      ***daa pê***  
 CFAnt3d/plNrPSTP   go.fol   plSNrPST.IV   NEG   CFCons3NrPSTP  
***m:uu ngmê***  
 see    PFS.3sO  
 ‘If they3 had not gone, they would not have seen it’

There follows some exemplification of the Remote Past (i.e. expressing thoughts about things that might have happened before yesterday).

- (460) a. *w:aa*                      *loo,*                      *p:aa*                      *módu*  
 CFAnt1sREMP go.REM CFCons1sREMP see.REM  
 ‘If I had gone (before yesterday) I would have seen it’
- b. ***wo dîpî***                      ***loo,***                      ***daa p:aa***                      ***módu***  
 NEG.CF1REMP go.REM NEG CFCons1sREMP see.REM  
 ‘If I had not gone (before yesterday) I would not have seen it’
- c. *w:ee*                      *lee*                      *knâpwo,*                      *p:ee*                      *módu*  
 CFAnt1dREMP go.fol dREMP.IV CFCons1sREMP see.REM  
 ‘If we2 had gone (before yesterday) , we2 would have seen it’
- d. ***wo dîp:ee***                      ***lee***                      ***knâpwo,***                      ***daa p:ee***                      ***módu***  
 NEGCFAnt1dREMP go.fol dSREMP NEG CFCons1sREMP see.REM  
 ‘If we2 had not gone (before yesterday), we would not have seen it’
- e. *w:oo*                      *lee*                      *dniye,*                      *p:oo*                      *módu*  
 CFAnt1plREMP go.fol plSREMP.IV CFCons1plREMP see.Rem  
 ‘If we3 had gone (before yesterday), we3 would have seen it’
- f. ***wo dpîpî***                      ***lee***                      ***dniye,***                      ***daa p:oo***                      ***módu***  
 CFAnt1REMP go.fol plSREMP.IV NEG CFCons1plREMP see.REM  
 ‘If we3 had not gone (before yesterday), we would not have seen it’
- g. *w:ii*                      *loo,*                      *p:ii*                      *módu*  
 CFAnt2sREMP go.REM CFCons2sREMP see.REM  
 ‘If you1 had gone (before yesterday) you1 would have seen it’
- h. ***wo dîpî***                      ***loo,***                      ***daa p:ee***                      ***módu***  
 NEG.CF2REMP go.REM NEG CFCons2sREMP see.REM  
 ‘If you1 had not gone you would not have seen it’
- i. *woo*                      *lee*                      *knâpwo,*                      *poo*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt2dREMP go.fol d.REMP.IV CFCons2dREMP see  
*ngópu*  
 PFS3sOREMP  
 ‘If you2 had gone (before yesterday) you would have seen it’
- j. ***wo dpîpî***                      ***lee***                      ***knâpwo,***                      ***daa poo***                      ***m:uu***  
 CFAnt2sREMP go.fol d.REMP.IV NEG CFCons2dREMP see  
*ngópu*  
 PFS3sOREMP  
 ‘If you2 hadn’t gone before yesterday you would not have seen it’
- k. *w:ee*                      *lee*                      *knâpwo,*                      *p:ee*                      *m:uu*  
 CFAnt1dREMP go.fol plSREMP.IV CFCons1dREMP see  
*ngópu*  
 PFS3sOREMP  
 ‘If we2 had gone (before yesterday) we2 would have seen it’

- l. **wo dpîpî**                      **lee**    **knâpwo**    **daa p:ee**  
 NEG.CFAnt1REMP go.fol plSREMP.IV NEG CFCons1dREMP  
**m:uu ngópu**  
 see PFS3sOREMP  
 ‘If we2 had not gone (before yesterday) we would not have seen it’
- m. **w:oo**                      **lee**    **dniyé,**                      **p:oo**                      **m:uu**  
 CFAnt1plREMP go.fol plSREMP.IV CFCons1plREMP see  
**ngópu**  
 PFS3sOREMP  
 ‘If we3 had gone (before yesterday) we3 would have seen it’
- n. **wo dpîpî**                      **lee**    **dniye,**                      **daa p:oo**  
 NEG.CFAnt1REMP go.fol plSREMP.IV NEG CFCons1plREMP  
**m:uu ngópu**  
 see PFS3sOREMP  
 ‘If we3 had not gone (before yesterday) we would not have seen it’
- o. **wo**                      **loo,**                      **pî**                      **módu (he)**  
 CFAnt3REMP go.REM CFCons3REMP see.REM  
 ‘If he had gone (before yesterday) he would have seen it’
- p. **wo daa**                      **loo,**                      **daa pî**                      **módu**  
 NEG.CFAnt3RMP go.REM NEG CFCons3REMP see.REM  
 ‘If he hadn’t gone he wouldn’t have seen it’
- q. **wo**                      **lee**    **knâpwo,**                      **pî**                      **m:uu**  
 CFAnt3RMP go.fol dSREMP.IV CFCons3REMP see.fol  
**ngópu**  
 PFS3sOREMP  
 ‘If they2 had gone before yesterday, they would have seen it’
- r. **wo daa**                      **lee**    **knâpwo,**                      **daa pê**  
 NEG.CFAnt3RMP go.fol dSREMP.IV NEG CFCons3d/plREMP  
**m:uu ngópu**  
 see.fol PFS3sOREMP  
 ‘If they2 had not gone before yesterday, they would not have seen it’
- s. **wo**                      **lee**    **dniye,**                      **pî**                      **m:uu**  
 CFAnt3RMP go.fol plSREMP.IV CFCons3REMP see.fol  
**ngópu (they3)**  
 PLS3sOREMP  
 ‘If they3 had gone, they would have seen it’

- t. *wo daa lee dniye, daa pê*  
 NEGCFAnt3RMP go.fol plSREMP.IV NEG CFCons3d/plREMP  
*m:uu ngópu*  
 see.fol PFS3sOREMP  
 ‘If they3 had not gone, they would not have seen it’

Unlike with the Continuous counterfactuals, I was unable to elicit systematic punctual habituals, positive or negative.

### 8.3.2.3 Continuous aspect: Negative counterfactuals

**Table 8.7:** Negative Counterfactual proclitics – Continuous aspect (Positives in roman, corresponding Negatives in **bold**).

TENSE, PERSON	SING		DUAL		PLURAL	
	If	then	If	then	If	then
<b>Future/ Present</b>						
1	<i>wunê</i> <b>wo dinê</b>	<i>pênê</i> <b>daa p:aa</b>	<i>w:ee</i> <b>wo dipi</b>	<i>p:ee</i> <b>daa p:ee</b>	<i>w:oo</i> <b>wo dpîpî</b>	<i>pun:oo</i> <b>daa pon:oo</b>
2	<i>w:ee</i> <b>d:ee</b>	<i>p:ee</i> <b>daa nyi</b>	<i>wodo</i> <b>wo dpîdoo</b>	<i>po / podo</i> <b>daa poo</b>	<i>w:ee</i> <b>wodaa</b>	<i>pînmyi</i> <b>daa pînmyi</b>
3	<i>wo</i> <b>wo daa</b>	<i>pê</i> <b>daa pê</b>	<i>wo</i> <b>wo dipi</b>	<i>pê</i> <b>daa p:ee</b>	<i>wo</i> <b>wo daa</b>	<i>pê</i> <b>daa pê</b>
<b>Imm Past (today)</b>						
1	<i>w:aa</i> <b>wo dî nê</b>	<i>p:aa</i> <b>daa p:aa</b>	<i>w:ee</i> <b>wo d:ee</b>	<i>p:ee</i> <b>daa p:ee</b>	<i>w:oo</i> <b>wo dpînê</b>	<i>p:oo</i> <b>daa p:oo</b>
2	<i>w:ii</i> <b>wochoo</b>	<i>p:ii</i> <b>daa pichi</b>	<i>woo</i> <b>wo dpîpî</b>	<i>poo</i> <b>daa poo</b>	<i>w:ee</i> <b>w:ee dp:ee</b>	<i>p:ee</i> <b>daa p:ee</b>
3	<i>wo</i> <b>wo daa</b>	<i>pî</i> <b>daa pî</b>	<i>wo</i> <b>wo daa</b>	<i>pî</i> <b>daa pî</b>	<i>wo</i> <b>wo daa</b>	<i>pî</i> <b>daa pî</b>
<b>Near Past (yesterday)</b>						
1	<i>w:aa</i> <b>wo dê</b> <b>nê</b>	<i>p:aa</i> <b>daa p:aa</b>	<i>wony:oo</i> <b>wo dipi</b>	<i>pêny:oo</i> <b>daa p:ee</b>	<i>wunê</i> <b>wo dê nê</b>	<i>pênmi</i> <b>daa p:aa</b>
2	<i>w:ii</i> <b>wodipi</b>	<i>p:ii</i> <b>daa p:ee</b>	<i>wudu</i> <b>wo dpo</b>	<i>pudu</i> <b>daa pudu</b>	<i>wu nmyi</i> <b>wo dê nmyi</b>	<i>pînmyi</i> <b>daa pînmyi</b>
3	<i>waa</i> <b>wo dê dî</b>	<i>paa</i> <b>daa paa</b>	<i>wudu</i> <b>wo dê dpî</b>	<i>pudu</i> <b>daa pê dpî</b>	<i>wu dnyi</i> <b>wo dê dnyi</b>	<i>pêdnyi</i> <b>daa pêdnyi</b>



Table 8.7 (continued)

TENSE, PERSON	SING		DUAL		PLURAL	
	If	then	If	then	If	then
<b>Rem Past (before yesterday)</b>						
1	<i>wonoo</i> <i>wo dê</i> <i>noo</i>	<i>ponoo</i> <i>daa</i> <i>ponoo</i>	<i>wonyipu</i> <i>wo dê</i> <i>nyipu</i>	<i>pênyipu</i> <i>daa</i> <i>pênyipu</i>	<i>wonmee</i> <i>wo dê</i> <i>nmee</i>	<i>pênmee</i> <i>daa pênmee</i>
2	<i>wonyoo</i>	<i>pênyoo</i>	<i>wodpîmo</i> <i>wo</i> <i>dêdpîmo</i>	<i>pêdpîmo</i> <i>daa pê</i> <i>dpîmo</i>	<i>wonmyee</i> <i>wo dê</i> <i>nmyee</i>	<i>pênmyee</i> <i>daa</i> <i>pênmyee</i>
3	<i>wodoo</i> <i>wo</i> <i>dêpwo</i>	<i>podoo</i> <i>daa</i> <i>podoo</i>	<i>wodpîmo</i> <i>wo</i> <i>dêdpîmo</i>	<i>pêdpîmo</i> <i>daa</i> <i>pêdpîmo</i>	<i>wudnye</i> <i>wo dê dnye</i>	<i>pîdnye</i> <i>daa pêdnye</i>
<b>Hab</b>						
1	<i>wunê</i> <i>wo dî nê</i>	<i>pênê</i> <i>daa p:aa</i>	<i>w:ee</i> <i>wo d:ee</i>	<i>p:ee</i> <i>daa p:ee</i>	<i>w:oo</i> <i>wo dpîn:oo</i>	<i>p:oo</i> <i>daa pono/ pên:oo</i>
2	<i>w:ee</i> <i>wod:ee</i>	<i>p:ee</i> <i>daa p:ee</i>	<i>wodo</i> <i>wo dpî doo</i>	<i>podo</i> <i>daa poo</i>	<i>w:ee</i> <i>wo dp:ee</i>	<i>p:ee</i> <i>daa p:ee</i>
3	<i>wo</i> <i>wo daa</i>	<i>pê</i> <i>daa pê</i>	<i>wo</i> <i>wo daa</i>	<i>pê</i> <i>daa pê</i>	<i>wo</i> <i>wo daa</i>	<i>pê</i> <i>daa pê</i>
<b>EXISTENCE “If you were”</b>						
1	<i>w:aa</i> <i>wa d:aa</i>	<i>p:aa</i> <i>d:aa p:aa</i>	<i>w:ee</i> <i>wo d:ee</i>	<i>p:ee</i> <i>daa p:ee</i>	<i>w:oo</i> <i>wo dp:oo</i>	<i>p:oo</i> <i>daa p:oo</i>
2	<i>w:ii</i> <i>wo d:ii</i>	<i>p:ii</i> <i>daa p:ee</i>	<i>woo</i> <i>wo dpo</i>	<i>poo</i> <i>daa poo</i>	<i>w:ee</i> <i>wo dp:ee</i>	<i>p:ee</i> <i>daa p:ee</i>
3	<i>wo</i> <i>wo daa</i>	<i>pê</i> <i>daa pê</i>	<i>wo</i> <i>wo daa</i>	<i>pê</i> <i>daa pê</i>	<i>wo</i> <i>wo daa</i>	<i>pê</i> <i>daa pê</i>

The negative continuous counterfactuals offer a full paradigm, complete with Habitual aspect as shown in Table 8.7 (organized in a slightly different way to the punctual paradigm). Note that the negatives in the table appear more analysable than they actually are: whereas the negative consequents often merely differ from the positives by a preposed *daa*, the antecedents like *wo dî nê* look analysable but aren't (there is no collocation *dî nê* elsewhere in this or other paradigms). However for many of the forms more analytic alternatives seem possible. For example the

forms *wudu* . . . *pudu*, 3<sup>rd</sup> person dual Near Past, apparently have the alternatives *wo dpî* . . . *paa dpî* where *dpî* is the regular 3<sup>rd</sup> Person Dual for this tense in the indicative.

It is notable that important contrasts are carried by as little as single subtle vowel changes – cf. for example Near Past 3<sup>rd</sup> Person Plural *wo dê dnyi*. . . *daa pêdnyi* and Remote Past 3<sup>rd</sup> Person Plural *wo dnê dnye* . . . *daa pêdnye*. These are genuine contrasts.

Here we will just selectively illustrate with some exemplars of the table above. Note that *mbwo tpapê* ‘chewing native betelnut’ is a customary activity typically with nominal incorporation, which renders a transitive verb into an intransitive one – the nominal will then fall between the proclitic and the verb. We start with the Present tense.

- (461) a. *wunê*                      *dpodo*,    *pênê*                      *mbwoo*    *tpapê*  
 CFAnt1sPRSC    working    CFCons1sPRSC    betel    chewing  
 ‘If I would be working (now), I would be chewing’
- b. *wo dînê*                      *dpodo*,    *daa p:aa*                      *mbwoo*    *tpapê*  
 NEGCFAnt1sPRSC    working    NEG    CFCons1sPRSC    betel    chewing  
 ‘If I was not working I would not be betel chewing’
- c. *w:ee*                      *dpodo*,    *p:ee*                      *mbwo*    *tpapê*  
 CFAnt2sPRSC    working    CFCons2sPRSC    betel    chewing  
 ‘If you1 were working (now) you would be betel chewing’
- d. *d:ee*                      *dpodo*,    *daa p:ee*                      *mbwo*    *tpapê*  
 NEGCFAnt2sPRSC    working    NEG    CFCons2sPRSC    betel    chewing  
 ‘If you1 were not working (now) you1 would not be betel chewing’
- e. *wodo*                      *dpodo*    *mo*,                      *podo*                      *mbwo*  
 CFAnt2dPRSC    working    dSPRSC.IV    CFCons2dPRSC    betel  
*tpapê*    *mo*  
 chewing    dSPRSC.IV  
 ‘If you2 were now working, you would be betel chewing’
- f. *wodpîdoo*                      *dpodo*    *mo*,                      *daa p:oo*  
 NEGCFAnt2dPRSC    working    plSPRSC.IV    NEG    CFCons2sPRSC  
*mbwo*                      *tpapê*    *mo*  
 betel                      chewing    plSPRSC.IV  
 ‘If you2 were not now working, you2 would not now be betel chewing’
- g. *w:ee*                      *dpodo*    *té*,                      *pînmyî*  
 CFAnt2plPRSC    working    plSPRSC.IV    CFCons2plPRSCIV  
*mbwo*    *tpapê*    *té*  
 betel    chewing    plSPRSC.IV  
 ‘If you3 were now working, you3 would be betel chewing’

- h. **wodaa** **dpodo** **té,** **daa pînmyî**  
 NEGCFAnt2plPRSC working plSPRSC.IV NEG CFCons2plIPRSIV  
**mbwo tpapê té**  
 betel chewing plSPRSC.IV  
 'If you<sub>3</sub> were not now working, you<sub>3</sub> would not now be betel chewing'
- i. **wo** **dpodo,** **pê** **mbwo tpapê**  
 CFAnt3sPRSC working CFCons3sPRSC betel chewing  
 'If he were working he would be betel chewing'
- j. **wo daa** **dpodo,** **daa pê** **mbwo tpapê**  
 NEGCFAnt3sPRSC working, NEG CFCons3s betel chewing  
 'If he were not now working he would be betel chewing'

Some examples in Near Past tense (yesterday) follow.

