CONJUNCTION IN KORAFE by Cynthia Farr, 1981.

Language names: Korafe-Mokorua

Language Family: Binandere

Location: Cape Nelson, Tufi District, Oro Province

A Portion of [The analysis is this article has been superceded by the following article:

Explanation in English and Korafe, Cynthia J.M. Farr, Ivan Lowe, Carl R. Whitehead,
Presented at a symposium in 1982 by Ivan Lowe

<u>   *GR Elliott*   </u>   <u>7/4/83</u>
           editor   date

CONJUNCTION IN KORAFE
(Papua New Guinea)

Cynthia Farr

1981

134 pp.

Conjunction in Korafe

Cynthia J.M. Farr
December 1, 1981

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (continued)

0. Introduction

Halliday and Hasan (1976:227) define conjunction as "a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before." Basically then, in order to have conjunction, there must be two conjuncts or propositions in some relationship to each other: either in an equality relationship or in an inequality relationship. Two words of Greek derivation are used widely to define these two relationships: parataxis (arranged next to) and hypotaxis (arranged under). In English, paratactic structures are often termed coordinate, and hypotactic structures subordinate. But for the purposes of this paper, I will follow Reesink's example (1978) and use parataxis and hypotaxis respectively to refer to the equality and inequality relationships in order to reserve the term coordination for a sub-type of both.

Grimes (1975:207ff) distinguishes between paratactic and hypotactic predicates as categories of rhetorical predicates, "propositions whose arguments are not related to their predicates via semantic roles." Paratactic predicates "dominate all their predicates in coordinate fashion" and are manifested by the semantic concepts of alternation and response. Hypotactic predicates "have

as one of their arguments the center, a term with
respect to which the proposition as a whole is subor-
dinated to some other proposition by being added to it
as an extra argument." These include the semantic
notions of supplementary or supporting predicates,
equivalent - specific predicates, explanation, evidence,
analogy and manner. He posits a third category, neutral,
which he says covers the semantic concepts: collection,
covariance, and adversative. In some contexts, the
neutral predicates manifest a paratactic relationship,
and in others a hypotactic one.

The problem giving rise to the need for this
neutral category can best be explained by reference to
anderson's matrix discussion of syntactic main and
subordinate and semantic main and subordinate clauses
as cited by Reesink from Kroll.

Table 1:   Anderson's Clause Matrix

	syntactic main	syntactic subordinate
semantic main	a	b
semantic subordinate	c	d

Anderson's examples for these relationships are:

(a.) <u>Ingemar is skiing</u>.

(b.) It is true <u>that he is very learned</u>.

(c.) <u>Robin doesn't study linguistics</u>, because he

has always been interested in language (but

because he wants to impress his girlfriend).

(d.) The tourist went to the place <u>where Jesus is</u>

<u>supposed to have been born</u>.

Where both clauses are syntactically main and semantically
main, there is true parataxis. Where one clause is both
syntactic and semantic subordinate and the other clause is
syntactic and semantic main, hypotaxis is clearly the
relationship between the conjuncts. However, where one
clause in a conjunction is syntactic subordinate and
semantic main or semantic subordinate and syntactic main,
the type of relationship is not clear, and one is tempted
to discuss the relationship as being on a continuum between
parataxis and hypotaxis.

For the purposes of this paper, I will use syntactic
criteria only to distinguish between parataxis and hypotaxis.
Thus, conjunction of two syntactic main clauses is paratactic,
and conjunction involving a syntactic subordinate clause is
hypotactic.

In addition to the parataxis/hypotaxis distinction,
there are two other parameters which need to be discussed
for a clear delineation of Korafe conjunction: internal/

external conjunction and presupposition/assertion.

The external/internal distinction presented in Halliday and Hasan (1976:321) is as follows: external conjunctions "are located in the phenomena that constitute the content of what is being said," and internal conjunctions are found "in the interaction itself, the social process that constitutes the speech event." As I apply the distinction to Korafe, external conjunction is a relationship between the units of the text, whether between arguments of a proposition or between propositions (clauses) or between combinations of propositions (sentences). Internal conjunction is the relationship in the mind of the speaker (hence 'internal') between the actual speech acts. This distinction is illustrated in examples (1) and (2).

    External:

    (1.) Mike Schmidt hit the ball <u>and</u> ran the bases
          for a home run.

    Internal:

    (2.) Tommy plays the piano <u>and</u> does a good job.

Halliday and Hasan's example 5.17a (245) illustrates both

within a single stretch of speech.

(

(3) I was very nearly opening the window, and
      putting you out into snow. And you'd have
      deserved it.

The internal/external distinction has proven most
helpful in analyzing Korafe[1] conjunctions, so I will
be discussing it as it pertains to the various sections
of the paper.

The final parameter to be discussed is that of
presupposition and assertion. I shall be using
presupposition in a pragmatic rather than logical sense
throughout this paper. Kempson (1975) points out that
linguists use presupposition in two senses which I shall
call the textual sense and the world knowledge one. The
textual presupposition is context specific. Any proposition
in the text may become a presupposition for what follows,
regardless of its truth value (whether the speaker believes
it or not). The world knowledge sense specifies, in
Kempson's (1975:190) terminology, that "the speaker believes
the hearer knows (and the speaker knows) a certain body of
propositions (i.e. a Pragmatic Universe of Discourse)" to
which the speaker can freely refer, because he believes the

hearer shares this set of presuppositions about the real
world which he has. An assertion is any set of conditions
that falls outside this set of shared presuppositions about
the real world, at that point in the discourse. Either the
speaker beldeves that the hearer does not share these
presuppositions, or else the speaker is querying something
outside of his set of real world presuppositions. However,
once an assertion is stated, it may become a presupposition
for the next assertion in the text, in accordance with the
textual sense of presupposition. Stalnaker (1972) further
distinguishes between semantic presupposition and pragmatic
presupposition. Thus, both conjuncts in a paratactic
conjunction are assertions, but become presuppositions for
all subsequent propositions, whereas all subordinated
propositions in a hypotactic conjunction are necessarily
presuppositions for the syntactic main conjunct. Kempson
(1975:101) points out the difference between the definitions
tendered by Strawson and Russell. Russell stated that
"assertion is a (very special kind of) commitment to the
truth of a proposition." Kempson maintains that Strawson's
definition of assertion is "to give information of some kind
to an audience." This distinction needs to be maintained for
Korafe, for, as will be shown, Korafe finite verbs differ
in this regard as to the type of assertion being made.

1.0 Korafe Conjunction

Korafe handles conjunction in two different ways:
through verbal juxtaposition and through connective words
or phrases (which I will term conjunctions), which consist
of demonstratives alone, stripped down medial verb forms,
and combinations of the same with clitics and nominals.

1.1 Conjunction through Verbal Juxtaposition:

Conjunction is manifested in the Korafe verbal system
through the following types of verbal juxtaposition:

(a.) juxtaposition of clauses in a string in which
every predicate except the ultimate one is a medial verb[2],
and the final predicate is manifested by a semi-final or
final form of the verb. The resultant construction can
be termed a clause cluster.

(b.) juxtaposition of the clause clusters mentioned
under (a.) with each other where the final clause cluster
must terminate with a final form of the verb and the other
clause clusters may terminate with either semi-final or
final verb forms. Both semi-final and final verbs are
finite ones.

Syntactically, these clause clusters appear to be
examples of parataxis or coordination of the type which
Grimes (1975:219) terms collection. Semantically,
juxtaposed constructions of the types (a.) and (b.)

often encode equivalence, an adversative relationship, or
a cause-effect relationship as well as the temporal succession
or overlap relationships. Even though semantically, the
relationship between two such conjuncts may be hypotactic,
I am considering these conjuncts as having a paratactic
relationship, based on structural criteria.