- (462) a. **w:aa** **dpodo,** **p:aa** **mbwo tpapê**  
 CFAnt1sIMMC working CFCons1sIMMC betel chewing  
 'If I had been working (yesterday) I would have been betel chewing'
- b. **wo dî nê** **dpodo,** **daa p:aa** **mbwo tpapê**  
 NEGCFAnt1sIMMC working NEG CFCons1sIMMC betel chewing  
 'If I hadn't been working (yesterday) I wouldn't have been betel chewing'
- c. **woo** **dpodo** **mo,** **poo** **mbwo**  
 CFAnt2dIMMC working plSPROXC.IV CFCons2dIMMC betel  
**tpapê mo**  
 chewing plSPROXIV  
 'If you<sub>2</sub> had been working yesterday, you<sub>2</sub> would have been chewing'
- d. **wo dpîpî** **dpodo** **mo,** **daa poo**  
 NEGCFAnt2dIMMC working plSPROXIV NEG CFCons2dIMMC  
**mbwo tpapê mo**  
 betel chewing plSPROXIV  
 'If you<sub>2</sub> hadn't been working yesterday, you<sub>2</sub> would not have been chewing'
- e. **wudu** **dpodo,** **pudu** **mbwo tpapê**  
 CFAnt3dIMMC working CFCons3dIMMC betel chewing  
 'If they<sub>2</sub> had been working yesterday, they would have been chewing'
- f. **wo dê dpî** **dpodo,** **daa pê dpî** **mbwo tpapê**  
 NEGCFAnt3dIMMC working NEG CFCons3dIMMC betel chewing  
 'If they<sub>2</sub> had not been working yesterday, they would not have been betel chewing'

Here are some Remote Past examples:

- (463) a. *wonmee dpodo, pênmee nkéli mwaa*  
 CFAnt1plREMC working CFCons1plREMC boat water  
*ndanî* (we3 REM)  
 drinking  
 ‘If we3 had been working (before yesterday) we3 would have been drinking beer’
- b. *wo dê nmee dpodo, daa pênmee nkéli mbwaa*  
 NEG1plREMC working NEG CFCons1plREMC boat water  
*ndanî*  
 drinking  
 ‘If we3 had not been working (before yesterday), we3 would not have been drinking beer’
- c. *wonmyee dpodo, pênmyee nkéli mbwaa ndanî*  
 CFAnt2plREMC working CFCons2plREMC boat water drinking  
 ‘If you3 had been working (before yesterday) you3 would have been drinking beer’
- d. *wo dê nmyee dpodo, daa pênmyee nkeli*  
 NEGCFAnt2plREMC working NEG CFCons2plREMC boat  
*mbwaa ndanî*  
 water drinking  
 ‘If they2 had not been working (before yesterday) they would not have been drinking beer’
- e. *wu dnye dpodo, pêdnye nkéli mbwaa ndanê*  
 CFAnt3plREMC working CFCons3plREMC boat water drinking  
 ‘If they3 had been working (before yesterday) they would have been drinking beer’
- f. *wo dê dnye dpodo, daa pêdnye nkéli*  
 NEGCFAnt3plREMC working NEG CFCons3plREMC boat  
*mbwaa ndanî*  
 water drinking  
 ‘If they had not been working (before yesterday) they would not have been drinking beer’

Now some exemplification of the Habitual Mood:

- (464) a. *wunê dpodo, pêê mbwo tpapê*  
 CFAnt1sHAB working CFCons1sHAB betel chewing  
 ‘If I had been habitually working, I would habitually have been betel chewing’
- b. *wo dî nê dpodo, daa p:aa mbwo tpapê*  
 NEG.CFAnt1sHAB working NEG CFCons1sHAB betel chewing  
 ‘If I had not been habitually working I would not have been habitually betel chewing’
- c. *w:ee dpodo mo, p:ee mbwo tpapê*  
 CFAnt1dHAB working dSC.IV CFCons1dHAB betel chewing  
*mo*  
 dSC.IV  
 ‘If we2 had been habitually working, we would have been habitually betel chewing’
- d. *wo d:ee dpodo mo, daa p:ee mbwo*  
 NEG.CFAnt1dHAB working dSC.IV NEG CFCons1dHAB betel  
*tpapê mo*  
 chewing dSC.IV  
 ‘If we2 had not been habitually working, we wouldn’t have been habitually betel chewing’
- e. *w:oo dpodo té, p:oo mbwo tpapê*  
 CFAnt1plHAB working plSC.IV CFCons1dHAB betel chewing  
*té*  
 dSC.IV  
 ‘If we3 had been working, we3 would have been habitually betel chewing’
- f. *wo dpîn:oo dpodo té, daa pê:n:oo mbwo*  
 NEG.CFAnt1plHAB working plSC.IV NEG.CFCons1dHAB betel  
*tpapê té*  
 chewing dSC.IV  
 ‘If we3 had not been working, we3 would not have been habitually betel chewing’
- g. *w:ee dpodo, p:ee mbwo tpapê – 2sHAB*  
 CFAnt2sHAB working CFCons2sHAB betel chewing  
 ‘If you1 had been habitually working, you would have been habitually betel chewing’

- h. **wo d:ee**                      **dpodo, daa p:ee**                      **mbwo tpapê**  
 NEG.CFAnt2sHAB working NEG CFCons2sHAB betel chewing  
 ‘If you<sub>1</sub> had not been habitually working, you would not have been  
 habitually betel chewing’
- i. **w:ee**                      **dpodo té,**                      **p:ee**                      **mbwo tpapê**  
 CFAnt2plHAB working plSC.IV CFCons2plHAB betel chewing  
**té**  
 plSC.IV  
 ‘If you<sub>3</sub> had been habitually working, you<sub>3</sub> would have been  
 habitually chewing betel’
- j. **wo dp:ee**                      **dpodo té,**                      **daa p:ee**                      **mbwo**  
 NEG.CFAnt2plHAB working plSC.IV NEG.CFCons2plHAB betel  
**tpapê té**  
 chewing plSC.IV  
 ‘If you<sub>3</sub> had not been habitually working, you<sub>3</sub> would not have been  
 habitually chewing betel’
- k. **wo**                      **dpodo yédi,**                      **pê**                      **mbwo**  
 CFAnt3HAB working 3sHABC.PROX CFCons3HAB betel  
**tpapê yédi**  
 chewing 3sHABC.PROX  
 ‘If he had been habitually working, he would habitually have  
 been chewing betel’
- l. **wo daa**                      **dpodo yédi,**                      **daa pê**  
 NEG.CFAnt3HAB working 3sHABC.PROX NEG CFCons3HAB  
**mbwo tpapê yédi**  
 betel chewing 3sHABC.PROX  
 ‘If he had not been habitually working, he would not habitually  
 have been chewing betel’
- m. **wo**                      **dpodo nó dó,**                      **pê**                      **mbwo**  
 CFAnt3HAB working 3dHABC.PROX CFCons3HAB betel  
**tpapê nó dó**  
 chewing 3dHABC.PROX  
 ‘If they<sub>2</sub> had been habitually working, they<sub>2</sub> would habitually  
 have been chewing betel’
- n. **wo daa**                      **dpodo nó dó,**                      **daa pê**  
 NEG.CFAnt3HAB working 3dHABC.PROX NEG CFCons3HAB  
**mbwo tpapê nó dó**  
 betel chewing 3dHABC.PROX  
 ‘If they<sub>2</sub> had not been habitually working, they<sub>2</sub> would not  
 habitually have been chewing betel’

- o. *wo dpodo nyédi, pê mbwo*  
 CFAnt3HAB working 3plHABC.PROX CFCCons3HAB betel  
*tpapê nyédi*  
 chewing 3plHABC.PROX  
 'If they3 had been habitually working, they3 would habitually have  
 been chewing betel'
- p. *wo daa dpodo nyédi, daa pê*  
 NEG.CFAnt3HAB working 3plHABC.PROX NEG CFCCons3HAB  
*mbwo tpapê nyédi*  
 betel chewing 3plHABC.PROX  
 'If they3 had not been habitually working, they3 would not  
 habitually have been chewing betel'

Finally, there are equative sentences with predicative nominals (continuous in nature), of the kind illustrated below:

- (465) a. *w:aa nkwépi, p:aa pi dono*  
 CFAnt1sEQU sorcerer CFCCons1sEQU person bad  
 'If I was a sorcerer I would be a bad person'
- b. *wo d:aa nkwépi, d:aa p:aa pi dono*  
 NEG.CFAnt1sEQU sorcerer NEG.CFCCons1sEQU person bad  
 'If I wasn't a sorcerer I would not be a bad person'
- c. *w:ee nkwépi dê, p:ee pi dono dê*  
 CFAnt1dEQU sorcerer DUAL CFCCons1sEQU person bad DUAL  
 'If we2 were sorcerers, we2 would be bad people'
- d. *wo d:ee nkwépi dê, daa p:ee pi*  
 NEG.CFAnt1dEQU sorcerer DUAL NEGSCFCCons1sEQU person  
*dono dê*  
 bad DUAL  
 'If we2 were not sorcerers, we2 would not be bad people'
- e. *w:oo nkwépi dé, p:oo pi dono dé*  
 CFAnt1plEQU sorcerer PL CFCCons1plEQU person bad PL  
 'If we3 were sorcerers, we3 would be bad people'
- f. *wo dp:oo nkwépi dé, daa p:oo pi*  
 NEG.CFAnt1plEQU sorcerer PL NEG.CFCCons1plEQU person  
*dono dé*  
 bad PL  
 'If we3 were not sorcerers, we3 would not be bad people'

- g. *woo nkwépi dê, poo pi dono dê*  
 CFAnt2dEQU sorcerer DUAL CFCons2dEQU person bad DUAL  
 ‘If you2 were sorcerers, you would be bad people’
- h. ***wo dpo nkwépi dê, daa poo pi***  
 NEG.CFAnt2dEQU sorcerer DUAL NEG.CFCons2dEQU person  
***dono dê***  
 bad DUAL  
 ‘If you2 were not sorcerers, you2 would not be bad people’
- i. *w:ee nkwépi dé, p:ee pi dono dé*  
 CFAnt2plEQU sorcerer PL CFCons2plEQU person bad PL  
 ‘If you3 were sorcerers, you3 would be bad people’
- j. ***wo dp:ee nkwépi dé, daa p:ee pi***  
 NEG.CFAnt2plEQU sorcerer PL NEG.CFCons2plEQU person  
***dono dé***  
 bad PL  
 ‘If you3 were not sorcerers, you3 would not be bad people’
- k. *wo nkwépi, pê pi dono*  
 CFAnt3EQU sorcerer CFCons3EQU person bad  
 ‘If he was a sorcerer he would be a bad person’
- l. ***wo daa nkwépi, daa pê pi dono***  
 NEG.CFAnt3EQU sorcerer NEG.CFCons3EQU bad person  
 ‘If he was not a sorcerer he would not be a bad person’
- m. *wo nkwépi dê, pê pi dono*  
 CFAnt3EQU sorcerer DUAL CFCons3EQU person bad  
*dê (they2)*  
 DUAL  
 ‘If they2 were sorcerers they2 would be bad people’
- n. ***wo daa nkwépi dê, daa pê pi***  
 NEG.CFAnt3EQU sorcerer DUAL NEG.CFCons3EQU person  
***dono dê***  
 bad DUAL  
 ‘If they2 were not sorcerers they2 would not be bad people’
- o. *wo nkwépi dé, pê pi dono dé*  
 CFAnt3EQU sorcerer PL CFCons3EQU person bad PL  
 ‘If they3 were sorcerers they3 would be bad people’
- p. ***wo daa nkwépi dé, daa pê pi***  
 NEG.CFAnt3EQU sorcerer PL NEG.CFCons3EQU person  
***dono dé***  
 bad PL  
 ‘If they3 were not sorcerers they3 would not be bad people’



## 8.4 Quotation and reported speech

Generally speaking, all reported speech is quoted directly, with the tense and person appropriate at the original time of speaking. The fidelity of reproduction sometimes even includes reporting the words in the original language if different from Yêlî Dnye (for example in Tok Pisin, which is not much in use on Rossel). One systematic exception to this, mentioned earlier (§5.2), is that pronouns can obtain ergative marking in quotation contexts, and in this case pronouns pick up the actual reference rather than the reported one. This and other subtle relativizations of deictic parameters are described in §8.4.3, but the main complications involve circumstances where A says something to B to tell C – in this case B's telling C may retain 3<sup>rd</sup> person marking in verbal form (and A's tense marking), but introduce 2<sup>nd</sup> person in pronominal form (as in 'Dad says you are to come now' expressed as 'Dad says you let him come now'). Section 8.4.2 is devoted to this special case, while §8.4.1 details normal reported speech, which involves hundreds of special quote formulae.

Reported speech constructions are used to do much more than report actual speech. They are also the general means for describing people's states of mind. So to narrate that the protagonist was thinking such and such, one says in effect 'He said to himself: I'll do such and such', where deixis is largely relativized to the protagonist's point of view. However, although the tense of the embedded thought may therefore be present (cf. *He thought "I'm going"*), it may also be past, reflecting the time of the thinking (cf. *He thought I'd (i.e. he'd) go*). Mostly these constructions involve a first person subjective perspective, as in the 'want' construction detailed in §7.5. The following examples illustrate some of these usages:

- (466) a. *u yi u ngwo doo a kwo, nî lê*  
           his desire 3sEXP 3sRemCI CLOSE standing 1sPST go  
           'He wanted (before yesterday) to go', lit. 'His desire was standing: I go'
- b. *ngmênê u kwo, wudî lê*  
           it.seems.to.him CFAnt1sIMM go  
           'It seems to him: I should have gone'  
           i.e. 'He realized he should have gone'
- c. *mw:aandiye apê n:aa lêpî*  
           morning 3>self.PI.QUOT (he.said.to.self) 1sImmFUTCI goCI  
           *Kîikwolo*  
           *Kîikwolo*  
           'Yesterday in the morning he said to himself: I'll go to Kîikwolo'

- d. *nipi* *nê dono*  
 1s>self.HAB.QUOT.to.self 1s bad  
 ‘I always used to say to myself: I’m bad’

But there’s at least one construction, with its own paradigm of pseudo-quotation particles meaning ‘without his/their, etc., knowing’, which systematically uses a fixed 2<sup>nd</sup> person as subjective subject:

- (467) *Ghaalyu mgîdî vy:o Ø dpî,*  
*Ghaalyu* night in 3NrPST sleeping  
 ‘Ghaalyu was sleeping in the middle of the night  
*nana kwodo yimê ngê \_nyi pyââ*  
 3sNot.Knowing.NrPast rat ERG 2sPOSS.foot toe  
*ngee pîpî*  
 3PRSCI.CLS eating  
 without knowing that a rat was chewing your (Ghaalyu’s) toes’

This makes sense if the construction is thought of as *unreported speech*: ‘He was not told: the rat is chewing *your* toes’. The construction is further discussed below.

#### 8.4.1 Quotation with quotation particles

Quotation by quotation particle is of special importance, because it is not only the means of reporting speech, but also, as mentioned, the basic means to express subjectivity – the thoughts, feelings, intentions and subjective states of protagonists, as illustrated by the following (quotatives in bold):

- (468) a. ***ngmê nê u kwo*** *daa nê lê, nana kwodo dîy:o*  
 it.seems.to.her NEG 1sIMM.PI go without.knowing later  
*kââdî, ala ngwo, **apu**, n:aa lêpî*  
 sun now 3s>3sQUOT 1sPROXCI going  
 ‘She thought to herself “I won’t go”, but unbeknownst to her, later the sun (came out), now, she said to herself, I’ll go’
- b. *kî tpêmi ngê kma **apu** nê kwódu*  
 this boy ERG frog 3s>selfQUOT.PRS 1sPST.PI blockade  
 ‘This boy is saying to himself I am going to capture this frog, i.e. he is trying to catch the frog’

In principle, quotatives are used before each clause of reported speech – the following was an infamous statement by a resident whiteman who had meant to say *pyaa yâmuyâmu*, ‘crocodile hunting’ (cf. Henderson 1995:85):

- (469) *Hughie ngê yepê, n:aa pyââ yâmuyâmu*  
 Hughie ERG 3s>3plQUOT.REM 1sImmFUTCI woman hunting  
 ‘Hughie said: “I am going woman hunting”’

Consequently, scope of the quotation is not in question in sentences like the following:

- (470) *Machedê kwo mê d:uu ngî, mê*  
 finished 3s>3sQUOT.REM REP3REM do plS.2sOIMP REP3REM  
*d:uu ngê*  
 do MFS3sO  
 ‘OK, he said (to him): “Do it again”, and he did it again’

The predicates of saying here are not normal verbs – they are quotation formula or particles that encode subject (speaker), indirect object (recipient), tense and other features within a single word. Sometimes the word is partially analysable into morphemes, although this really has diachronic relevance only, since the forms are synchronically unpredictable. In the example before the last, *yepê* can be analysed as *ye-pê*, where *ye* is the pronoun ‘to/from them’ and *pê* is an unanalysable element meaning ‘3<sup>rd</sup> person speaker saying in remote past tense’. In a similar way then we have *akapê*, analysable as *a-ka-pê* ‘me-DAT-3speakingREM’, i.e. ‘He said to me the day before yesterday’, or *ngêpê* analysable as *nga-pê* ‘to+2s-3speakingREM’, i.e. ‘He said to you the day before yesterday’. These forms are thus partially analysable post hoc, but first principles cannot predict the correct form (they are what Makkai 1972 called ‘idioms of encoding’ even if they may be partially transparent from a decoding point of view). Further, the residue after stripping transparent morphs often does not remain a morpheme in its own right. In what follows I will treat them as essentially arbitrary forms, but the reader will note that they are often composed of two parts, first an indicator of the addressee and then an indicator of the speaker/tense/mood. I’ll sometimes separate and gloss the parts separately so readers can see this – but they should not conclude that these forms are therefore fully compositional, or that they really form two lexical words, even though they are (by voicing rule) separate phonological words. The addressee indicators are the more transparent elements, closely related to the dative (source/goal) pronouns, which are repeated below for convenience. Normally however I’ll gloss the quotation particles as a

whole along the lines “2s>3sIMMQUOT” meaning ‘a second singular speaker said to a 3<sup>rd</sup> singular addressee earlier today the clause that follows’ (unlike for continuous aspect, I’ll not mark punctual aspect for compactness). Such quasi-verbs have some theoretical interest. Although fairly full tense/mood paradigms exist, the paradigmatic distinctions are not identical to the distinctions made in normal verbs, and these quotation particles occur without the inflectional particles mandatory on finite verbs. Despite this, it is notable that the quotation particles can carry the full range of case-marked arguments that a normal verb of saying can take, as illustrated below (quotation particle *kwowo* in bold):

- (471) *Yidika ngê Joseph ka **kwowo** ndapî ala*  
 Yidika ERG Joseph DAT 3rdSpkr>3sAddr.QUOT.ImmFUT money this  
 ‘Yidika is going to say tomorrow to Joseph “Here’s the shell-money”’

Normal verbs of saying do exist, of course. There are a range of both transitive and intransitive verbs of saying and telling (e.g. *tpapê* ‘tell (intransitive)’, *nj:ii* ‘narrate, tell a story (transitive)’, *vyi* ‘say (transitive)’, but these are not normally used to report conversations, but for other uses, for example:

- (472) *Nd:uu nga n:aa tpapê*  
 Goodbye 2sDAT 1sPRS.MOT telling  
 ‘I’ll be saying goodbye now’ (conventional parting formula)

- (473) *danêmbum nîê nj:ii*  
 story 1sPRS.CLS narrate  
 ‘I’ll tell (you) a story’

For reported speech, the quotative formulae are the basic means. How many such quotation particles are there? Just as with the inflectional particles we can calculate the matrix: there are 9 person/numbers, up to six tenses, 2 aspects, 2 moods, etc. Focussing just on the punctual aspect, that would give us  $9 * 9$  (for each possible speaker person/number to each possible recipient person/number) for each of 4 indicative tenses, plus the habitual and the imperative, i.e.  $81 * 6 = 486$  cells. Amazingly, many of these potential cells are actually filled, including some of the reflexive cases (‘I said to myself’, etc.). The following tables (8.8 to 8.10) are derived partly from notes kindly made available by Jim Henderson, and partly by direct elicitation – some of them would be vanishingly rare in normal texts (and elicitation sometimes proved correspondingly difficult), but many (especially the past tenses) are frequently used. The tables provide the basic punctual indicative paradigm, the present tense continuous paradigm, followed by the

imperative and habitual moods. Each table is a matrix with speaker person/number in columns, and addressee person/number in rows. I provide in Table 8.8 the ordinary unmarked (‘nominative’) and in Table 8.9 the dative pronouns for reference, since they are often more or less perspicuously (but unpredictably) embedded in the quote particle.

**Table 8.8:** Ordinary unmarked pronouns for reference.

1s	1d	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3d	3pl
<i>ne</i>	<i>nyo</i>	<i>nmo</i>	<i>nyi</i>	<i>dp:o</i>	<i>nmyo</i>	–	–	–

**Table 8.9:** Ordinary Dative pronouns for reference.

1s	1d	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3d	3pl
<i>a ka</i>	<i>nye</i>	<i>nmo</i>	<i>nga</i>	<i>dpo</i>	<i>nmye</i>	<i>kwo</i>	<i>ye</i>	<i>ye</i>

The addressee component in Table 8.10 is rather clearly distinguishable in some of these paradigms:

**Table 8.10:** Some frequent exponents of the addressee-component, preceding the speaker component.

Addressee ↓	Sing	Dual	Plural
1	<i>a ka</i>	<i>nye</i>	<i>nmo/nmê</i>
2	<i>nga</i>	<i>dpî/dpâ</i>	<i>nmye</i>
3	<i>kwo</i>	<i>ye/yi</i>	<i>ye/yi</i>

Note: many of the vowels centralize in actual use, e.g. *a ka* may be realized as *a kê*, *nga* may be realized as *ngê*.

In the tables below (8.12 to 8.14), we follow the tenses from Future to Remote Past.

Table 8.11 should be read as follows: the first form in the first column is *nga nê*, a first person speaker addressing a second singular person, so it means ‘I will tell you tomorrow that/whether’. Although some of these Future forms may be thought to have very little utility, a number of them are certainly attested in usage. (I remind the reader that although the gloss in b. below might suggest compositionality, *nê* alone is a verbal proclitic; similarly *kwowo* in a. might be analysed as *kwo-wo*, but *wo* has no independent meaning – the morpheme break is of diachronic interest only. It suggests that some of these forms, like *nganê*, historically derive from a dative pronoun and a verbal proclitic.)

**Table 8.11:** Future (Tomorrow only; Punctual, also perhaps Continuous).

SPEAKER									
ADDR	1s	1d	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3d	3pl
1s				<i>a ka nyi</i>	<i>a ka dpî</i>	<i>a ka nmyi</i>	<i>a ka wo</i>	<i>a ka wo</i>	<i>a ka wo</i>
1d				<i>nye wa</i>	<i>nye wa dpî</i>		<i>nye wo</i>	<i>nye wo</i>	<i>nye wo</i>
1pl				<i>nmo wa nyi</i>	<i>nmî wa dpî</i>	<i>nmo wa nmyi</i>	<i>nmo wo</i>	<i>nmo wo</i>	<i>nmo wo</i>
2s	<i>nga nê</i>	<i>dpo nê</i>	<i>nmye nê</i>				<i>nga wa</i>	<i>nga wa</i>	<i>nga wa</i>
2d							<i>dpo wa</i>	<i>dpo wa</i>	<i>dpo wa</i>
2pl									
3s	<i>kwo nê</i>	<i>kwo nye</i>	<i>kwo nmo</i>	<i>kwo nyi</i>	<i>kwo nyi</i>	<i>kwo nmyi</i>	<i>kwo wo</i>	<i>kwo wo</i>	<i>kwo wo</i>
3d	<i>ye nê</i>	<i>ye nye</i>	<i>ye nmo</i>	<i>ye nyi</i>	<i>ye dpî</i>	<i>ye nmyi</i>	<i>ye wo</i>	<i>ye wo</i>	<i>ye wo</i>
3pl	<i>ye nê</i>	<i>ye nye</i>	<i>ye nmo</i>	<i>ye nyi</i>	<i>ye dpî</i>	<i>ye nmyi</i>	<i>ye wo</i>	<i>ye wo</i>	<i>ye wo</i>

- (474) a. *Brother Ray ngê Joseph ka kwowo ndapî ala*  
 Brother Ray ERG Joseph DAT 3>3sQUOT.FUT shell.money this  
 ‘Brother will say to Joseph ‘Here’s the money’’
- b. *nga nê wanê lê*  
 1s>2sQUOT.FUT UNCERT 1sFUTPI go  
 ‘I’ll tell you tomorrow whether I’ll go’
- c. *yewo mââ naa*  
 3>3plQUOT tomorrow feast  
 ‘He will tell them tomorrow “the feast will be tomorrow”’  
 (i.e. He will tell them tomorrow it will be the day after tomorrow)

The Present tense Continuous forms in Table 8.12 seem to be restricted to the present. Their uses are as in the following examples:

- (475) a. *a ka nyimo lukwe?*  
 2s>1sPRS.QUOT.CI what  
 ‘What are you trying to tell me?’
- b. *ngê numo ala ngwo d:uu ngi!*  
 1s>2sPRSQUOT.CI now do 2sIMPPI  
 ‘I am telling you: do it now’

**Table 8.12:** Present Tense Continuous aspect (presumes *ala ngwo* 'right now' e.g. *kwo numo*— 'I am telling him now'). Question marks indicate uncertain forms or possible gaps in the paradigm.

Address		Speaker						
↓	1s	1d	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3pl
1s				<i>a ka nyimo</i>	<i>a ka nyimo</i>	<i>a ka nyimo</i>	<i>a kópu</i>	<i>a kópu</i>
1d				<i>nye nyimo</i>	<i>nye nyimo</i>	<i>nye nnyimo</i>	<i>nyípu</i>	<i>nyípu</i>
1pl				<i>nmo nyimo</i>	<i>nye nyimo</i>	<i>nye nnyimo</i>	<i>nmópu</i>	<i>nmópu</i>
2s	<i>nga numo</i>	<i>nganyimo</i>	<i>nga nmîmo</i>	<i>nyimo</i>	—	—	<i>ngópu</i>	<i>ngópu</i>
2d	<i>dpâ numo</i>	<i>dpanyimo</i>	<i>dpâ nmîmo</i>	—	<i>?yenyimo</i>	—	<i>dpópu</i>	<i>dpópu</i>
2pl	<i>nmye numo</i>	<i>nmyenyimo</i>	<i>nmye nmîmo</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>?yenyimo</i>	<i>nmyópu</i>	<i>nmyópu</i>
3s	<i>kwo numo</i>	<i>kwo nyimo</i>	<i>kwo nmîmo</i>	<i>kwo nyimo</i>	<i>kwo nyimo</i>	<i>kwo nyimo</i> / <i>kwo nnyomo</i>	<i>kwodo</i> / <i>kópu (soon)</i>	<i>kwodo</i> / <i>kópu</i>
3d	<i>ye numo</i>	<i>ye nyimo</i>	<i>ye nmîmo</i>	<i>ye nyimo</i>	<i>ye nyimo</i>	<i>ye nyimo</i> / <i>ye nnyomo</i>	<i>yedê</i>	<i>yedê</i>
3pl	<i>ye numo</i>	<i>ye nyimo</i>	<i>ye nmîmo</i>	<i>ye nyimo</i>	<i>ye nyimo</i>	<i>ye nnyomo</i> / <i>ye nyimo</i>	<i>yedê</i> / <i>yípu</i>	<i>yípu</i>
Unspecified							<i>apu</i>	<i>apu</i>

- c. *ngên mîmo mwi chi lêpî*  
 1pl>2sPRSQUOT. there 2sIMPCI go.CI  
 ‘We3 are saying to you1: you1 buzz off!’
- d. *ngópu nyi vyîlo*  
 3>2sPRSQUOT.CI you the.one  
 ‘He’s saying that you are the one’
- e. *kópu mbwêmê a chóó dê t:âmo*  
 3>3sPRSQUOT.CI pig my self 3IMMPI stole  
 ‘He’s telling him that I am the one who stole the pig’
- f. *nmópu Yidika mbii*  
 3>1plPRSQUOT.CI Yidika sick  
 ‘He is telling us that Yidika is sick’
- g. *ngópu vyi ngi*  
 3>2sPRSQUOT.CI tell 2sIMPPI  
 ‘He is saying to you: tell it!’
- h. *kî pini ngê apu, Ghaalyu angenê?*  
 that person ERG 3>anyPRSQUOT.CI Ghaalyu where  
 ‘This guy is saying: where is Ghaalyu?’
- i. *dpânumo n:aa lêpî*  
 1s>2d.PRSQUOT.CI 1sCIPRSMOTION going  
 ‘I tell you2 I am going’
- j. *dpânyimo nye lêpî mo*  
 1d>2d.PRSQUOT.CI 1d.CIPRS going dS.CIPROX.Intrans  
 ‘We2 are saying to you2 – we are going’
- k. *kî pini ngê dpópu lee choo*  
 that person ERG 3>2d.PRSQUOT.CI go.FOL 2sS.IMP.Intrans  
 ‘This guy is saying to you2 you must go’
- l. *nganumo/ngad:a muntoo*  
 1s>2sPRSQUOT.CI/1s>2sIMMQUT.PI enough  
 ‘I am telling you/I just told you: enough! (stop crying)’
- m. *Kakan ka kwo numo ma ngi*  
*man’s.name* DAT 1s>3sPRSQUOT.CI eat 2sS.IMP.PI  
 ‘I am telling Kakan to eat it’
- o. *Ngmidimuwó ka kwo numo Kakan ngê*  
*woman’s.name* DAT 1s>3sPRSQUOT.CI *man’s.name* ERG  
*dpî ma ngê*  
 2/3IMP eat 3sS3sOIMP  
 ‘I told Ngmidimuwó to tell Kakan to eat it’ (lit. ‘I to her Ngmidimuwó  
 “Have Kakan eat it”’)



Table 8.13: Quote Formulae for Immediate Past (earlier today), Punctual Aspect\*.

Addr.	Speaker	⇒	1s	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3d	3pl
↓										
1s	<i>d:ê</i> 'I said to myself today'				<i>a ka ch:e</i> 'you told me'	<i>a ka nye</i>	<i>a ka nmyimo</i>	<i>a ka dê</i> 'he said to me'	<i>a ka dê</i>	<i>a ka dê</i>
1d		<i>nyed:a</i>			<i>nye ch:e</i>	<i>nye nyimo</i>	<i>nye nmyimo</i>	<i>nyedê</i>	<i>nyedê</i>	<i>nyedê</i>
1pl	<i>nmo d:a</i>				<i>nmo ch:e</i>	<i>nmo nmyimo</i>	<i>nmo nmyimo</i>	<i>nmîdê</i>	<i>nmîdê</i>	<i>nmîdê</i>
2s	<i>nga d:a</i>		<i>nga dnye / nga ch:e</i>	<i>nga dnye</i> <i>nga ch:e</i>	<i>ch:e</i>			<i>ngadê</i>	<i>ngadê</i>	<i>ngadê</i>
2d	<i>dpî d:a</i>		<i>dpo dnye / dpo ch:e</i>	<i>dpo dnye / dpo ch:e</i>				<i>dpî dê</i>	<i>dpîdê</i>	<i>dpîdê</i>
2pl	<i>nmye d:a</i>		<i>nmye ch:e</i>	<i>nmye ch:e</i>				<i>nmyedê</i>	<i>nmyedê</i>	<i>nmyedê</i>
3s	<i>kwo d:a</i>		<i>kwoch:e / kwo dnye</i>	<i>kwoch:e / kwo dnye</i>	<i>kwo ch:e</i>	<i>kwo ch:e</i> ( <i>kwo nyimo</i> – 'did you ask him?')	<i>kwo ch:e / kwo</i> <i>nmyimo</i>	<i>kwodo</i> (NB also <i>adê</i> – unspecified recipient)	<i>kwodo</i>	<i>kwodo</i>
3d	<i>ye d:a</i>		<i>ye ch:e</i>	<i>ye ch:e</i>	<i>ye ch:e</i>	<i>ye nyîmo</i>	<i>ye nmyîmo</i>	<i>ye nmyîmo</i>		
3pl	<i>ye d:a</i>		<i>ye ch:e</i>	<i>ye ch:e</i>	<i>ye ch:e</i>	<i>ye dpî</i> (HAB form is <i>yedpîmo / yednyimo</i> )	<i>ye dmye *</i>	<i>ye dê</i>	<i>ye dê</i>	<i>yedê</i>

\*Some of the vowels in these forms centralize in actual use: e.g. *ngadê* is often realized as *ngêdê*

Table 8.13 gives the forms for the Immediate Past, Punctual aspect. As in a number of the other quotation paradigms, there are further forms that are semantically general over the recipient. Thus *adê*, ‘he said’, does not specify singular or plural recipients (although it may signal that the current speaker heard the exchange):

- (476) *Father ngê adê Monki ngê dinghy ghêê ngê*  
 Father ERG 3sQUOT Monki ERG dinghy wash 3sS.3sO.IMP.WEAK  
 ‘Father said Monki should wash the dinghy’ (i.e. Father said “Let Monki wash the dinghy”)

Some examples of use:

- (477) a. *ngêdê vyi ngi*  
 3>2sQUOT.IMM tell 2sS3sO.IMP.PI  
 ‘He told you (earlier today) to tell’ (i.e. He said to you “You must tell it”)
- b. *a ka ch:e km:ii vyini*  
 me DAT 2sIMMQUOT coconut climb.2sIMP  
 ‘You told me to climb the coconut’
- c. *a ka dê ma ngi*  
 me DAT 3SIMMQUOT eat 2sIMP.PI  
 ‘He told me to eat it’
- d. *nye ch:e ma nyoo*  
 1d.DAT 2sIMMQUOT eat 2dS.3sO.IMP.PI  
 ‘You told us2 to eat it’ (i.e. You told us2 “eat it, you2!”)
- e. *kwo ch:e ma ngi*  
 him.DAT 2sIMMQUOT eat 2sIMP.PI  
 ‘You told him to eat it’
- f. *ye d:a ma yóó*  
 them.DAT 1sIMMQUOT eat 2plS.3sOIMP.PI  
 ‘I told them3 “you3 eat it”’
- g. *ye dmye Lów:a nmo lêpî té*  
 them.DAT 2plIMMQUOT Lów:a 1PL going plS.PRS/FUTCI  
 ‘Did you3 tell them you3 are going to Lów:a?’ (Did you tell them3 “We3 are going to Lów:a?”)
- h. *dpî d:a lee choo*  
 1s>2sIMMQUOT go.FOL 2dS.IMP.PI.Intrans  
 ‘I told you2 (earlier today) to go’

- i. *kwo d:o daa nê ma*  
 1s>3sIMMQUOT NEG 1sREM eat  
 ‘I told him today: I have not eaten/am not about to eat’  
 (REM prenucleus is here triggered by Negation – see §10.1)
- j. *yech:ee nmo lêpî té*  
 2s>3d/pl.IMMQUOT 1plImmFUT.CI going 1plS.PROXIntrans  
 ‘You told them (earlier today) we are going?’
- k. *nmîdê tpile we têdê daa nê lê*  
 3s>1pl.IMMQUOT sing.sing place NEG 1sREM.PI go  
 ‘He said to us (today): I am not going to the sing-sing’
- l. *ngêdê chi dpî*  
 3>2sIMMQUOT 2sIMP.CI sleeping  
 ‘He told you: sleep!’

The Near Past forms (identical to Remote Past forms) are given in Table 8.14 below. So we have:

- (478) *ma nê mââ Lów:a nê lê*  
 yesterday 1s>1sNrPastQUOT tomorrow Lów:a 1sNrPST go  
 ‘Yesterday I said to myself “tomorrow I’ll go to Lów:a”’

Alternative forms with an embedded clause in different tense or mood:

- (479) a. *ma nê mââ Lów:a wa nê lê*  
 yesterday 1s>1sNrPastQUOT tomorrow Lów:a 1sFUT go  
 ‘Yesterday I said to myself “tomorrow I’ll go to Lów:a”’
- b. *ma ngênê mââ Lów:a nê lê*  
 yesterday 1s>2sNrPastQUOT tomorrow Lów:a 1sFUT go  
 ‘Yesterday I said to you “tomorrow I’ll go to Lów:a”’
- c. *kwono n:aa lêpî*  
 1s>3sNrPastQUOT 1sImmFUTCI going  
 ‘I said to him: I’m going’
- d. *kwînye n:aa m:uu d:uu*  
 2>3sNrPastQUOT NEG2sIMPCI.MOT doing  
 ‘Did you(s/pl) say to him: don’t do it?’
- e. *a ka pê dono kópu*  
 3>1sNrPastQUOT bad affair  
 ‘He said to me yesterday: a bad business’
- f. *ma dpîpê amênî diyé?*  
 yesterday 3>2d.NrPastQUOT 1sDistFUT.REP return  
 ‘Yesterday, did he say to you<sub>2</sub> that he’ll be coming back today’  
 (i.e. ‘Did he say “I’ll return tomorrow?”’)

Table 8.14: Near Past Tense *Mi:a* (Yesterday) or Remote Past (*m:iitiuwo*, day before yesterday).<sup>42</sup>

Addr.	Speaker ⇒							
	1s	1d	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3pl
1s	<i>nê</i>	—	—	<i>a ka nye</i>	<i>a ka nye</i>	<i>a ka nye</i>	<i>a ka pê</i>	<i>a kê pê</i>
1d	—	—	—	<i>nye</i> <i>nye</i>	<i>nye</i> <i>nye</i>	<i>nye</i> <i>nye</i>	<i>nyêpê</i>	<i>nyêpê</i>
1pl	—	—	—	<i>nmo nye</i>	<i>nmo nye</i>	<i>nmo nye</i>	<i>nmîpê</i>	<i>nmîpê</i>
2s	<i>ngênê</i>	<i>ngê nyenê</i>	<i>ngê</i> <i>nmînê</i>	<i>nye 'to self'</i>	—	—	<i>ngêpê</i>	<i>ngêpê</i>
2d	<i>dpînê</i>	<i>dpo</i> <i>nyenê</i>	<i>dpîno</i>	—	<i>nye</i>	—	<i>dpîpê</i>	<i>dpîpê</i>
2pl	<i>nmyenê</i>	<i>nmye nyenê</i>	<i>nmyeno</i>	—	—	<i>nye</i>	<i>nmyîpê</i>	<i>nmyîpê</i>
3s	<i>kwonê</i> / <i>kwono</i>	<i>kwanye</i> / <i>kwînye</i>	<i>kwo</i> <i>nmo</i>	<i>kwînye</i>	<i>kwînye</i>	<i>kwînye</i>	<i>kwo</i> / <i>kwopê</i>	<i>kwo</i> / <i>kwopê</i>
3d	<i>yenê</i>	<i>ye nye</i> / <i>?kwonye</i>	<i>ye nmo</i>	<i>ye nye</i>	<i>ye nye</i>	<i>ye nye</i>	<i>yepê</i> / <i>yôpu</i>	<i>yepê</i> / <i>yôpu</i>
3pl	<i>yenê</i> / <i>yeno</i>	<i>ye nye</i>	<i>ye nmo</i>	<i>ye nye</i>	<i>yenye</i>	<i>yenye</i>	<i>yepê</i> / <i>yôpu</i>	<i>yepê</i> / <i>yôpu</i>

<sup>42</sup> These forms have been exhaustively checked and alternate forms (like *yôpu* for *yepê*) do not necessarily seem to make a tense difference, even though they may suggest one tense or the other (e.g. *yôpu* seems more used for the remote past).