Each clause terminating in a medial verb can be
considered an assertion, which becomes a presupposition for
the succeeding clause. But the clausescluster together
to form one event chain with a composite sentential asser-
tion. Event chains may be subdivided to allow for different
topics by (i.) the addition of the verb 'finish' where
different referents are topicalized, or (ii.) the usage
of the contrastive focus markers _avo_ and _avori_, which
are often used when the same referent is sentence subject,
but a different topic is in focus in one section of the
sentence.

(4) ..._siono_   _eni_ _ir-ari_,   _siono_

shuttle   one remain-seq.ir.3s.DR[3] shuttle

eni _gemb-eoro_,   _dadab-eari_

one weave.SP-seq.proc.1p.DR finish-seq.proc.3s.DR

g-ido   _eni_ _amo_   _gemb-uraera_.

see.SP-seq.SR one that.t. weave.SP-proc.1p.ind

'...one shuttle remains (aside), and we
weave (using) another shuttle until it is
finished, and then we weave that (first)
one.'

(5) ...nu   tumba   ghae   f-ua   nati
    he   night   with   come.LP-seq.ir.SR   house

atu-da   ghuf-use,   avo-ri,   nunda
rear-at   fly.LP-sim.SR   that.ct.-e.   his

beka   mo   "Jufi,   jufi,"   s-eraira.
mouth   t.   jufi   jufi   say-proc.3s.ind

'...he (the small fruit bat) comes at night,
and while he is flying around at the back of
the house, all right, he says, "Jufi, jufi,"
as his bird call.'

(6) Aimi   sav-era
     that.con.t.   went.out-seq.dur.p.3p.SR

buv-u   g-ido   kavenu
approach.SP-seq.IA   see.SP-seq.SR   comfort

s-edo   avo   jingabu   amo   voto
say-seq.SR   that.ct.   snake   that.t.   net

ghae   b-u   vit-ido   founa
with   get.SP-seq.IA   ascend.SP-seq.SR   reef

<u>da</u> <u>fug</u>-<u>etero</u>   <u>fas</u>-<u>etiri</u>

on   throw.SP-seq.r.3p.DR   lay.down-seq.r.3s.DR

<u>d</u>-<u>edo</u>   <u>kaiya</u>-<u>i</u>   ifu <u>da</u> <u>gaf</u>-<u>useri</u>.

hit.SP-seq.SR knife-con. body on cut-DP.3p.ind.

'They went out to him, saw (the snake), and

expressed their sympathy, and then that snake

they grabbed along with the net and pulled him

up on to the reef where they threw him down,

beat him and cut him with a knife.'

Just as the sentence is unfinished at the termination
of a medial verb clause, so clause clusters that terminate with
a semi-final verb may not terminate a sentence. By their
very nature, these two sets of forms have a textual
presuppositional value within the sentence. The affixation
on a medial verb presupposes to some extent the subject-topic
of the next predication as well as the temporal relationship
of the two conjuncts to each other. Most medial verb forms
terminate in ‑o, which seems to have the semantic component
of given, or presupposed in relationship to something else
which follows.

All semi-final[4] verbal forms, some medial same referent
forms, and the future, present, and procedural (gnomic)

indicative forms together with the third person singular
forms of all of the indicative conjugations, except the
indefinite past, terminate with the morpheme -a. The
semi-final verb forms are used to delimit an assertion that
has a dependency status in the sentence, or else to
interrupt the flow of the discourse to impart some
background information. Thus, they are used to terminate
relative clauses, embedded in another clause. They break
off the temporal or logical flow of the text to indicate
collateral information like an explanation, a question,
or a flashback. They occur before most demonstrative
pronouns in mid-sentence position, especially when the
pause in intonation follows the demonstrative. The -a
occurs with same referent medial verbs that manifest a
durative aspect: the time span of the verb continues up
until the next action occurs, and it cannot be defined
(or terminated) without the subsequent predication.