Remote Past forms are the same as Near Past forms in Table 8.14. Some examples follow.

- (480) a. *kwinye* *n:aa m:uu* *ghay*  
 1d>3sNr/REMQUOT NEG 2sIMPCI.MOT falling  
 ‘We2 said to him “Don’t fall down”’
- b. *ngênê* *n:aa m:uu* *ngê* *d:uu*  
 1s>2NrPast/REM.QUOT NEG.2sIMPCI.MOT NEG.IMP do  
 ‘I told you1: don’t do any more’
- c. *nyenye* *lee* *choo*  
 2>2d.NrPast/REM.QUOT go.FOL 2dS.IMP.IV  
 ‘You2 said to us2: go!’
- d. *yinye* *yópu pândĩĩ* *daa nmyi* *kpêê*  
 2>3plNr/REM.QUOT wind big NEG 2PLPOSS direct.experience  
 ‘You2 said to them: you3 haven’t experienced a cyclone’
- e. *a kê pê* *Morning Star* *wunê* *pwiyé*  
 3s>1sNrPST/REM.QUOT Ship.name 3ImmFUTCI.CLS come/go  
*knĩ*  
 dS.PROXPI  
 ‘He told me (yesterday/before) that MV Morning Star will come this way’  
 (NB. A few intransitive verbs like *pwiyé* may irregularly take dual enclitics as here.)
- f. *kwonmo* *jungle juice* *namê* *ndanĩ*  
 1pl>3sNr/REM.QUOT home.brew 2IMP.CI drinking  
 ‘We3 said to him (yesterday or before): don’t drink home brew’
- g. *yenye* *bible dpo* *kp:aa yó*  
 1d/2>3d/plNrPST.QUOT bible 2IMP.PI.CLS read 2plS.sO.IMP.PI  
 ‘We2/you2/3 said to them2/3 read the bible’
- h. *ngênê* *dpo* *‘nuw:o* *ngi*  
 1s>2sNrPST/REM.QUOT 2IMP.PI.CLS bring 2sS3sO.IMP.PI  
 ‘I said to you: bring it’
- i. *yenye* *dpĩ* *lee* *choo*  
 1d>2/3plNrPST/REM.QUOT 2/3IMP.PI go.FOL 2dl.IMP.PI.Intrans  
 ‘We2 told them2 to go’
- j. *yenye* *lee* *dmyino*  
 1d>2/3plNrPST/REM.QUOT go.FOL 2pl.IMP.PI.Intrans  
 ‘We2 told them3’

The imperative paradigm (Table 8.15) is not easy to fill out through elicitation. The forms with second person are clear, and there are also some clear forms for third

person subjects as shown, all specialized with imperative force. One confusing fact is that the forms ending in *-ipi* also occur in the Habitual quotative paradigm below, but there's no identity with the Imperative paradigm, despite some overlaps.

**Table 8.15:** Imperative Quote Formulae (e.g. *a kipi* = 'you tell me').

Address Speaker ⇒								
↓	1s	1d	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3Dual/PL
1s	—	—	—	<i>a kipi</i>	<i>a kipi</i>	<i>a kipi</i>		
1d	—	—	—	<i>nyipi</i>	<i>nyipi</i>	<i>nyipi</i>		
1pl	—	—		<i>nmipi</i>	<i>nmipi</i>	<i>nmipi</i>		
2s	—	—	—	<i>apii</i> 'you say this'	—	—		
2d	—	—	—	—	<i>apii</i>	—		
2pl	—	—	—	—	—	<i>apii</i>		
3s				<i>kwi</i> 'you tell him!'	<i>kwipi</i> 'you2 tell him'	<i>kwipi</i>	<i>kwipi</i>	<i>kwipi</i>
3d				<i>yipi</i>	<i>yipi</i>	<i>yipi</i>	<i>yipi</i>	<i>yipi</i>
3pl				<i>yipi</i>	<i>yipi</i>	<i>yipi</i>	<i>yipi</i>	<i>yipi</i>

The interpretation and utility of these imperative forms is illustrated below:

- (481) a. *a kipi*                      *dî*                      *kn:aadi*  
           2s>1sIMP.QUOT    1sIMMPI    make.mistake  
           'You say to me: I made a mistake'
- b. A to B: *a kipi*                      *Kîmbêkpâpu*    *n:aa*                      *lêpî?*  
           2s>1sIMP.QUOT    Place.Name    1sImmFUTCI    going  
           'Are you asking me to go to K? May I go to K?'
- B to A: *u p:o,    chi                      lêpî*  
           alright    2sIMPCI    going  
           'OK, off you go'
- c. *Nkéli*                      *u*                      *dpodo*    *pyu*    *dê*                      *y:oo*                      *Parish*  
      boat                      3sPOSS    working    doer    Dual    ERGDual/PL    Parish  
      Council    *ka*    *dpî*                      *vyi*    *y:e,*                      *yipi*  
      Council    DAT    2dS.IMP.PI    say    3d/plS.sO.IMP    3d>3pl.IMP.QUOT  
      *mu ntoo*  
      enough  
      'The boat crew must tell the parish council this, they must say to  
      them: Enough!'

- d. *Father ka dpî vyi y:e, kwipi mu ntoo*  
 Priest DAT 2d.IMP.PI say 3d/pl.S.sO.IMP 3d>3sIMP.QUOT enough  
 ‘You2 must say to Father, they2 must tell him enough’
- e. *apii m:aa*  
 2s>2sIMP.QUOT daddy  
 (to infant) ‘Say it like this: ‘Daddy’
- f. *Yidika ka kwi, kââkââ*  
 man’s.name DAT 2s>3sIMP.QUOT grandfather  
 (instructing boy in proper kin term) ‘You say to Yidika:  
 (classificatory) ‘Grandpa’
- g. *a kipi nê*  
 2s>1sIMP.QUOT 1s  
 ‘You say to me: I’m the one’ (i.e. confess, you did it)

Some more examples of usage:

- (482) a. *a kipi “mw:ââkó”*  
 2>1sIMP.QUOT thanks  
 ‘Say thank you to me!’
- b. *kwi “mw:ââkó”*  
 2s>3sIMP.QUOT thanks  
 ‘You say thanks to him!’
- c. *apii “dpî ma ngi!”*  
 2s>2sIMP.QUOT 2/3IMPDefd eat 2s3sO.IMP  
 ‘You must say to yourself: eat it’
- d. *nyipi “ma nyo!”*  
 2s>1d.IMP.QUOT eat 2dS.sO.IMP  
 ‘You1 tell us2 “You2 eat it”’
- e. *nmipi “ma yó”*  
 2>1pl.IMP.QUOT eat 2pl.3sO.IMP  
 ‘You tell us3 “You3 eat it”’
- f. *yipi “ma nyo/yó”*  
 2/3>3plIMP.QUOT eat 2d/2plS.3sO.IMP  
 ‘You tell them2/3 “You2/3 eat it”’
- g. *kwipi ma ngi*  
 2s>3sIMP.QUOT eat 2sS.3sOIMP.PI  
 ‘You tell him to eat’
- h. *kwipi “nê mââ”*  
 2s>3sIMP.QUOT 1s tomorrow  
 ‘You tell him “I’ll (see you) tomorrow”’
- i. *magistrates ye yipi yi kópu dono*  
 magistrates 3PLDAT 2/3d/PL>2/3d/pl.IMP.QUOT that affair bad  
 ‘The magistrates must say to them: that is a bad business’

Note that quotation-particle+clause can be embedded in another of the same kind, in which case some deictic shifting to 3<sup>rd</sup> person may occur:

- (483) *Yidika ngê Pikuwa ka apê*  
 man's.name ERG man's.name DAT 3s>anyNr/REM.QUOT  
*Kakan ka kwipi chi lêpî*  
 man's.name DAT 3s.3sIMP.QUOT 2sIMPCI going  
 'Yidika said to Pikuwa (before today) let him (Pikuwa) say to Kakan  
 "Off you go"'

A further note on *apii*. Its literal use is as exemplified above and in the sentence below:

- (484) *km:ii u mênê apii, waterline anyi t:a*  
 coconut 3Poss inside 2s>2sIMP.QUOT waterline where hanging  
*nê, yed:oo mu kêêlî ghê copra shed dp:uu*  
 3S.PROXCI then that place part copra shed 3HABCI.MOT  
*m:uu ngmê*  
 see PFS.3sOHABPI  
 'You have to say to yourself, inside the coconuts is there still a waterline,  
 they used to see it at the copra marketing board'

However, *apii* (2s>2sIMP.QUOT) also derivatively constitutes a common tag question form, where it asks for confirmation of a statement, as in:

- (485) a. *Jazz II wa kee, apii?*  
 Jazz II 3FUTPI ascend TAG  
 'MV Jazz is coming up, isn't it?'  
 b. *Kêna wa nê lê, apii?*  
 Kêna UNCERT.FUTPI 1s go TAG  
 'Am I going to Kêna, or not (I am wondering to myself)'

The habitual, recollect, codes 'generic action', repetitive normative behaviour, glossed with 'used to' in the local English regardless of tense. Table 8.16 gives the habitual quotatives, as exemplified in (486):

- (486) a. *Weta ngê nyedoo, kîdîngê vy:a dp:o*  
 Man's.name ERG 3s>1d.HAB.QUOT 1sNEGIMP hit 2dO.HABPI  
 'Weta used to say to us2, I must not hit you2'



Table 8.16: Habitual forms (addressee prefixes are optional).

Addr.	Speaker ⇒								
↓	1s	1d	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3d	3pl
1s	nipi 'I used to say to myself'	—	—	a ka nyipi	a ka dpyipi	a ka nmyipi	a kódo	a kódo	a kódo
1d	—	(noko) nyip <sup>43</sup>	—	nye nyipi	nye dpyipi	nye nmyipi	nyedoo/ nyedpo	nyedoo/ nyedpo	nyedoo/ nyedpo
1pl	—	—	noko nmipi	nmo nmipi	nmo dyipi	nmo nmyipi	nmodoo	nmodoo	nmodoo/ nmodpo
2s	ngê nipi / ngipi	ngê dmye	ngê nmipi	—	—	—	ngêdoo /ngêdpo*	ngêdoo	ngêdoo
2d	dpo nipi	dpo dmye	dpo nmipi	—	noko dyipi	—	dpído	dpído	dpído
2pl	nmye nipi	nmye dmye	nmye nmipi	—	—	noko nmyipi	nmyedoo	nmyedoo	nmyedoo
3s	kwo nipi	kwo dmye	kwo nmipi	kwo nyipi	kwo dyipi	kwo nmyipi	kwódo	kwódo	kwódo
3d	ye nipi/ ye numo	ye dmye	ye nmipi	ye nyipi	ye dpyipi	ye nmyipi	ye dpo	ye dpo	ye dpo
3pl	ye nipi/ ye numo	ye dmye	ye nmipi	ye nyipi	ye dpyipi	ye nmyipi	ye dpo	ye dpo	ye dpo

\*Increasingly now pronounced *ngadpo*, *ngadoo*<sup>43</sup> 'We used to tell each other/ourselves'

- b. *nye dpyipi mbwê mê dpî ma nyoo*  
 1Dual.DAT 2d>1d.HAB.QUOT pig 2dS.IMP eat 2dS.3sO.IMP  
 ‘You2 used to say to us2, you2 eat a pig!’
- c. *kwódo, chi mgeemgee*  
 3>3sHAB.QUOT 2sIMMPI lazy  
 ‘They used to tell him: you are lazy’
- d. *ngê nmîpi, nyi tp:ee mb:aamb:aa*  
 1pl>2sHAB.QUOT 2s boy good  
 ‘We used to tell you you were a good boy’
- e. *nyedpo, dpî mgeemgee pyu dê*  
 3>1dQUOT 2DualIMM lazy doer Dual  
 ‘He used to say to us, you2 are lazy’
- f. *dpîdoo choo n:aa kpîpî*  
 3>2d.HAB.QUOT 2dS.IMPCI fish.with.line  
 ‘He used to say to you2, you go fishing’
- g. *ngêdoo, namê dpodo*  
 3>2sHAB.QUOT 2sNEGIMP.CI working  
 ‘He used to say to you2, don’t work’
- h. *noko nyipi chi kmaapî*  
 REFL.DAT 2d>?HAB.QUOT 2sIMPCI eating  
 ‘We used to say to each other, you eat!’
- i. *nmyipi dmyinê kmaapî*  
 2pl>2/3HAB.QUOT 2plIMPCI eat  
 ‘You3 used to say you3 guys eat’
- j. *(a ka) nyipi chi dpodo*  
 (1sDAT) 2sHAB.QUOT 2sIMPC working  
 ‘You used to say to me, work!’
- k. *nipi nê dono*  
 1s>1sHAB.QUOT 1s bad  
 ‘I used to say to myself: I’m bad’
- l. *a ka dpyipi nyi dono*  
 1sDAT 2d.HAB.QUOT 2s bad  
 ‘You2 used to say to me: you’re bad’
- m. *Jimi Kaawe ngê ye dpo namê nkîngê*  
 man’s.name ERG 3s>3d/plHAB.QUOT 2sNEGIMP be.frightened  
 ‘Jimmy always used to say: don’t be frightened’
- n. *nmo nmîpi namê school*  
 1plDAT 2s>1plHAB.QUOT 2sNEGIMP school  
 ‘You1 used to tell us3 you should not go to school’

- o. *a kódo*                      *chi*                      *dpodo*  
           3>1sHAB.QUOT    2sIMPC    working  
           ‘They always used to say to me: you work!’
- p. *nyipi*                      *nê*                      *d:uu*  
           2sHAB.QUOT    1sNrPST/REM.PI    do  
           ‘You used to say (to yourself) I’ll do it (you wanted to do it).’

The following forms (Table 8.17) seem to be specialized for ‘saying to oneself’, i.e. for describing subjective states of self or others. I believe there are further distinctions between tenses, not recognized here and not properly recorded. Although another addressee can (at least for some of the forms) be specified, if none is provided the interpretation is that the protagonist is thinking or speaking to himself.

**Table 8.17:** Speaking to self, or unspecified addressee (Punctual aspect, apparently either of unmarked tense or mixed tenses).

Speak	1s	1d	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3d	3pl
<i>awedê</i> (Today)	<i>d:a/</i> <i>numo</i>	<i>nyinê/</i> <i>numo</i>	<i>nmînê</i>	<i>ch:e</i>	<i>nyemo</i>	<i>nmyimo</i>	<i>apu</i> <i>adê</i>	<i>apê</i>	<i>apê</i>
<i>ma</i> (Yesterday)	<i>nê</i>	<i>nyinê/</i> <i>numo</i>	<i>nmînê</i>	<i>nyinê</i>	<i>nyemo</i>	<i>nmyimo</i>	<i>apê</i>	<i>apê</i>	<i>apê</i>
<i>m:ii</i> <i>tuwó</i> (Days before yesterday)	<i>nê</i>	<i>nyinê/</i> <i>numo</i>	<i>nmînê</i>	<i>nyinê</i>	<i>nyemo</i>	<i>nmyimo</i>	<i>apê</i>	<i>apê</i>	<i>apê</i>

- (487) a. *numo*                      *kî*                      *pini*                      *too*                      *pee*                      *kpaapîkpaapî*  
           1s>1s.QUOT    that    person    skin    piece    white  
           ‘I am saying to myself, this guy is white’
- b. *mw:aandiye*                      *d:a*                      *n:aa*                      *lêpî*                      *Kîikwolo*  
           morning                      1s>1s.QUOT    1sImmFUTCI    going    place.name  
           ‘In the morning I said to myself I’ll go to Kîikwolo’
- c. *mw:aantiye*                      *apê*                      *n:aa*                      *lêpî*                      *Kîikwolo*  
           morning                      3s>3sNrPast.QUOT    1sImmFUTCI    going    place.name  
           ‘Yesterday in the morning he said to himself I’ll go to Kîikwolo’  
           (the tense is apparently here coded)
- d. *ch:e*                      *wudî*                      *d:uu*  
           2s>2sIMM.QUOT    1sIMMPI.CF.Ant    do  
           ‘Today you said to yourself: I should have done it’

- e. *ch:e*                      *nê mââwe*  
 2s>2sIMM.QUOT 1s bigman  
 ‘You are saying to yourself that you are a big man’
- f. *adê*                      *wudî*                      *lê*  
 3s>3sIMM 1sIMMPI.CF.Ant go  
 ‘He said to himself today, I should have gone’

The forms in Table 8.17 are used to narrate the thoughts of a protagonist in a story. Note that they are not the same as the evidential forms used to report seeming facts (as in ‘it seems to me’ etc.), which are tenseless and are as follows (Table 8.18, with examples in (488)):

**Table 8.18:** “It seems to me/you/him etc” (tenseless).

	Sing	Dual	Pl
1	<i>na a ka</i>	<i>nyinê nye</i>	<i>nmînê nmo</i>
2	<i>na ngê</i>	<i>dpînê dpo</i>	<i>nmyinê nmye</i>
3	<i>ngmênê u kwo</i>	<i>yinê ye</i>	<i>yinê ye</i>

- (488) a. *ngmênê u kwo*, *n:aa*                      *lêpî*  
 it.seems.to.him 1sHABCI going  
 ‘It seems to him that he’ll go, i.e. he’s inclined to go’
- b. *ngmênê u kwo*,                      *wudî*                      *lê*  
 it.seems.to.him 1sIMMPI.CF.Ant go  
 ‘It seems to him: I should have gone (i.e. he realizes he should have gone)’
- c. *na a ka*                      *mââwê ndĩĩ*                      *ngmê*  
 it.seems.to.me bigman great INDF  
 ‘He is one of the great bigmen it seems to me’
- d. *yinê ye*                      *doo u ntââ*  
 it.seems.to.them NEG enough  
 ‘It seems to them not enough’
- e. *na a ka*                      *kî*                      *tp:ee*, *lukwe dîy:o*                      *a*                      *yééyée*  
 it.seems.to.me that boy, what reason 3ImmFUTCI marrying  
 ‘It seems to me he is just a boy, why is he getting married?’
- f. *ma*                      *na a ka*                      *yey pyu yî*                      *vy:o*  
 yesterday it.seemed.to.me yey doer ANAPH among  
*dêdî*                      *kwo*  
 NEG3sNrPSTC standing  
 ‘Yesterday it seemed to me that there were no good yey giver  
 (diviner) among them’

- g. *na ngê n:uu?*  
 na N+ka who  
 ‘It seems to you who (did it)?’
- h. *yinë ye noo k:omodanê*  
 it.seems.to.them 1sREMC lying  
 ‘It seemed to them that I was telling a lie/tricking them  
 (before yesterday)’

Table 8.19: Without Knowing (Present tense paradigm).