    (7)   Nu   r-av-ara   sifo

         he   dur-sleep-seq.np.3s.SR day

         at-etiri   er-etira.

         dawn.SP-seq.r.3s.DR arise.SP-tp.3s.ind.

         'He slept until day dawned, and then he arose.'

Final verb forms terminate either in _ea_ (as described
above) or with _-i_ in almost all verbs that terminate content
questions or with the past indicative forms of the verb.
The final indicative verb forms may occur sentence medially
just like the semi-final forms do, but the intonational
break usually is evidenced between the final verb form and
the subsequent demonstrative. These indicative verb forms,
terminating in _-a_ or _-i_, also predicate statements and
factual yes-no questions in sentence final position. Ivan
Lowe (personal communication) states that an assertion is
something that the speaker tells the addressee (information)
and/or something that the addressee may check for its
true-false value. Our language teacher, Warrington Isari,
believes that the _-i_ assertion is definitely true and a
bit stronger and more definite than the _-a_ assertion. I
believe that "the morpheme _-i_ indicates that the truth value
of the underlying cognitive proposition is well-defined and
is true for all except the contrafactual construction, in
which case it is false."[5] The morpheme _-a_ suggests that
"the truth value of the underlying cognitive construction is
not well-defined (left open) and can be either true or
false."[5] It is used under these conditions irrespective
of whether the verb is positioned medially or finally in
the sentence. So, for the following sentence:

(8) <u>Nu</u> <u>rejo</u> <u>eti</u>?

   he   what   do.tp.3s.q.

   'What did he do?'

the speaker is asserting that 'he did do something', and
that the truth value of that assertion is true. Whereas,
in:

(9) <u>Avose</u>,   <u>nu</u> <u>y-arira</u>.

   perhaps   he   go.LP-f.3s.ind.

   'Perhaps he will go.'

the speaker is merely giving more information, information
for which no truth value can be assigned.

   There is a further distinction that can be drawn
between the <u>-a</u> verbal forms and the <u>-i</u> verbal forms. The
<u>-a</u> verbal forms are used to manifest actions that are in
some sense incomplete. In the case of the future tense,
it is not started. This imperfective quality explains why
the semi-final verbs all manifest the <u>-a</u> suffix: they
indicate that there is something unfinished about the
sentence they occur in. The <u>-i</u> verbal forms often mark
predications, whose actions are completed or established.

(10) <u>Nanda</u> <u>saramana</u> <u>anakora</u> <u>eteni</u>.

    my   work   already   do.tp.1s.ind.

    'I already did my work.'

1.2 Conjunctions

In Korafe, conjunctions are either demonstratives[6],
medial sequential same referent verbs without personal or
temporal desinences, or a combination of the two, sometimes
with additional nominals and/or clitics. The nominals used
are: <u>gáti</u> 'front, forward projection', <u>ambo</u> 'back, tail',
<u>kotu</u> 'footprint', <u>tuka</u> 'point', <u>susu</u> 'source', and <u>beka</u>
'truth'. The following relationals and clitics also are
used in combinations to form conjunctions: <u>ta</u> 'frustrative
marker', <u>da</u> 'locative', <u>dae</u> 'purpose', and '<u>go</u>''comparison'.
In the following list, the type of conjunction formation is
indicated by numerical subscripts: a_1 to demonstratives,
a_2 to medial verbs, a_3 to combinations of demonstratives
and medial verbs, a_4 to combinations of demonstratives and
clitics, and a_5 to nominal conjunctions or combinations of
nominal conjunctions with relationals.