Tense	1s	1d	1pl	2s	2d	2pl	3s	3d	3pl
<b>IMM</b>	<i>nana a</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>
<b>(today)</b>	<i>kada*</i>	<i>nyede</i>	<i>nmoda</i>	<i>ngada</i>	<i>dpoda</i>	<i>nmyidê</i>	<i>kwodo</i>	<i>yedê</i>	<i>yedê</i>
<b>NrPST/ REM</b>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>	<i>nana</i>
<b>(Yesterday or before)</b>	<i>aka pê</i>	<i>nyepê</i>	<i>nmopê</i>	<i>ngêpê</i>	<i>dpîpê</i>	<i>nmyipê</i>	<i>kwo</i>	<i>yepê</i>	<i>yepê</i>

\**nana a kapê* is past or future – full non-present paradigm not collected, but Near Past (Yesterday) and Remote Past (before yesterday) seem to be the same.

The ‘without knowing’ construction is of special interest: the shape of the particles (Table 8.19) and the way it handles deictic shifts makes it clear it should be understood as a special kind of quotation particle, where the non-knowing participant is addressed in the second person (by the all knowing narrator perhaps, or an unmentioned witness).

- (489) *Ghaalyu mgîdî vy:o Ø dpî, nana kwodo*  
 Ghaalyu night middle 3IMM sleeping, 3sNot.KnowIMM  
*yimê ngê \_nyi pyââ ngee pîpî*  
 rat ERG 2s-toe 3IMMC.CLS eating  
 ‘Ghaalyu was sleeping in the middle of the night, without knowing that  
 a rat was chewing your (Ghaalyu’s) toes’

The 2<sup>nd</sup> person perspective can be expressed e.g. as the subject of the subordinate clause, as below. Note the tense alternations between (490)a. and b. do not affect the embedded verb, which is in the Immediate Past:

- (490) a. *Mgaa mgîdî vy:o Ø dpî, nana kwodo*  
 Mgaa night middle 3sIMM sleeping 3sNot.KnowREM  
 \_ngêê ndiya chi yé  
 your.hand in.fire 2sIMMP put  
 ‘Mgaa was sleeping, he put his hand in the fire without knowing’  
 (Immediate Past)  
 lit. ‘Mgaa was sleeping, (and someone reported to him) you put your  
 hand in the fire’
- b. *Mgaa mgîdî vy:o doo dpî, nana kwo*  
 Mgaa night middle 3sREM sleeping, without.knowing  
 \_ngêê ndiya chi yé  
 your.hand in.fire 2sIMMP put  
 ‘Mgaa was sleeping, he put his hand in the fire without knowing’  
 (Remote Past)

The 2<sup>nd</sup> person perspective can also be expressed in the object position:

- (491) a. *r97\_12\_v9\_s1*  
*Kwo, lee knî nana yepê,*  
 3QUOT go\_ 1dS.IMP 3dNot.Knowing  
*mwiyé kî d:uu m:uu dp:o*  
 first CERT 3IMM.MOTPI see you2  
 ‘They said: Let’s go. They didn’t know that he had seen them first  
 (lit. They didn’t know that he came and saw you two)’
- b. (August 11, 2011 42:02)  
*nana a kêpa, dîy:o wunê tókótókó*  
 without my knowing(past/future), later 3ImmFUTCI testing  
*ngi*  
 2sObject  
 ‘Without my knowing then, later it would test me (lit. you)’

There follow some exemplifications of the paradigm, first in Immediate Past tense (earlier today):

IMM (Today)

- (492) a. *nana a kada, yimê ngê \_nyi pyââ ngee pîpî*  
 1sNot.KnowIMM rat ERG 2s-toe 3IMMC.CLS eating  
 ‘Without my knowing the rat was biting my (lit. your) toes’

- b. *nana ngada, yimê ngê \_nyi pyââ ngee pîpî*  
 2sNot.KnowIMM rat ERG 2s-toe 3IMMC.CLS eating  
 ‘Without your knowing the rat was biting your toes’
- c. *nana nmoda, yimê ngê \_nmyi pyââ dmi ngee*  
 1plNot.KnowIMM rat ERG 2pl.foot toe CLF 3IMMC.CLS  
*pîpî té*  
 eating MFS3plO  
 ‘Without our3 knowing the rat was biting our3 (lit. your3) toes’
- d. *nana yedê, yimê ngê dpî nté ka chedêchedê*  
 3dNot.KnowIMM rat ERG 2d food CERT3IMMC finishing  
 ‘Without them2 knowing the rat was finishing off their2  
 (lit. your2) food’
- e. *nana nyedê, yimê ngê dpî nté ka chedêchedê*  
 1dNot.KnowIMM rat ERG 2d food CERT3IMMC finishing  
 ‘Without us2 knowing the rat was finishing off our2 (lit. your2) food’

Under some circumstances, however, 3<sup>rd</sup> person subjects (a. and b. below) and objects do not necessarily make this shift to 2<sup>nd</sup> person:

- (493) a. *kî nê t:âât:âât, nana a kada wu meedi chi/*  
 CERT 1sIMMC waiting 1sNot.Know that path.spec 2sIMMP/  
*dê kwolo*  
 3IMMP follow  
 ‘I was waiting for him. Without my knowing, you/he took that other path.’
- b. *nana nmopê, ka nmy:uu nmo*  
 1plNot.Know CERT3IMMC looking.for 1plOPROXC  
 ‘Without us knowing, he was looking for us’

Other miscellaneous examples with 2<sup>nd</sup> person shift:

- (494) a. *nana nyêpê, ka nmy:uu dp:o*  
 1dNot.Know CERT3IMMC 2plOPROXC  
 ‘Without we2 knowing, he was looking for us2 (you2)’
- b. *nana nyêpê, l:âmo dpô ngee ngmê*  
 1dNot.Know losing 2dSNrPSTC get 2<sup>nd</sup>Dual  
 ‘Without us2 knowing (yesterday), we (lit. you2) lost that thing’
- c. *nana ngêpê, \_ngênê dê pw:onu Alotau*  
 2sNotKnow.NrPast 2sPOSS.Uncle 3sIMMP died Alotau  
 ‘You didn’t know (yesterday) that your uncle died in Alotau’

- d. *nana yepê, yâpwo ghii u mênê dmye kee*  
 3plNot.Know.REM sacred.place parts its inside 2plIMMP enter  
*dmi*  
 plSIMMP  
 ‘Without them<sub>3</sub> knowing, they went inside a yâpwo’
- e. *nana nyêdê, dpî kê l:âmo dpo ngee*  
 1dNot.KnowIMM 2dPOSS shell.money losing 2dIMMP get  
*ngmê*  
 PFS3sOPROX  
 ‘Without us<sub>2</sub> knowing(today), we<sub>2</sub> (lit. you<sub>2</sub>) lost our (lit. your<sub>2</sub>) kê  
 shell coin’

### 8.4.2 Reported instructions

As has been mentioned, there is a special construction for relaying an instruction, a bit like English *You are to come in now*. As Henderson noted (1995:87), in this construction the overt pronominals will reflect the current speech participants, but the inflectional system may reflect the original speech situation. In the original situation, Dad might say to a messenger:

- (495) *Kaawe a pwiyé we*  
 Kaawe CLS come P.IMP3sS  
 ‘Let Kaawe come here’

And then the messenger may say to Kaawa:

- (496) *M:aa ngê apu, nyi a pwiyé we*  
 Dad ERG QUOT.3s>anyPRS 2s CLS come PIMP3sS  
 ‘Dad says You are to come now’ lit. ‘Dad says you let him come’

In this way one can get a mismatch of person marking between that appropriate to the initial speech event, and that appropriate to the reporting event: here the 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun takes a 3<sup>rd</sup> person imperative inflection.

However, there is some latitude in this system. Consider for example the case of possessive pronouns. These will often stay rigid under the report (where in (497)a. S tells K to tell Y, and in (497)b. K tells Y):



- (497) a. S>K: *Yidika ka dpî vyi a taa*  
 Yidika DAT IMPDefd2/3 tell my knife  
*dpo núw:o ngê*  
 IMPDefd.CLS2/3 bring MFS.3sO  
 ‘Tell to Yidika: Bring back my knife’ (S’s knife)
- b. K>Y: *Stephen ngê apu a taa a núw:o*  
 Stephen ERG QUOT3s>anyPRS my knife CLS bring  
*ngê*  
 MFS.3sO.IMP  
 ‘Stephen says “Bring back my knife”’

But the pronominals can be relativized to the second situation of speaking – below in (498) either the b. or c. variants can be used to express the same meaning:

- (498) a. S>K: *Yidika ka dpî vyi ‘naa*  
 Yidika DAT IMPDeferred2/3 tell (N)your+knife  
*dpo ‘nuw:o ngê*  
 IMPDefd.CLS2/3 bring MF3sO  
 ‘Tell Yidika to bring you back your (K’s) knife’
- b. K>Y: *Stephen ngê apu nyi ngê*  
 Stephen ERG QUOT3s>anyPRS you ERG  
*‘naa dpo ‘nuw:o ngê*  
 (N)your+knife IMPDefd.CLS2/3 bring MF3sO  
 ‘Stephen says you are to bring your (K’s) knife (=K’s knife)’
- c. K>Y: *Stephen ngê apu nyi ngê a*  
 Stephen ERG QUOT3s>anyPRS you ERG my  
*taa dpo ‘nuw:o ngê*  
 knife IMPDefd.CLS2/3 bring MF3sO  
 ‘Stephen says you are to bring my (K’s) knife’

There are additional special properties of these situations. Consider the following where the (499)a. example has a verb of giving specialized to 3<sup>rd</sup> person recipients, inflected with a 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular subject and a 1<sup>st</sup> person recipient – note that the recipient is deviantly expressed with 1s signalled by the absolutive form of the pronoun, not the oblique or possessive. The next two examples show that other variants are also possible, in b. with a match between verb and recipient person, but in c. with a mismatch between the verb inflection and the verb root!

- (499) a. *kî P:êêkmiyé ka kwi nê ka ndapî*  
 That P:êêkmiyé DAT tell.2sIMP 1s DAT shell.money  
*ngma a y:eeni*  
 INDF CLS give.to3.IMP2s  
 ‘Tell P:êêkmiyé that she should give ndap shells to me’  
 (NB: *nê ka*, not \**a ka*; and note verb “give to 3<sup>rd</sup> person” with 2s inflection)
- b. *kî P:êêkmiyé ka kwi ndapî a ka*  
 That P:êêkmiyé DAT tell.2sIMP shell.money 1sPOSS DAT  
*ngma a ki*  
 INDF CLS give.to2nd.IMP2s  
 ‘Tell P:êêkmiyé that she should give ndap to me’  
 (Note: verb “give to 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person” with 2s inflection)
- c. *P:êêkmiyé ka kwi ndapî a ka ngma*  
 P:êêkmiyé DAT tell.2sIMP shell.money 1sPOSS DAT INDF  
*a kê ngê*  
 CLS give.to2nd IMP3sS3sO  
 ‘Tell P:êêkmiyé that she should give ndap to me’  
 (note: verb “give to 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person” with 3s inflection)

These details are of some interest in that they seem to establish some kind of cross-linkage between the clause of saying and the reported speech, but they do not establish that the reported speech is actually embedded. Although the verb or quotation formula could be said to have the reported clause as subcategorized under its argument structure, syntactically some kind of adjunction may be all that is involved.

### 8.4.3 Other relativizations of deixis

There are complexities around the parameters of person, time and place, where a reported utterance might be ambiguous between values for those parameters in the original reported speech event versus those relevant for the reporting speech event. First, consider the case of person deixis. Reported 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronouns might in principle be ambiguous, but in fact mostly there are special constructions which avoid this, as illustrated below:

- (500) a. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo: kî nê dpî*  
 Mwonî Erg Weta DAT 3>3QUOT CERT 1s sleeping  
 ‘Mwonî told Weta: I was sleeping’ i.e. that Mwonî (not current speaker) was sleeping

- b. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo: nê ka dpî*  
 Mwonî Erg Weta DAT 3>3QUOT 1s CERT3CI sleeping  
 ‘Mwonî said to Weta: I (current speaker, not Mwonî) was sleeping’
- c. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo: kî nyi dpî*  
 Mwonî Erg Weta DAT 3>3QUOT CERT 2s sleeping  
 ‘Mwonî told Weta: you were sleeping’ i.e. that he Weta (not current addressee) was sleeping
- d. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo: nyi ka dpî*  
 Mwonî Erg Weta DAT 3>3QUOT 2s CERT3CI sleeping  
 ‘Mwonî told Weta that you (current addressee, not Weta) was sleeping’

In these cases, the clause reporting the speech has the normal form of direct speech in example (500)a. (*kî nê dpî*) and c. (*kî nyi dpî*), the cases where person deixis is relativized to the original speech event. It has a special form in the cases where the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> pronouns refer to the reporter (b. *nê ka dpî*) or his addressee (d. *nyi ka dpî*) – in these cases the *ka* is a 3<sup>rd</sup> person inflection combined with the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun.

When the pronoun or inflection instantiates an Ergative argument, in both direct speech and reported speech the pronoun would normally not appear. However, just where it refers to the speaker or addressee of the current speech event, it occurs with Ergative case marking:

- (501) a. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo, a nee*  
 Mwonî Erg Weta DAT 3>3QUOT 1POSS canoe  
*yi chi ‘nuw:o*  
 FOCUS 2sIMMPI take  
 ‘Mwonî asked Weta: did you take my canoe?’ i.e. if Weta had used his – Mwonî’s – canoe
- b. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo, nê ngê a*  
 Mwonî Erg Weta DAT 3>3QUOT 1s ERG 1sPOSS  
*nee yi ‘nuw:o*  
 canoe FOCUS take  
 ‘Mwonî asked Weta: Did I (the speaker) take my canoe?’
- c. *yed:oo yuu a mênê y:oo, wo,*  
 then report CLOSE 3PRS.CI.MOT give.to3 3FUT.QUOT  
 ‘Then she would give a report, saying  
*nê ngê kî kpiye noo*  
 1s ERG CERT3PastPI block 1sOREM.PI  
 ‘I blocked her’ (lit. ‘I blocked me’)

- d. *Kêpî ngê dê vyi, kwo, nê ngê a*  
 Kêpî ERG 3IMM said, 3>3QUOT 1s ERG 1sPOSS  
*ngomo awêde a pwaapî*  
 house today 3CI.PRS breaking  
 ‘Kêpî said ‘She said to someone, I (present speaker Kêpî) will  
 break into my (=her) house today’

Notice the oddity of example (501)c., where 1<sup>st</sup> person pronominal elements refer to different individuals: the ergative pronoun (*nê*, ‘I’) refers to the current speaker, but the enclitic *noo*, coding 1<sup>st</sup> person object etc., refers to the person performing the embedded speech act (she would have said “He blocked me”, but it is here represented as “I (the current speaker) blocked me (the one reported to have said this)”. Again, consider d., where the *nê ngê* (‘I ERG’) must refer to the speaker of the whole current sentence (Kêpî), but the *a ngomo* ‘my house’ refers to the embedded speaker, a woman.

Similar constructions disambiguate possessive pronouns, as the following illustrate:

- (502) a. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo, a nee*  
 Mwonî ERG Weta DAT 3>3QUOT my canoe  
*chi ‘nuw:o*  
 2sIMMPI take  
 ‘Mwonî asked Weta if he (Weta) had used his (Mwonî’s) canoe’  
 (cannot mean addressee’s canoe)
- b. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo, nê u nee*  
 Mwonî ERG Weta DAT 3>3QUOT 1s 3sPOSS canoe  
*chi ‘nuw:o*  
 2sIMMPI take  
 ‘Mwonî asked Weta if he had taken my (the speaker’s) canoe’
- c. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo, \_nee chi*  
 Mwonî ERG Weta DAT 3>3QUOT 2sPOSS+canoe 2sIMMPI  
*‘nuw:o*  
 take  
 ‘Mwonî asked Weta if he (Weta) had used his Weta’s canoe’ (cannot  
 mean addressee’s canoe)
- d. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo, nyi u nee*  
 Mwonî ERG Weta DAT said 2s 3sPOSS canoe  
*chi ‘nuw:o*  
 2sIMMPI take  
 ‘Mwonî asked Weta if he had taken your (the addressee’s) canoe’

- e. *Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo, u nee chi*  
 Mwonî ERG Weta DAT 3>3QUOT 3sPOSS canoe 2sIMMPI  
 'nuw:o  
 take  
 'Mwonî asked Weta if he (Weta) had used his Mwonî's / someone  
 else's canoe'

As the last example shows, only the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun has ambiguities – here it can be read as referring to the reported speaker, i.e. it can be relativized to the reporting event. However the salient reading is reference to a third party.