Paratactic conjunctions:

    <u>gitida/giti</u>$_5$ 'before/first'

    <u>ainda gitida</u>$_5$ 'before that'

    <u>amboda</u>$_5$ 'afterwards'

    <u>ainda amboda</u>$_5$ 'after that'

a_1	'and' (external AND, speaker assumes that addressee can make his own logical connection between the two conjuncts.)
ata_4	'and frustratingly enough'
edo_2	'and' (internal AND, speaker is spelling out to addressee that the conjoined elements do have a connection for him, also means AND THEN.)
$kotu/kotugo_5$	'in addition to, besides, furthermore, likewise, moreover, nevertheless' (internal AND)
o	'or' (indicate external disjunction of both the inclusive and exclusive types, also used to indicate 'on the other hand'. This morpheme actually is a loan word from English, 'or'.)
ai_1	'or' (biased disjunctive of both the inclusive and exclusive types. It is used as a tag on yes-no questions to indicate 'yes'.)
$gido_2$	'seeing'

Hypotactic conjunctions

ghae	'and/with' (dual comitative relator)
de	'and/with' (plural comitative relator)

amo₁	'when, if, since, regarding that' (topic and implicational marker. See Farr, Lowe, and Whitehead 1981 manuscript for further discussion of its use as a topic.)
amota₄	'if that is frustratingly the case...'
ava₁	'but/leaving that proposition and heading another direction' (See Farr, Lowe, and Whitehead 1981 manuscript for further discussion of it as a contrastive topic marker.)
avata₄	'but, yet, however, nevertheless, despite that'
avose₃	'perhaps/saying that, but I don't know for sure...'
a gido₃	'therefore, so, then, hence (literally means 'seeing that')
avo gido₃	'therefore, so' (literally means 'seeing that significantly contrastive event')
ava sedo₃	'therefore, consequently, because of that' (It may occur in sentence tail position. It literally means 'saying that'.)

<u>aindae</u>$_4$ <u>sedo</u>$_3$	'therefore, because of that controlling factor' (It may occur in sentence tail position. It literally means 'speaking on account of that'. The <u>sedo</u> component makes it an internal conjunction.)
<u>aindae</u>$_4$	'therefore, because of that controlling factor' (It may occur in sentence tail position. It is an external conjunction literally meaning 'on account of that'.)
<u>ai</u> <u>resira</u> <u>(amo)</u>	'that says that' (This conjunction is used to express internal reason. Actually this construction begins and ends with a demonstrative and has a fully inflected final verb form 'it says' in present tense between the two.)
<u>ainda</u> <u>tuka</u> <u>(mo)</u>$_5$	'the point of that (is)'
<u>ainda</u> <u>susu</u> <u>(mo)</u>$_5$	'the source of that (is)'
<u>ainda</u> <u>beka</u> <u>(mo)</u>$_5$	'the reality of that (is)'
<u>dae</u> (<u>aindae</u>)	'in order to, for the purpose of'
<u>dae</u> <u>sedo</u>$_2$(<u>aindae</u>)	$\frac{1}{2}$speaking in order to, speaking for the purpose of'

aminga~~4~~/amingo~~4~~   'like that'

avavaga~~4~~/avaga~~4~~/

avavago~~4~~/avago~~4~~   'like that'

kau daba ava~~5~~   'just like that'

kau daba aminga ava~~5~~   'exactly like that'

1.3   Criteria for delimiting paratactic and hypotactic

      structures language specifically for Korafe

      I have already pointed out, following the presenta-

tion of Anderson's main/subordinate clause classification

that there is a continuum between paratactic conjunction

and hypotactic conjunction, when one conjunct is syntac-

tically main, yet semantically subordinate or vice versa.

Therefore, as Halliday and Hasan (1976:238) say, "There

is no single, uniquely correct inventory of the types of

conjunction relation; different classifications are

possible, each of which would highlight different aspects

of the facts."

      According to the classification I am presenting

here, verbal juxtaposition (1.1) strategies exemplify

parataxis, and most conjunctions (1.2) hypotaxis. However,

there are a few conjunctions which demonstrate a paratactic

relationship. These are the demonstratives without topi-

calizing clitics a 'that' meaning 'and', and ai 'that with

control' meaning 'or', the verbal form edo 'doing' (AND

THEN), ata 'and (with a frustrative element)', kotugo/

kotu 'and moreover', and o 'or (an English loan word)'.
Regarding hypotaxis, Reesink (1978 ms:24) states for
Usan: "Following Anderson's criterion, this means that
one of the conjuncts involves an embedded sentence," and
this applies to Korafe also. In Korafe, embedding is
accomplished by the use of a semi-final or final verb
form terminating a clause or clause cluster that is
embedded in the sentence by a demonstrative. This embedded
or restrictive relative clause may replace the head noun
and be possessed, as in the following example.

> (10)   ...nunda   aki.mane   vos-edo
>   her   older.sisters   descend.SP-seq.SR
>
>   nenda   edo   gh-etera
>   their   do.seq.SR   do.successively-tp.3p.SF
>
>   ava   etero...
>   that.ct.   do.seq.r.3p.DR
>   'her older sisters came down and did what
>   they always did...'

The following example illustrates the use of the relative
clause in a marked topicalization situation similar to the
English cleft sentence.

(11)   Mandi   sife   f-umutara   amo,

       boy   yesterday   come.LP-yp.3s.SF   that.t.

       nu-mo-ri.

       he-t.-e.

       'The boy that came yesterday, it is he.'

The next example illustrates the use of the relative clause
in a marked topicalization situation similar to the English
pseudo-cleft sentence.

(12)   Na   reju-á   ingari   uju   erena

       I   what.spec.-that to.bake want   do.pr.1s.ind.

       amo,   farava-ri.

       that.t.   bread-e.

       'What I want to bake is bread.'

Examples (13) and (14) illustrate the contrast between
parataxis and hypotaxis respectively, differing only in the
presence of the embedding amo in (15).

       Paratactic adversative:

(13)   Sasingu   ava   usera,   jo

       children   that.ct.   do.dp.3p.SF   not

amb-ae-ri.

die.SP-not.do-e.

'The children did that, (but) they did not die.'

Hypotactic embedding:

(14) Sasingu   ava   usera   amo,

      children   that.ct. do.dp.3p.SF   that.t.

      jo   amb-ae-ri.

      not   die.SP-not.do-e.

      'The children who did that didn't die.'

Keeping these criteria in mind, I am discussing
paratactic onjunction first under the areas of temporal
(THEN) conjunction, coordination (AND), alternation (OR),
narrowing focus conjunction (AND-BUT), and the juxtaposition
of verbal forms that encodes the semantic ideas of
equivalence, adversative, and cause and effect. Hypotactic
conjunction in Korafe includes hypotactic coordination,
implication: condition and hypotactic equivalence (IF,
WHEN, SINCE), adversative-contraexpectation (BUT), cause-
reason (SO), purpose-prevention (IN ORDER (NOT) TO),
comparison and pretense. Within the hypotactic section
is a brief discussion of the hypotactic nature of
quotations and the use of sedo/sise, but the main discussion

of quotation and reported speech, including their placement

in the paratactic-hypotactic dichotomy, is at the conclusion

of the paper.

2.0   Paratactic Rhetorical Predicates

Conjunction operates at three levels in Korafe:

phrase level, inter-clausal or sentence level, and above

the sentence level. Halliday and Hasan (1976:222) discuss

the sentence level paratactic and hypotactic relationships

in reference to clause complexes, but they see the

relationships at this level as being basically structural

or logical, rather than conjunctive. They (1976:238)

narrow the scope of conjunctive relationships to

relationships that are involved in makingla text cohesive.

However, in Korafe, at least for coordination and

alternation, I prefer to discuss conjunction on all three

levels.

In section 1.0, I introduced the external-internal

distinction that Halliday and Hasan posit. The external

conjunctions appear to conjoin clauses that would be

assigned to the 'a-cell' of Anderson's (Table 1), where

both clauses are syntactic and semantic main clauses.

The internal use of the paratactic conjunctions occurs

with clauses that most probably would be listed under

the 'c-cell', because both clauses are still syntactically

main ones, but the second clause presupposes the first

clause, which appears to be semantically subordinate.