Time and place deixis are more ambiguous, although again the favoured interpretation is clearly with regards to the original reported speech situation. Consider the following permissible interpretations of the place adverb *al:ii* 'here':

- (503) *Njinjôpu, Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo, al:ii dpo*  
 placename Mwonî ERG Weta DAT said here 2/3sIMPDefd.CLS  
*pwiyé*  
 come  
 'At Njinjôpu, Mwonî said to Weta, you must come here'  
 (i) Mwonî told Weta to come to where Mwonî then was i.e. to Njinjôpu  
 (ii) Mwonî told Weta to come to where current speaker and addressee  
 now are

Time expressions also have potential ambiguities, but with the same preference for values given by the original speech situation:

- (504) *ma Mwonî ngê Weta ka kwo, mââ*  
 yesterday Mwonî ERG Weta DAT 3>3QUOT tomorrow  
*dpo*  
 2/3sIMPDefd.CLS  
*pwiyé*  
 come  
 'Yesterday Mwonî told Weta: you must come tomorrow' i.e. today

However both the following are possible ways of expressing the same reported proposition:

- (505) a. *m:iituwo*                      *Mwonî*   *ngê*   *Weta*   *ka*   *kwo*,  
           day.before.yesterday   *Mwonî*    *ERG*   *Weta*   *DAT*   3>3QUOT  
           *m:ii*                              *dpo*                              *pwiyé*  
           day.after.tomorrow    2/3sIMPDefCLS    come  
           ‘Mwonî said the day before yesterday to Weta that he must come the  
           day after tomorrow, i.e. today’
- b. *m:iituwo*                      *Mwonî*   *ngê*   *Weta*   *ka*   *kwo*,            *awêde*  
           day.before.yesterday   *Mwonî*   *ERG*   *Weta*   *DAT*   3>3QUOT    today  
           *dpo*                              *pwiyé*  
           2/3sIMPDef.CLS    come  
           ‘Mwonî said the day before yesterday to Weta that he must come today’

In formal meetings, speakers may refer to themselves by name, with third person agreement. Nevertheless embedded sentences are likely to retain first person reference, as in (said by John):

- (506) *ye*    *John*   *u*            *lama*            *mê*   *daa*   *tóó*    *K:aalum*  
           that   John   3POSS   knowledge   REP   NEG   sitting   K:aalum  
           *nî*            *ngîy:a*            *ngê*  
           1sPASTPI   make.sleep   3sOREM.PI  
           ‘This John<sub>1</sub> his<sub>1</sub> knowledge doesn’t exist of my<sub>1</sub> causing K:aalum to go to  
           sleep (by sorcery)’

## 8.5 Temporal subordination

There are a number of distinct constructions involving temporal subordination, with translations glossing ‘When . . .’, ‘While . . .’, ‘As soon as . . .’, etc. Many of these involve periphrastic adverbials of the kind ‘the time at which’, but there is at least one full paradigm of verbal proclitics devoted entirely to the portmanteau expression of tense/aspect/person/number together with temporal subordination – I will call this the *Yi*-paradigm. The *Yi*-paradigm is easily confused with other uses of *yi*, including the cleft construction and ordinary anaphoric linkage (also with *yi*), but the cleft form is relatively indeclinable (usually of the form *yinê*) whereas the *Yi*-construction has a full range of portmanteau forms of *yi*. I will describe first the more analytic constructions, returning to the *Yi*-paradigm below.

### 8.5.1 Adverbial constructions

An adverbial clause of temporal subordination (a ‘when’ clause) can be built by using the periphrastic temporal specifier *dini ghi* ‘time part’ together with an adverbialized relative clause, to build a structure ‘At the time at which S1, S2’:

- (507) *u        dînê   dini   ghi   n:iî   ngê   a                   ghêê*  
 3sPoss shake time part REL ADV\_ 3sREM.PI.CLS moved  
*ngê        kîd:oo   yi   yîlî   doo n:aa   a        nkaa*  
 MFS3sOREM after.that tree many 3sREMCL.MOT CLOSE participate  
 ‘When he pulled it to shake it, all the other trees shook too’  
 (lit. ‘At the time at which he moved its shaking, many trees went and moved in synchrony’)

### 8.5.2 The *têdê*-construction

The noun *têdê* means ‘time’ or ‘place’, and is used to build nominalizations, as in:

- (508) *kpîpî    têdê            n:aa    lêpî*  
 fishing time/place 1sPRSCI going  
 ‘I am going fishing’

In a similar way, it combines with a Continuous verbal root (or gerund) to form a ‘While’-clause:

- (509) *nêêdî    yâmuyâmu   têdê   y:i            mu   nê*  
 possum hunting while there/here there 1sREM.PI.CLS  
*ghêpê        wo*  
 went.down sSREM.WEAK  
 ‘While I was hunting possum, I fell down there’

### 8.5.3 The *yi*-construction

This construction expresses rather different notions in the punctual and continuous aspects. We will take them in turn. In the punctual aspect, it builds a two-clause construction [S1 + S2], with the *yi*-marked clause being S1, the whole understood to convey ‘As soon as S1, S2’, ‘When S1, S2’:

- (510) *Fabian a yi t:aa, yed:oo a nmî lee*  
 Fabian 3FUTPI.CLS YI arrive then FUT 1pl go.FOL  
*dmi*  
 plPROXPI  
 ‘As soon as Fabian arrives, we’ll go’

- (511) *nté yidî m:a, tpii da ghay*  
 food 1sIMMPI.YI eat rain 3sIMM.CLS fall  
 ‘As soon as I had eaten (earlier today), rain fell’

The marking of the *yi* construction involves the fusion of *yi* with the inflectional proclitic in arbitrary ways, as shown in the following table (Table 8.20) for the Punctual Aspect paradigm. The exact interpretation of the temporal overlap between the two events, and the causal relation between them, is perhaps a matter of pragmatic construal, as already suggested by the examples above. The strong interpretation, ‘as soon as, and as a result of’ is clearly a matter of pragmatic interpretation, as it is sometimes obviously inappropriate:

- (512) a. *yi dmye m:a ngmê, tpile dmy:oo ghêê*  
 YI 2plIMMP eat PFS3sOPROXP things 2plIMMP.MOT wash  
*tumo*  
 PFS3plO  
 ‘When you<sub>3</sub> ate (today) you didn’t wash the plates’  
 b. *ma Fabian yi t:aa, nkéli ngê kada*  
 yesterday Fabian YI3PROXP arrived boat ERG ahead  
*a y:oo*  
 3NrPST leave  
 ‘Yesterday, just as Fabian arrived, the boat left (without him)’

But where appropriate it goes through:

- (513) a. *yichi vy:a, ghó dê pwopu*  
 YI2sIMMP hit spirit 3sIMMP blow  
 ‘When you hit him, his spirit flew (unconscious, today)’  
 b. *y:aa d:uu ngê, nê kwada wo*  
 YI3REMP taste MFS3sOREMP 1sREMP vomit sSREMP.WEAK  
 ‘When I tasted it, I vomited’

Incidentally, the adverbial temporal construction and the *yi*-construction can be combined, as in:



- (514) *dini ghi n:ii ngê yichi t:aa, lukwê ngmê*  
time part REL ADV YI2sIMMP arrive what INDF  
*dê pyódu*  
3IMMP happen  
'When you arrived, what happened?'

There is also apparently a Habitual paradigm with non-unique forms (bottom of Table 8.20), which has a 'whenever' interpretation, as illustrated here:

- (515) a. *yudu taa, dpî lê*  
YI.1sHABP arrive 3HABP go  
'Whenever I arrive he goes'  
b. *yidnye taa knî, dpî lê*  
YI.1dHABP arrive dS.IV 3HABP go  
'Whenever we2 arrive he goes'

**Table 8.20:** *yi*-Construction – the Punctual aspect paradigm.

Future	Sing	Dual	Plural
1	<i>a y:aa</i>	<i>a y:ee</i>	<i>a y:uu</i>
2	<i>a y:ii</i>	<i>a yuu</i>	<i>a yi nmyi / vy:ee</i>
3	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>
Immediate Past (and Present, Today)			
1	<i>yidî</i>	<i>yi dnye</i>	<i>yudu</i>
2	<i>yichi</i>	<i>yudu</i>	<i>yi dmye</i>
3	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>
Near Past (Yesterday)			
1	<i>y:aa</i>	<i>y:ee</i>	<i>y:uu</i>
2	<i>y:ii</i>	<i>yuu</i>	<i>vy:ee</i>
3	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>
Remote Past (Before Yesterday)			
1	<i>y:aa</i>	<i>y:ee</i> e.g. <i>y:ee taa knâpwo</i> 'as soon as we2 arrived'	<i>y:oo</i> e.g. <i>y:oo taa dniye</i> 'as soon as we3 arrived'
2	<i>y:ii</i>	<i>yuu</i> e.g. <i>yuu taa knâpwo</i> 'as soon as you2 arrived'	<i>vy:ii</i> e.g. <i>vy:ii taa dniye</i> 'as soon as you3 arrived'

Table 8.20 (continued)

Future	Sing	Dual	Plural
3	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i> e.g. <i>yi taa knâpwo</i> ‘as soon as they <sub>2</sub> arrived’	<i>yi</i> e.g. <i>yi taa dniye</i> ‘as soon as they <sub>3</sub> arrived’
<b>Habitual</b>			
1	<i>yudu</i>	<i>yidnye</i>	<i>yudu</i>
2	<i>yi dpyi</i>	<i>yudu</i>	<i>yi dmye</i>
3	<i>yuu</i>	<i>yuu</i>	<i>yuu</i>
<b>Imperative</b>			
1		<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>
2	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>
3	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>	<i>yi</i>

We turn now to the Continuous Aspect version of the *yi*-construction with special proclitics as in Table 8.21. The meaning is somewhat different, as the construction now suggests considerable or complete overlap between the events in S1 and S2:

- (516) a. *yinë* *lêpî*, *n:aa* *‘ne’ne*  
 YI.1sPRSCI go.CI 1sPRSCI.MOT taking  
 ‘I’ll take it as I go’
- b. *y:ee* *lêpî*, *dpî* *‘nuw:o* *ngi*  
 YI2sPRS going 2sIMPP take 2sS3sOIMPP  
 ‘Take it along as you go’
- c. *nkéli* *k:oo* *yînmo* *lêpî* *nyédi*, *nmîmo*  
 boat inside YI.1PlHAB go.CI PlSubjHABCI.Intr 1plHABCI  
*kpîpî* *nyédi*  
 fishing PlSubjHABCI.Intr  
 ‘Whenever we are going along in a boat, we trawl for fish’
- d. *yidê* *lêpî* *yuu* *châpwo*  
 YI.3sNrPSTC going leg cut  
 ‘As he was going he cut his leg (yesterday)’
- e. *yi nyipu* *lêpî*, *nyipu* *danêmbum*  
 YI.1dREMC going 1dREMC talking  
 ‘As we<sub>2</sub> were going, we<sub>2</sub> were talking (day before yesterday)’
- f. *yi nmee* *mbêpê*, *nmee* *nd:amênd:amê*  
 YI.1plREMC running 1plREMC singing.sacred.song  
 ‘As we were running along (in a sailing boat), we would sing sacred songs (Remote Past)’

**Table 8.21:** *yi*-Construction: The Continuous aspect paradigm.

Tomorrow	Sing	Dual	Plural
1	<i>a y:i / a yinî lêpî</i>	<i>a yi ny:oo lêpî _</i>	<i>a yi nmî lêpî _</i>
2	<i>a yi nyi lêpî</i>	<i>a yi dpî / a yudî lêpî</i>	<i>a yi nmyi lêpî _</i>
3	<i>a yi lêpî</i>	<i>a yi dpî / a yudî lêpî</i>	<i>a yi dnyi lêpî _</i>
<b>Now</b>			
1	<i>yinê lêpî _</i>	<i>y:ee lêpî mo</i>	<i>yinmo / yuno lêpî té</i>
2	<i>y:ee lêpî _</i>	<i>yidpo / yido lêpî mo</i>	<i>vy:ee lêpî té</i>
3	<i>ye lêpî _</i>	<i>ye lêpî mo</i>	<i>ye lêpî té</i>
<b>Today</b>			
1	<i>y:aa lêpî</i>	<i>y:ee lêpî mo</i>	<i>y:oo lêpî té</i>
2	<i>y:ii lêpî</i>	<i>yuu lêpî mo</i>	<i>vy:ee lêpî té</i>
3	<i>yi lêpî</i>	<i>yi lêpî mo</i>	<i>yi lêpî té</i>
<b>Yesterday</b>			
1	<i>y:aa lêpî</i>	<i>yi nyoo lêpî _</i>	<i>yi nmî / yunu lêpî _</i>
2	<i>y:ii lêpî</i>	<i>yi dpî / yudu lêpî _</i>	<i>yi nmyi lêpî _</i>
3	<i>yidî lêpî</i>	<i>yi dpî / yudu lêpî _</i>	<i>yi dnyi lêpî _</i>
<b>Day before yesterday</b>			
1	<i>yi noo lêpî _</i>	<i>yi nyipu lêpî _</i>	<i>yi nmee lêpî _</i>
2	<i>yi nyoo lêpî _</i>	<i>yi dpîmo lêpî _</i>	<i>yi nmyee lêpî _</i>
3	<i>yi doo lêpî _</i>	<i>yi dpîmo lêpî _</i>	<i>yi dnye lêpî _</i>
<b>Habitual</b>			
1	<i>yinê lêpî yedi</i>	<i>y:ee lêpî nódó</i>	<i>yinmo / yuno lêpî té</i>
2	<i>y:ee lêpî yedi, nyimo kpîpî yedi</i>	<i>yi dpo lêpî nódó</i>	<i>vy:ee lêpî nyédi</i>
3	<i>ye lêpî yedi</i>	<i>ye lêpî nódó</i>	<i>ye lêpî nyédi</i>

The *yi*-construction described here is a special bi-clausal construction. The *yi*-element itself is a declinable anaphoric which is found in other constructions, for example the single-clause focus construction where it combines with the absolutive-focussing particle *vyîlo* (see §8.6.1)

## 8.6 Focus constructions and clefts

There are two basic focus constructions, defined semantically as constructions which highlight one argument as the focus, and assert that this argument in particular, rather than other salient alternatives, played the relevant role in the event. One is restricted to Absolutive arguments, the other to Ergative ones (a

reflex of the syntactic ergativity of the language: see Chapter 9). One construction is based on the identificatory deictic element *vyîlo* (or *vyîlâ*) together with an anaphoric proclitic on the verb, the other involves special forms of the proclitic (e.g. *yinê*, again involving the anaphoric element *yi*). They have different uses: the *vyîlo*-construction highlights the Absolutive argument (S of an intransitive clause, O of a transitive one), while the *yinê* construction highlights the Ergative subject of a transitive verb, as illustrated below:

- (517) a. *kî pini ngê chêêpî vyîlo yi* ← ***vyîlo* highlights Absolutive NP**  
 that man ERG stone FOC-ABS ANAPH  
*d:ii*  
 threw  
 ‘That’s the stone which the man threw’
- b. *kî pini ngê chêêpî yinê dê* ← ***yinê* highlights Ergative NP**  
 that man ERG stone FOC-ERG 3sIMM  
*d:ii*  
 threw  
 ‘That’s the man who threw the stone’

Note that we can test the ergative/absolutive alternation here using paired verbs, like *tpapê* ‘chew betel nut’ (intransitive although incorporating), and *kuwo* ‘chew betel nut’ (transitive):

- (518) a. *Monki vyîlo yi mbwo* ← ***vyîlo* highlights S-NP**  
 Monki FOC-ABS 3Anaph betel  
*tpapê* (\**Monki yinê mbwo tapê*)  
 chew.intrans  
 ‘Monki is the one who was chewing betel’
- b. *Monki ngê mbwo yinê kuwo* ← ***yinê* highlights A-NP**  
 Monki ERG betel FOC-ERG chew.trans  
 ‘Monki is the one who was chewing (not us)’
- c. *Monki ngê mbwo vyîlo yi* ← ***vyîlo* highlights O-NP**  
 Monki ERG betel FOC-ABS 3Anaph  
*kuwo*  
 chew.trans  
 ‘Monki was chewing betel, not anything else’

We noted in §7.9.4 (also §8.3.1.2; §8.3.2.2; §8.7.1.3) that *tpapê* as in example (518)a. above is an exceptional verb, since it is morphologically intransitive but in some

respects syntactically ergative, incorporating a pseudo-object. Here though it is the morphological status with an Absolutive subject that is relevant. One can further show this by looking at normal transitives, which optionally incorporate their object, thus detransitivizing. In this case, the detransitivization allows *vyîlo* to have scope over an agent of a (detransitivized) transitive verb. The normal transitive structure in example (519)a. below would require the *yinê*-construction to focus on the agents. The intransitivized sentence in example b. has the object of the transitive sentence incorporated in a privileged position between proclitic and verb, while the enclitic also displays the change of transitivity status. Now to focus on the agents one must use a *vyîlo*-construction:

- (519) a. *Monki Tili y:oo mbwo yinê kuwo*  
 Monki Tili ERG+PL betel FOC-ERG chew.trans  
*ngmê*  
Trans.PFS.3sO.CIPROX  
 ‘Monki and Tilly were the ones who were chewing betel’
- b. *Monki Tili vyîlo dê yi mbwo kuwo*  
 Monki Tili FOC-ABS Dual ANAPH betel chew.trans  
*mo*  
Intrans.d.CIPROX  
 ‘Monki and Tilly were the betel-chewing ones’
- c. *Monki Tili vyîlo dê yi mbwo tpapê*  
 Monki Tili FOC-ABS Dual ANAPH betel chew.intrans  
*mo*  
Intrans.d.CIPROX

The c. sentence, with the substitution of intransitive verb root *tpapê* for transitive *kuwo*, utilizes the same focus construction as the detransitivized sentence in b.

Scope is thus fully determined on the basis of (surface) grammatical relations, not by the position of the cleft elements. The following sections provide more detail on both constructions.

### 8.6.1 The *vyîlo* focus construction

To transform a non-focussed sentence into its focus or clefted counterpart, two elements are added to the pre-verbal nucleus: *vyîlo* followed by anaphoric *yi* suitably fused in portmanteau form with other elements in the proclitic:

- (520) a. non-focal: *mââwe ka kwo?*  
                           Bigman CERT-3sCI.PROX stand.sS  
                           ‘Is the bigman standing there?’
- b. focal: *mââwe vyîlo y:e kwo*  
                           Bigman DEICTIC ANAPH-3sCI.PROX stand.sS  
                           ‘Is that the bigman standing there?’

*Vyîlo* has independent uses as a presentational deictic. The following illustrates the non-focus uses of deictic *vyîlo*:<sup>44</sup>

- (521) A: *ala vyîlo?* B: *ye daa vyîlo*  
                           this-nr-Spkr the-one? that-nr-Addr NEG the-one  
                           ‘Is this the one?’ ‘No, that (near you) is not the one’

There is no proximal deictic component in *vyîlo*: thus one can say equally *kî vyîlo* ‘is that-medial the one?’, *wu vyîlo* ‘is that-uncertain the one?’, *mu vyîlo* ‘is that-distant the one?’.

But the focus-element *vyîlo* normally occurs in a special slot, just before the verbal proclitic, and is invariant over tense, mood, person, and so on. The other element of the construction is anaphoric *yi*, which fuses with the normal verbal proclitic in a not wholly predictable paradigm of 144 cells (defined by tense, aspect, person, number, mood configurations). This *yi* appears to inflect exactly as the paradigm involved in the bi-clausal temporal construction described in §8.5.3 (see Tables 8.20 and 8.21). There are some quite subtle distinctions in the form that this *yi* element takes, for example, in continuous aspect, an alternation between *yi* and *ye* according to tense:

<sup>44</sup> The fact that *vyîlo* has these other deictic uses makes it possible to introduce deictic *vyîlo* in a *yinê*-construction – in that case the sentence has the properties of a *yinê* cleft (and *vyîlo* occurs initially, not in the pre-nucleus):

- (i) *vyîlo yi pini ngê yinê a d:uud:uu ngê*  
       DEIC ANAPH man+spec ERG A-FOCUS 3HabCont do.Cont MonoFS.3sO.HabCont  
       ‘He’s the one who habitually does it’

Thus the *vyîlo* construction is defined not just by the element itself, but by the whole construction.

- (522) a. *James Headmaster ka vyîlo ye nkîngê*  
 James headmaster POSTP FOC-ABS ANAPH.3PRS be.afraid  
 ‘James is the one (currently) frightened of the Headmaster’
- b. *James Headmaster ka vyîlo yi doo nkîngê*  
 James headmaster POSTP FOC-ABS ANAPH.3.REMPC be.afraid  
 ‘James is the one who used to be frightened of Headmaster’
- c. *ngêpê ngomo vyîlo ye wumê wuwó ngmê*  
 prayer house FOC-ABS ANAPH 3ImmFUTC building PFS3sO  
 ‘They are building a church, not anything else’
- d. *ngêpê ngomo vyîlo yi dnyi wuwó*  
 prayer house FOC-ABS ANAPH 3plNrPSTC building  
 ‘They were building a church, not anything else’

(Below, for compactness, the ANAPH element will not be fully glossed.) The key observation is that the *vyîlo*-construction focuses on the absolutive argument of sentences whether S or O, and similarly on the absolutive one of experiencer (‘oblique subject’) sentences.

Since the pre-verbal position of *vyîlo* (just before *yi*) is the normal unmarked location, its scope (underlined in the following examples) is determined by grammatical relations, specifically by restriction to the absolutive argument of normal subject sentences (the S-argument in a. below, or the O-argument in b.). Even when it is moved, the scope remains the same:

- (523) a. *kî dmââdî mbwódo vyîlo yi kmaapî*  
 that girl on.ground FOC-ABS ANAP dine  
 ‘This is the girl who was eating(intransitive) on the ground’
- b. *kî pini ngê chêêpî vyîlo yi d:ii → movement*  
 that man ERG stone FOC-ABS ANAPH threw possible  
 ‘That’s the stone which the man threw’

Changes in scope can be illustrated by the interaction of this construction with others. When O-incorporation detransitivizes the sentence (524)a. below as in b., it has the expectable change of scope – since there is no surface O-NP to scope over in the incorporated sentence b., the scope now switches to the absolutive subject or NP in S-function. PP-incorporation, which takes place with some exceptional intransitives, has no effect on the function of the S-NP, and thus the scope remains on the S-NP in these cases (see example c.).

- (524) a. **Incorporation with transitive verb – intransitivizing, scope changes**

*kî pyópu ngê nté vyîlo yi ch:eech:ee*  
 that woman ERG food(ABS) FOC-ABS ANAPH cooking  
 ‘This is food that the woman was cooking’

- b. *kî pyópu vyîlo [yi nté ch:eech:ee]<sub>verb complex</sub>*  
 that woman FOC-ABS ANAPH food cooking  
 ‘This is the woman who was food-cooking’

- c. **Incorporation of PP by intransitive V** – does not change scope:

*Mwonî vyîlo yi nêêdî ka vyuwu*  
 Mwonî FOC-ABS ANAPH possum DAT look.for  
 ‘Mwonî is the one who looks for possum’

- d. **Experiencer construction** – Absolutive NP is focussed as before:

*Yidika ngê nkéli u yi vyîlo yi a*  
 Yidika EXP boat its desire FOC-ABS ANAPH 3sCI.PROX  
*kwo*  
 standing  
 ‘It is a boat (not a canoe) that the desire is standing for Yidika’  
 (i.e. He wants a boat)

- e. **Reciprocal** – subject can be in scope if intransitive verb:

*kî tpódu noko vyîlo dê yi danênum*  
 those men.two RECP.DAT FOC-ABS Dual ANAPH talking  
*mo*  
 Intrans.CI..PROX  
 ‘Those two men are the ones who were talking to each other’

In the experiencer construction in d. above with a ‘dative’-subject, *vyîlo* has scope over the absolutive NP as always (here the ‘want’ predicate takes the object of desire in the absolutive case, and the desirer in the ‘dative’ or rather the special experiencer case). Reciprocals are a complex part of the grammar, intransitivizing in certain tenses/aspects, and (unlike reflexives) occurring with intransitive verbs as in e. above. Here the S-NP (‘those two men’) binds the oblique NP *noko* ‘to each other’, thus allowing a *vyîlo* construction to focus on the subject of a reciprocal clause, not an option with reflexive clauses.

There is one important rider on the otherwise invariant rule that *vyîlo* takes scope over the absolutive NP, for the scope can include Instrumental NPs (but not e.g. Dative NPs):



- (525) *kî pini ngê kpîdi pee dmââdî ka yuu*  
 that man.spec ERG cloth piece girl DAT foot  
*ngê vyîlo yi y:oo*  
 INST FOC-ABS ANAPH give.to.3  
 ‘It was a cloth that that man gave with his foot to the girl’  
 OR ‘It was with his foot that that man gave the cloth to the girl’  
 BUT NOT ‘It was to the girl that that man gave the cloth with his foot’

It is not clear why this should be the case: despite the explicit marking of instrumental NPs (with a case-marker which in the singular is homophonous with the ergative), perhaps they are less oblique (higher on a thematic hierarchy) than other oblique NPs. In any case, *vyîlo* can not scope over e.g. the dative NP (‘to the girl’) in the example above.

To further illustrate the S/O restriction, consider first the following transitive sentences, where the focussed element is always the object:

- (526) a. *vyîlo yi kópu yi dî vyi*  
 FOC-ABS that word ANAPH 1sImmPST say  
 ‘Those are the words I said’  
 b. *bread vyîlo yi Ø ma*  
 bread FOC-ABS ANAPH 3sPRS eat  
 ‘It’s bread that he eats’  
 c. *ngêpê ngomo vyîlo yi wumê wuwó*  
 prayer house FOC-ABS ANAPH 3ProxHabC+MOT build  
*ngmê*  
 PFS3sO  
 ‘It’s a church they are building (not anything else)’  
 d. *ship vyîlo ye ndîê ngmê*  
 ship FOC-ABS ANAP construct PFS3sO  
 ‘It’s a ship (steel boat) they are building!’

Contrast this with intransitive sentences where the focussed element is always the subject:

- (527) a. *kî dmââdî bicycle mbêmê vyîlo yi yââ*  
 DEIC girl bicycle on FOC-ABS ANAPH sit.down  
 ‘This girl is the one who sat on the bike’  
 b. *kî dmââdî mbwódo vyîlo yi kmaapî*  
 DEIC girl on.ground FOC-ABS ANAPH dine  
 ‘This is the girl who was eating on the ground’

- c. *kî pyópu vyîlo yi nté ch:eech:ee*  
 DEIC woman FOC-ABS ANAPH food cooking  
 ‘This is the woman who was food-cooking’
- d. *Mwonî vyîlo yi nêêdî ka vyuwu*  
 Mwonî FOC-ABS ANAPH possum POSTP look  
 ‘Mwonî is the one who looks for possum’
- e. *James Headmaster ka vyîlo ye nkîngê*  
 James Headmaster POSTP FOC-ABS ANAPH be.frightened  
 ‘James is the one frightened of the Headmaster (ye is not yi – is Present)’

Note that in example (527)c. the verb is transitive, but the clause is intransitive because the object is incorporated (*nté* ‘food’ occurs between proclitic *yi* and the verb), and *vyîlo* picks out the intransitive (zero-case marked) subject. Similarly, in d., we have an intransitive verb (‘look (for)’) which can incorporate its subcategorized PP (here ‘for possum’) – although there are two NPs in play, it is the absolutive not the oblique that is focussed on. The sentence in e. has an intransitive verb that subcategorizes for a non-incorporated PP (‘be frightened of NP’) and here again the subject is focussed on.

In Experiencer (Dative-Subject) structures, *vyîlô* consistently picks out the absolutive NP as expected:

- (528) *Yidika ngê nkéli u yi vyîlo yi a kwo*  
 Yidika EXP boat 3POSS desire ABS-FOC ANAPH 3PRS standing  
 ‘It is a boat that Yidika wants’ (lit. ‘It is a boat the desire for which is standing to Yidika’)

### 8.6.2 The *yinê* construction

This construction is the most frequent focus construction. (It is not to be confused with the formally similar *yi*-construction, which is a two-clause construction of temporal subordination discussed in §8.5.3, nor with the simple anaphoric *yi* construction just met inside the *vyîlo*-construction, described in §8.6.1). The *yinê* construction is marked either entirely in the proclitic in portmanteau form (3<sup>rd</sup> person *yinê* (S)/ *y:oo* (Dual/PL in distal tenses), relatively indeclinable), or in other persons by a combination of the normal proclitic preceded by a possessed emphatic *chóó*, as in *a chóó anê kââ* ‘My self I-will put (it)’. This second form could be said to be merely an emphatic, but it serves the same focus function and was elicited as the non-3<sup>rd</sup> person counterpart, and furthermore it can co-occur with

other emphatics. The paradigm of *yinê*-forms, which replace the normal verbal proclitics, looks then as in Table 8.22 (for the punctual aspect) and Table 8.23 (for the continuous aspect). I have illustrated with the verb *kââ* ‘put (standing)’ (suppletive forms *kaa*, *kapî*) and appropriate enclitics, but the operative *yinê*-element is just the material before the verb.

**Table 8.22:** *Yinê* construction, Punctual aspect (Indicative mood unless noted)

Illustrated with verb *kââ/kaa/kapî* ‘put’/‘putting’, with 3s Object e.g. ‘He is the one who put it’.

PERSON – TENSE – Tomorrow	Sing	Dual	Plural
1	<i>a chókó anê kââ</i>	<i>nye chókó anyi kââ</i>	<i>nmî chókó anmî kââ</i>
2	<i>nyókó anyi kââ</i>	<i>dpî chókó a dpî kaa ngmê</i>	<i>nmyi chókó anmyi kââ ngmê</i>
3	<i>yinê wa kââ</i>	<i>y:oo wa kaa ngmê</i>	<i>y:oo wa kaa ngmê</i>
<b>TENSE – Earlier today</b>			
1	<i>a chókó dê kââ</i>	<i>nyi chókó dnye kââ</i>	<i>nmî chókó dpî kââ</i>
2	<i>nyókó chí kââ</i>	<i>dpî chókó dpî kaa ngmê</i>	<i>nmyi chókó dmye kaa ngmê</i>
3	<i>yinê dê kââ</i>	<i>yinê dê kaa ngmê</i>	<i>yinê dê kaa ngmê</i>
<b>TENSE – Yesterday</b>			
1	<i>a chókó nê kââ</i>	<i>nye chókó nyi kââ</i>	<i>nmî chókó nmî kââ</i>
2	<i>nyókó nyi kââ</i>	<i>dpî chókó dpî kaa ngmê</i>	<i>nmyi chókó nmyi kaa ngmê</i>
3	<i>yinê kââ</i>	<i>yinê kaa ngmê</i>	<i>yinê kaa ngmê</i>
<b>TENSE – REM</b>			
1	<i>a chókó nê kââ</i>	<i>nye chókó nyi kââ</i>	<i>nmî chókó nmî kââ</i>
2	<i>nyókó nyi kââ</i>	<i>dpî chókó dpî kaa ngópu</i>	<i>nmyi chókó nmyi kaa ngópu</i>
3	<i>yinê kââ</i>	<i>y:oo kaa ngópu</i>	<i>y:oo kaa ngópu</i>
<b>MOOD – Habitual</b>			
1	<i>a chókó dpî kââ</i>	<i>nyi chókó nye kapî ngê</i>	<i>nmî chókó nmo kapî ngê</i>
2	<i>nyókó dpyi kââ</i>	<i>dpî chókó dpyi kaa ngmê</i>	<i>nmyi chókó dmye kaa ngmê</i>
3	<i>yinê dpî kââ</i>	<i>yinê / y:oo dpî kaa ngmê</i>	<i>yinê / y:oo dpî kaa ngmê</i>
<b>- Imp Deferred*</b>			
1	—	—	—
2	<i>nyókó anyi kââ</i>	<i>dpî chókó a dpî kaa ngmê</i>	<i>nmyi chókó anmyi kaa ngmê</i>
3	<i>chókó dpî kaa ngê</i>	<i>yi chókó dpî kaa y:ee</i>	<i>yi chókó dpî kaa y:ee</i>

\*Note: There appear to be no Non-deferred Imperative forms

**Table 8.23:** *Yinê* construction, Continuous aspect.

PERSON –	Sing	Dual	Plural
<b>TENSE – Tomorrow</b>			
1	<i>a chókó anî kapî</i>	<i>nyi chókó any:oo kapî</i>	<i>nmî chókó anmî kapî</i>
2	<i>nyókó anyi kapî</i>	<i>dpî chókó adpî kapî</i>	<i>nmyi chókó anmyi kapî</i>
3	<i>yinê adî kapî</i>	<i>y:oo adpî kapî</i>	<i>y:oo adnyi kapî</i>
<b>TENSE – Now</b>			
1	<i>a chókó n:aa kapî</i>	<i>nyi chókó nye kapî</i>	<i>nmî chókó nmo kapî</i>
2	<i>nyókó nye kapî</i>	<i>dpî chókó dpo kapî ngmê</i>	<i>nmyi chókó nmye kapî ngmê</i>
3	<i>chókó a dî kapî</i>	<i>yi chókó a dpî kapî</i>	<i>yi chókó a dnyi kapî</i>
<b>TENSE – Earlier today</b>			
1	<i>a chókó nî kapî</i>	<i>nye chókó nyi kapî</i>	<i>nmî chókó nmî kapî</i>
2	<i>nyókó nyi kapî</i>	<i>dpî chókó dpî kapî ngmê</i>	<i>nmyi chókó nmyi kapî ngmê</i>
3	<i>yinê kapî</i>	<i>yinê kapî ngmê</i>	<i>yinê kapî ngmê</i>
<b>TENSE – Yesterday</b>			
1	<i>a chókó nê kapî</i>	<i>nyi chókó ny:oo kapî</i>	<i>nmî chókó nmî kapî</i>
2	<i>nyókó nyi kapî</i>	<i>dpî chókó dpî kapî</i>	<i>nmyi chókó nmyi kapî</i>
3	<i>yinê dî kapî</i>	<i>yinê dpî kapî _</i>	<i>yinê dnye kapî (not dnyi)</i>
<b>TENSE – REM</b>			
1	<i>a chókó noo kapî</i>	<i>nyi chókó nyipu kapî</i>	<i>nmî chókó nmee kapî</i>
2	<i>nyókó nyoo kapî</i>	<i>dpî dpîmo kapî _</i>	<i>nmyi chókó nmyee kapî</i>
3	<i>yinê doo kapî _</i>	<i>yinê dpîmo kapî _</i>	<i>yinê dnye kapî _</i>
<b>MOOD- Habitual*</b>			
1	<i>a chókó n:aa kapî ngê</i>	<i>nyi chókó nye kapî ngê</i>	<i>nmî chókó nmo kapî ngê</i>
2	<i>nyókó nye kapî ngê</i>	<i>dpî chókó dpo kapî ngópu ngê</i>	<i>nmyi chókó nmye kapî ngópu ngê</i>
3	<i>yinê a kapî ngê</i>	<i>yinê / y:oo a kapî ngópu</i>	<i>yinê / y:oo a kapî ngópu</i>
<b>MOOD- Imperative</b>			
1	<i>a chókó anî kapî</i>	<i>nyi chókó any:oo kapî</i>	<i>nmî chókó anmî kapî</i>
2	<i>nyókó chi kapî **</i>	<i>dpo choo kapî</i>	<i>nmyi chókó dmyinê kapî</i>
3	<i>(yinê) chókó kapî ***</i>	<i>y:oo a dpî kapî</i>	<i>y:oo adnyi kapî</i>

\*Note: Habitual PROXimal and Habitual Distal use same forms

\*\**nyókó a nyi kapî* has additional obligation force: ‘you must habitually . . .’

\*\*\*the *yinê* here apparently likewise adds deontic force

The *yinë* focus construction, constituted as illustrated in the paradigms, does not itself have the syntactic (dual-clause) structure of an English cleft, although it can be combined with such a structure, using deictic *vyîlo* (distinct from the focus-marker):

- (529) a. *vyîlo yi pini ngê yinë a d:uud:uu*  
 DEIC Anaph man.spec ERG FOC.ERG 3HAB.C do.HAB.C  
*ngê*  
 MFS.3sO  
 ‘This is the man who habitually does it’
- b. *nyi vyîlo nyóó nye d:uud:uu ngê*  
 you DEIC (N)2sSELF 2sHAB.C do.HAB.C MFS.3sO  
 ‘You there are the one who habitually does it’

Notice how such a structure has three pronominally-marked elements (for b. above, the pronoun *nyi*, the 2<sup>nd</sup> person possessive nasal assimilated to *chóó* as *nyóó*, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> person habitual proclitic *nye*). But here we will concentrate on the simplex *yinë* focus construction, since its properties carry over to the more complex cleft of which it is a part.

As noted above, the *yinë* construction can only highlight the transitive subject or A-function argument (in contrast to absolutive NP focussing by the *vyîlo* construction):

- (530) *Tili ngê yinë dê t:âmo*  
 Tili ERG FOC-ERG 3IMMPI steal.PROX  
 ‘Tilly (and no one else) is the one who stole it’

A typical use of the *yinë* construction is to announce the revelation of an identity, hitherto unknown or mysterious, or thought to be someone else, as in the following extracts from myths:

- (531) a. *Kââdî ngê yinë kââ, kââdî ngê*  
 sun ERG FOC-ERG put.on, sun ERG  
*yinë wiye ngê*  
 FOC-ERG tie 3sO\_MFS(Trans)  
 ‘The Sun was the one who tightened it securely’
- b. *ye Mbaati ngê yinë a vyuwó*  
 that deity ERG FOC-ERG 3REM.PI.CLS set\_alight  
*ngê vyeeli ngomo*  
 3sOMFSTrans Vyeeli house  
 ‘It was (the God) Mbaati who burnt the sacred long house’

- c. *Gha cha y:oo, y:oo a*  
 Gha man+wife ERG-PL FOC-ERG 3sREM.PI.CLS  
 ‘nuw:o ngópu  
 bring PFS3sO.REM.PI/HABC(Trans)  
 ‘Gha and his wife, they are the ones who brought it  
 (shell-money to Rossel)’

In conversation it may be used to contradict an assumption:

- (532) A: *mââ, Yelingep Dâmu’nuwo wa lê*  
 tomorrow boat.name place.name 3FUTP go  
 ‘Tomorrow the boat Yelingep is going to Damenu’  
 B: *kêle, Aani ngê yi dpodo yinê wa dóó*  
 No boat.name ANAPH work FOC-ERG 3FUTP do  
 ‘No, (the boat) Aani is the one which will do that work’  
 (because Yelingep has mechanical problems)

## 8.7 Constructions based on nominalization

The basic nominalization of a verb uses the continuous root directly, without derivation, as a gerund or ‘action nominal’ (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2013). Thus an inherently punctual transitive verb like *pwââ* ‘break’ has a suppletive continuous root *pwaapî* which can be used directly as a nominal meaning ‘breaking something’. Its intransitive counterpart is *pwópu*, with continuous root *pwópupwópu*, ‘breaking’, which can likewise be used as a gerund. Inherently continuous roots like *dpodo*, ‘working’, also directly yield gerunds, *u dpodo* ‘his work’. These gerunds have a number of uses, playing a role in special constructions listed below, but they can generally take the place of any NP, occurring e.g. in ergative position:

- (533) *kwo yéyéyé ngê a ‘nuwo*  
 QUOT getting.married.to ERG 3sREM.PI.CLS brought  
*nyoo ala y:i*  
 2sREM.PI/HABPROX DEIC here  
 ‘She said: marriage brought you here’

In addition to this, the resultative construction (§7.9.1) yields nominalizations, which can play the role of an NP in a sentence.