Therefore, the first clause belongs to the 'c-cell', and

the second clause belongs to the 'a-cell', in that it

is syntactic and semantic main.

In Korafe, unmarked conjunction is demonstrated

by juxtaposition of clauses, terminating either in

medial verbs (See (a.) in section 1.1) or in semi-final

or final verbs (See (b.) in section 1.1). If the

juxtaposition of clause clusters is of the latter

type, the conjunction is probably expressing an

equivalence, adversative, or cause-effect relationship

in addition to or instead of the logico-temporal   ·

relationship that normally is encoded in verbal

juxtaposition. However, which type of relationship

it is is not specified, and the addressee must decide

for himself whether it is an equivalence or an

adversative, etc. Where actual demonstrative or other

types of conjunctions are used, the nature of the

connective relationship is clearly defined. So, there

are three levels of paratactic conjunction: unmarked

verbal juxtaposition, conjuncts joined by external

conjunctions (so that either conjunct may occur in

initial position), and conjuncts joined by internal

conjunctions, where, at least in the speaker's mind, the
first conjunct must always precede the second conjunct
for the utterance to make good sense. The first level
is the least specific in terms of the type of conjunctive
relationship. The third is the most specific in terms
of the inter-relatedness of the two events, expressed by
the conjuncts, to each other.

2.1 Temporal (THEN) Relationships

Halliday and Hasan (1976:243,261ff) describe
THEN relationships as one of the four cohesive connectors.
Grimes (1975:214,221-2) describes temporal relationships
as being hypotactic when they encode temporal setting
within the discourse, where the collection in time
oriented by elements such as after, while, etc. For him,
paratactic temporal relationships are indicated by a
verbal string (collection of verbs) manifesting temporal
sequence and/or simultaneity.

Korafe normally manifests temporal sequence and
overlap-simultaneous relationships by stringing together
clauses that terminate in medial verbs which occur with
sequential or simultaneous-overlap desinences. The
medial verbs also have desinences to express repetition,
duration up until the subsequent event, actions which are

ᴠ

viewed as one integral event with the next action, and
actions which are punctiliar. If the subject-topic
of the subsequent clause differs from the one under con-
sideration, the medial verb is also marked with a subject-
topic desinence. Between clause clusters or sentences,
the unmarked relationship manifested by tail-head linkage
(beginning a sentence with a medial form of the verb that
concluded the preceding sentence) is temporal sequence.

(15) <u>Na</u> . <u>evetu</u> <u>fifit</u>-<u>useni</u>.   <u>Fit</u>-<u>ido</u>

      I   woman put.LP-dp.1s.ind. put.SP-seq.SR

      <u>ainda</u>   <u>amboda</u>,   <u>na</u> <u>dubo</u> <u>mema</u> <u>useni</u>.

      of.that afterwards I   neck pain do.dp.1s.ind.

      'I married a wife. After I married, I was

      troubled.'

(16) <u>Gemb</u>-<u>udo</u>   <u>gagh</u>-<u>arera</u>.   <u>Gagh</u>-<u>edo</u>

      weave,SP-seq.SR fold-f.1p.ind fold-seq.SR

      <u>diti</u> <u>gay</u>-<u>arera</u>.   <u>Ga</u>-<u>edo</u>...

      eyes spear.SP-f.1p.ind. spear.SP-seq.SR

      'Having sewn (the pandanus leaves together),

      they fold (the mats) in half. After folding,

      they sew a quilting stitch (near to the two

      side edges). After sewing...'

The chaining together of medial verb clauses is the
external (in the Halliday and Hasan sense) unmarked way
of encoding temporal succession and overlap. The medial
sequential forms of 'do': _edo_ and _etiri_, and the medial
simultaneous forms of 'do': _use_ and _iri_ are used to indicate
emphatic temporal succession and overlap (i.e. the speaker
is emphasizing his view of the temporal relationship in
using these forms). See section 2.2.for a more complete
discussion of _edo_ as the AND THEN conjunction.