### 8.7.1 Nominalization and syntactic ergativity

In English, arguments of nominalizations of the following kind have an obvious interpretation – if the verb is transitive the argument is in A-function, as in example (534)a., or if intransitive it is in S-function, as in b. (but see Quirk et al. 1985:1063ff and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2013 for the full story):

- (534) a. Your hitting is haphazard  
       b. Your snoring is a problem

In other words, the possessive pronominal argument is interpreted in both cases as a nominative subject. But in Yéli Dnye, the equivalent transitive verb has an odd interpretation to English ears (recall: 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular possession is expressed by fusing of a floating homorganic nasal, represented here as prefix N):

- (535) *ngmapî*                                      *dono*  
       *N+ mgapî*                                      *dono*  
       2sPoss+killing-by-sorcery    bad  
       ‘Your sorcerizing is bad’ means ‘The killing of you by sorcery would be bad’  
       *not* ‘The killing by you using sorcery would be bad’

It has in effect a passive-like interpretation – ‘your being killed by sorcery would be bad’. This alerts us to the fact that whereas English nominalizations as in the examples above preserve the subject (whether in A- or S- function) as a possessive to the left of the gerund, Yéli Dnye gerunds preserve the absolutive noun phrase (whether in S- or O-function) immediately to the left.

#### 8.7.1.1 Lexical arguments of nominalizations

Leaving aside till §8.7.1.3 pronominal possession of the kind just illustrated, the basic generalization is that the full lexical arguments of nominalized verbs in Yéli Dnye show the following pattern:

- Lexical arguments that would be Absolutive arguments in finite constructions – whether in S or O role – surface as unmarked NPs associated with nominalized verbs
- Lexical arguments that would be Ergative ones in a finite clause can surface optionally as lexical possessors of transitive gerunds

(These patterns do not seem to fit the typology laid out in Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2013, but would constitute another minor type where S and O are unmarked and

A alone can be a possessor.) As illustration of the basic pattern, we can exploit the fact that many verbs have transitive and intransitive doublets, each with a set of suppletive verb forms. Thus we have in Table 8.24 the following paired roots for the verbs ‘to turn something over’ vs. ‘to turn over (e.g. capsized)’:

**Table 8.24:** ‘To turn something over’ vs. ‘to turn over (e.g. capsized)’.

Suppletion categories	Transitive Verb	Intransitive Verb
	‘to turn something over’	‘to turn over self’
punctual proximal tenses	<i>tpaa</i>	<i>tpââlî</i>
punctual remote past	<i>tpólu</i>	<i>tpalî</i>
punctual followed root	<i>tpaa</i>	<i>tpalî</i>
continuous aspect	<i>tpiyé</i>	<i>tpâlîtpâlî</i>

In each case, it is the continuous aspect root which is used as the non-finite, nominalized form of the verb. Consider first the transitive forms: (536)a. gives the finite transitive sentence, b. its unmarked nominalization.

(536) **Transitive nominalization**

- a. *Yidika ngê u nee dê tpaa*  
 Yidika ERG 3Poss canoe 3simmPastPI overturn.TV  
 ‘Yidika overturned his canoe’
- b. *nee tpiyé dono*  
 canoe overturning.TV bad  
 ‘Overturning a canoe is bad (don’t do it)’
- c. *Yidika u nee tpiyé dono*  
 Yidika his canoe overturning.TV bad  
 ‘Yidika’s over-turning of the canoe is bad (Yidika did it, not someone else using Yidika’s canoe)’ (does not mean ‘overturning Yidika’s canoe is bad’)

When the finite clause in example (536)a. is nominalized, it is the O argument that is the unmarked surviving argument as in b. The ergative argument can however be got in by using a possessive structure, as in c. In that case the possessor *must* be understood as the agent, not as a semantic possessor.

In contrast, with the intransitive verb counterpart, the S argument is the unmarked surviving argument, and a possessor can only be interpreted as a semantic possessor (the owner), not as the agent of the action. In example (537), a. gives the finite intransitive sentence, and b. its unmarked nominalization, while c. shows



that an additional possessive NP only has an ‘ownership’ (not an agentive) reading (d. shows the finite counterpart):

(537) **Intransitive nominalization**

- a. *nee dê tpââli*  
canoe 3simmPastPI overturn.IV  
‘The canoe overturned’
- b. *nee tpâli tpâli dono*  
canoe overturning.IV bad  
‘The overturning of a canoe is bad (whenever it happens)’
- c. *Yidika u nee tpâli tpâli dono*  
Yidika his canoe overturning.IV bad  
‘The turning over of Yidika’s canoe is bad’
- d. *Yidika u nee dê tpââli*  
Yidika his canoe 3simmPastPI overturn.IV  
‘Yidika’s canoe turned over (not necessarily with him on board)’

**8.7.1.2 Pronominal arguments of nominalizations**

As we saw, these nominalizations or gerunds can be pronominally possessed, and in that case a variant of the normal pattern usually applies, since the possessive pronoun has the same interpretation as a non-possessive lexical noun. Thus, in examples (538)a. and b, below, intransitive verbs (with S arguments) have the possessor interpreted as S, while transitive verbs, as in c. and d., have the pronominal possessor interpreted as in O function:

- (538) a. *dpî paa lîmîlîmî*  
2DualPoss walking quick  
‘Your2 walking is fast’
- b. *maa lîmîlîmî*  
*N+paa*  
2sPoss+walking quick  
‘Your1 walking is fast’
- c. *dpî vye dono*  
2Dual hitting bad  
‘The hitting of you2 is bad’ (not ‘You two doing the hitting is bad’)
- d. *nmyee dono*  
*N+vye*  
2sPoss+hitting bad  
‘The hitting of you1 is bad’

Thus so far we have the following patterns:

- Lexical arguments that would be Absolutive arguments in finite constructions – whether in S or O role – surface as unmarked NPs associated with nominalized verbs
- Lexical arguments that would be Ergative ones in a finite clause can surface optionally as lexical possessors of transitive gerunds
- Pronominal arguments that would be in Absolutive case in the finite counterpart construction surface directly as possessive pronouns before the gerund (this is Koptjevskaja-Tamm’s 2013 ‘Ergative-Possessive’ type of action nominal, except that participants in A function do not appear).

The Yéli Dnye patterns are exceptional, judging from the WALs samples: most languages with ergative case-marking avoid the interpretative problems by not having gerunds at all, or by retaining the full marking of finite sentences (comparing WALs Chapter 98, Comrie 2013; and Chapter 62, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2013; see also Comrie & Thompson 1985).

### 8.7.1.3 Exceptional intransitive verbs

These patterns are, however, somewhat complicated by the fact that a finite sentence with an incorporated object seems to be able to carry that incorporated object with it in the nominalized form. The evidence for this comes from exceptional (morphologically) intransitive verbs like *tpapê* ‘chew betel’ which allow incorporated pseudo-objects:

- (539) a. *mbwo tpapê dono*  
           native-betel chewing bad  
           ‘Chewing native betel is bad’
- b. *u/yi mbwo tpapê dono*  
           3s/3PlPoss native.betel chewing bad  
           ‘His/their chewing native betel is bad’ (not ‘Chewing his/their betel is bad’)
- c. *mwo tpapê dono* (= *nyi mbwo tpapê*  
           *N+mbwo* in Western dialect)  
           2sPoss+native-betel chewing bad  
           ‘Your1 chewing native betel is bad’
- d. *Yidika u mbwo kuwo dono*  
           Yidika 3sPoss native-betel chewing.TV bad  
           ‘Yidika’s chewing of native betel is bad’ (not ‘The chewing of Yidika’s betelnut is bad’)

In these cases, despite the intransitive verb root, the pattern of interpretation is like that with transitives: the unmarked NP is interpreted as in O-like function, and the possessive cannot be interpreted as a possessor (example (539)b. cannot mean ‘Chewing his/their betel nut is bad’), but must be interpreted as an A-like argument, even though in the corresponding finite clause it would be an absolutive subject of an exceptional intransitive verb. Notice that in d. the pattern of interpretation is identical when the counterpart transitive root *kuwo* is used instead of intransitive *tpapê*.

There is another exceptional class of intransitive verbs which incorporate a PP rather than an NP – for example the verb *vyuwo* ‘to look for’ subcategorizes for a PP with postposition *ka* (just like English ‘look for him’), and the whole PP can be optionally incorporated. In this case, when the verb is nominalized its arguments are interpreted just like a normal intransitive verb’s arguments:

- (540) a. *kêndap ka vyuwo dpodo ntî*  
 shellmoney DAT looking.for work big  
 ‘Looking for *kêndap* shellmoney is hard work’
- b. *Cosmis u kêndap ka vyuwo John Lêmonkê*  
 Cosmis 3sPOSS shell.money DAT looking John Lêmonkê  
*u dpodo*  
 3sPoss work  
 ‘It is John’s work to look for *kêndap* (shell money) for Cosmis’  
 (not ‘Cosmis’ looking for shell money is (really) John Lêmonkê’s work’)

Here, as example (540)b. makes clear, the possessor of the NP in the PP (Cosmis) has the normal possession reading.

These facts are interesting because they show that it is the syntactic behaviour of verbs, not the morphology of their arguments, that governs this particular aspect of syntactic ergativity, namely the interpretation of arguments of nominalizations. Thus in the case of the morphological intransitives which behave syntactically like transitives, incorporating an O-like NP, the nominalizations behave just like regular transitive verbs. On the other hand, morphologically intransitive verbs that incorporate their PPs are still both morphologically and syntactically intransitive, so their nominalizations behave like regular intransitives. However, we will see immediately below that not all aspects of syntactic ergativity are so indifferent to morphological ergativity.

### 8.7.1.4 The control of the arguments of gerunds in complex constructions

There is not much evidence in the language of complex control patterns (i.e. patterns of obligatory coreferential interpretation across clauses). One exception is the causative construction, the only valence-increasing operation in the language. This involves a causative verb which (obligatorily) incorporates a gerund, which is a nominalized clause. The causative verb *kwolo* ('make, cause', with continuous form *kîgha*) normally takes an intransitive gerund (e.g. 'work') to make a transitive verb, e.g. 'make someone work' (lit. 'make someone (he) be working'). This of course is an absolutive control pattern (O-NP of 'make/cause' is coindexed with the S-NP of 'working'). In the normal case the intransitive gerund is an Agentive or Unergative intransitive, so the interpretation is 'X causes Y to do something', as illustrated below:

- (541) *Yidika ngê tp:ee dê a dpodo kîgha*  
 Yidika ERG boy dual-N 3sIMMCI.CLS work causing  
*dê*  
 MFS.3dO.PROX.TV  
 'Yidika was making the two boys work'  
 lit. 'Yidika was making the two boys<sub>i</sub>, (they<sub>i</sub>) working'

Now, exceptionally, *kwolo* may take transitive gerunds like *châpwo* 'cutting something'. In this case, however, the construal is different – it does not mean 'make someone cut something', it means rather 'to make something be cut into pieces'. That is to say, it is construed as 'He made it<sub>i</sub> (O-NP) cutting of it<sub>i</sub> (O-NP)', again an absolutive pattern of interpretation. This is entirely consistent with the general construal rules for gerunds – they retain the absolutive NP, whether in S- or O-function. This pattern is illustrated below in example (542)a.:

- (542) a. *pi ngê k:aa neepî ngê dê châpwo kwolo*  
 person ERG taro knife INST 3IMMPI cut.TV cause  
 'Someone cut the taro into pieces with a knife'  
 lit. 'Someone made the taro<sub>i</sub> cutting (it<sub>i</sub>) with a knife'
- b. *dmââdî ngê kpele dê y:e kpîdî pee dê*  
 girl ERG grasshopper two INST cloth piece 3IMMPI  
*chópu kwolo*  
 tear.IV cause  
 'The girl cut the cloth into pieces with scissors ('grasshoppers')'  
 lit. 'The girl made the cloth<sub>i</sub> (it<sub>i</sub>) tearing with scissors'

The b. sentence above shows a sentence closely parallel to a., but with an intransitive gerund from an unaccusative/patientive (or Undergoer subject) verb that means ‘be tearing (of things)’. The interpretation contrasts with that in the a. sentence, where the causee is the agent of the intransitive gerund, because the ‘be tearing’ verb is Patientive or Unaccusative, and presumes an inanimate subject. Nevertheless both sentences share the same control pattern: the control or coindexing runs from the matrix Absolutive NP to Absolutive NP of the gerund.

Summing up the patterns of interpretation for these causative structures, they show a resolutely absolutive pattern of control, even in the exceptional cases: an absolutive NP (O-NP of the causative verb) controls an S-NP, or exceptionally an O-NP, of the gerund. I should note that, although the gerund is not strictly a clause but merely a nominalization, this is the nearest we seem to come in Yêlî Dnye to an absolutive cross-clausal ‘pivot’-like pattern of interpretation (as described by Dixon 1994 as definitive of syntactic ergativity: see Chapter 9 below).

### 8.7.2 Other nominalization structures

The resultative construction was described in §7.9.1, as involving a transitive punctual root (proximal tense) which carries with it the O-argument of the corresponding transitive sentence, now in subject role. Normally it is interpreted as a full clause. But it can also be directly used as a nominalization without further derivation. Note that resultatives take dual/plural agreement markers just like NPs, suggesting that they are underlyingly nominalizations in all cases. When used as nominals, such resultative NPs can then play a further role in the NP slots in other sentences. They can thus occur e.g. as the subject of attributive adjective clauses:

- (543) a. *Tili u d:ââ pwaa ngmê dono*  
 Tili 3sPOSS pot break.TV RES bad  
 (or: *Tili u d:ââ dono pwaa ngmê*)  
 ‘The breaking of Tilly’s pots is bad’  
 (using RESULTATIVE construction)
- b. *te ndiya yé ngmê dono, ngmênê d:ââ k:oo kée*  
 fish on.fire put RES bad but pot inside put.in  
*ngmê mb:aamb:aa*  
 RES good  
 ‘It’s bad to put fish on a fire, they are better in a pot’  
 (lit. fish-being put on a fire bad, but being-put.in inside a pot good)

Or they can be adverbialized by a postposed adverbializer *ngê*, and then occur with positionals to describe a state:

- (544) a. *ke'ne kwe'ne kalê ngmê ngê ka tóó*  
 door openIV Causative RES ADV CERT3sPRSCI sit  
 'The door stays open (habitually)'  
 (repeated from example (318)f.)
- b. *d:ââ yi dê yi kêêlî kaa*  
 pot tree Dual 3PLPOSS between put.standing  
*ngmê ngê a kwo*  
 RES ADV 3PRSCI standing  
 'The pot is standing put (jammed) between two trees'
- c. *yi w:uu kuu tapil mbêmê kaa ngmê ngê*  
 tree seed dishful table on.top put.standing RES ADV  
*a kwo*  
 3PRSCI standing  
 'A dishful of nuts has been put standing on the table'

In this construction the NP acting as the (Absolutive) argument of the Resultative is simultaneously acting as subject of the positional verb (as shown by the collocational constraints between the NP and verbs, e.g. doors 'sit', pots 'stand').

- (545) a. *pyââ ngê leede yi p:uu dê kââ*  
 woman ERG ladder tree against 3IMM make.stand  
 'A woman put the ladder against the tree'
- b. *leede yi p:uu kaa ngmê ngê*  
 ladder tree against make.standFOL RES ADV  
*a kwo (\*t:a)*  
 3PRSCI standing (\*hanging)  
 'The ladder is standing having been made to stand against the tree'  
 (note *ngê* is obligatory here after *ngmê*)
- c. *kwo al:ii 'nuw:o ngmê ngê d:ii*  
 3sQUOTE here take/bring Resultative ADV NEG2sCI  
*tóó*  
 sitting/being(s/d)  
 'She said: You are not really (from here), having been brought here (by marriage)'

## 8.8 Other biclausal constructions

There are many conjunctive expressions which serve to construct biclausal dependencies. The following examples illustrate the use of *k:om(o) tpile*, ‘although, even though’, *mu kópu* ‘because’, *anté* ‘when’, *p:ee* ‘instead of’ (with negative):

- (546) a. *k:om tpile*      *\_nyi*      *ye*      *daa kwo,*      *ngmênê*  
 EVEN.THOUGH 2s+desire 3plDAT NEG standing, but  
*dpî lili*  
 2sIMP go.IMP  
 ‘Even though they don’t want you, you should go’
- b. *n:aa*      *lêpî,*      *mu kópu*      *t:ââ*      *wa a*  
 1sIMMFUT.C going BECAUSE flood UNCERT.3IMMFUT  
*ghîî*  
 come.down  
 ‘I’m going because a flood might come down’
- c. *Yidika dê*      *nod:e,*      *mu kópu dîy:o*      *Mbilipe*  
 Yidika 3IMMP become.angry FOR.THAT.REASON Mbilipe  
*dê lê*  
 3IMMP go  
 ‘Mbilipe went off because Yidika was angry (today)’
- d. *nkéli anté*      *wa*      *kee,*      *Alotau n:aa*  
 boat WHEN UNCERT.3ImmFUT ascend Alotau 1sImmFUTC  
*lêpî*  
 going  
 ‘When a boat comes, I’ll go to Alotau’
- e. *Ghêlî daa pwene,*      *u*      *kee*      *yoo u ngwo m:uu*  
 YET NEG died.REM 3POSS grandchild PL in.turn saw  
*too*  
 MFSpIO  
 ‘Before he died (lit. He hadn’t yet died) he saw his grandchildren’
- f. *p:ee*      *dêdê*      *dpodo,*      *Ghaalyu mbii*  
 INSTEAD.OF NEG3NrPSTC working, Ghaalyu sickness  
 ‘Instead of working Ghaalyu was sick’

These conjunctive expressions come before the predicate, although nominals may precede them as in example (546)d. These constructions do not seem to show any special control characteristics or cross-clausal dependencies.