I prefer to view these concatenations of medial
verbs as collections of verbs in a paratactic relationship.
But there is some justification syntactically as well as
semantically for claiming a hypotactic rhetorical predicate
for temporal settings in discourse. Temporal settings
are usually introduced as one clause in a string of clauses,
each of which terminates with a medial verb. However,
even though the subject of the temporal setting clause
differs from the subject of the preceding clause, the
preceding clause may and often does terminate with a
medial verb, marked with same referent, rather than
different referent, desinence. This same referent marking
indicates that the subject-topic of the preceding clause
has a scope that extends over the temporal setting clause.

(17) ...gagaraka   baj-i   tambuno

      girl.exc.   grow.up-seq.IA.SR moon

etoto   ava   dadab-etiri,   noi

two   that.ct. finish-seq.r.3s.DR her.mother

numamo   g-era...

her.father   see.SP-tpq3p.SF

'...that little girl continued to grow until
two months had elapsed, (then) her parents
examined (her)...'

Since temporal succession is the expected relationship
dominating medial verb strings, when the speaker draws
from his knowledge of real world events and refers
cataphorically to an event (mentioning it in an event
chain that refers to events which temporally preceded it),
he uses a complicated structure, involving the devices of
negation and simultaneous-overlap medial verb forms.

(18) Nu jo Jebo y-ae   ir-iri,
      he not Jebo go.LP-not.do remain-sim.r.3s.DR
      ne   f-usevu.
      you.2p come.LP-dp.2p.ind.
      'He still hadn't gone to Jebo when you came.'

Use of time words alone and in combination with demonstratives marked with the possessive clitic is the internal marked way of indicating temporal sequence. As mentioned before, Korafe speakers usually encode temporal succession between sentences by unmarked tail-head linkage. The usage of the temporal expressions: amboda 'afterwards' and ainda amboda 'after that' indicates marked temporal sequence. These two temporal expressions are conjunctions in the sense that they indicate a relationship between two conjuncts, but their basic function is to mark discourse clock time[7]. There may be some grounds for calling them hypotactic conjunctions as Grimes does, but I prefer to view them as paratactic conjunctions joining two clauses in an equality relationship. Syntactically, there seem to be several reasons for maintaining them as syntactic main clauses. The usual intonation break falls before ainda amboda, breaking it away from the clause it should be embedding. Ainda amboda often occurs sentence initial with a topicalizer mo following it, indicating that it is actually sentence theme, in accordance with Dik's (1978:19) usage of the word. If ainda amboda were truly an embedding conjunction expressing a hypotactic relationship, it would follow semi-final forms of the verb (which are often used as the

verb in embedded constructions) at least occasionally.
But, it predominantly follows medial forms or occurs
at sentence breaks as the initial element in the second
sentence (which automatically presupposes that it follows
the final verb that terminates the first sentence).
Therefore, I consider amboda and ainda amboda to be
paratactic conjunctions. Since temporal succession is
the usual temporal ordering in Korafe, temporal expressions
like giti 'first', gitida 'at first', and anakora 'already,
long ago' occur near the beginning of a discourse.
Cataphoric temporal reference (re-ordering two clauses
so that the time index in the first clause follows that
of the second clause) does occur infrequently in Korafe
discourses. It is manifested externally by verbal
juxtaposition of a negated overlap medial form with
another verbal form (as mentioned above). It is
sometimes manifested by the overlap verbal medial
form in a clause followed by the internal conjunction
ainda gitida 'before that' and a subsequent clause.

(19) Ne   isoro   tuturo   ari   dae
      they   war   start   to.do   in.order.to

      use   ainda   giti-da   mo   kau
      do.sim.SR   that.pos first-at   t.   like

nu ba<u>banungari</u>   <u>avavaga</u>   <u>use</u>

spec to.pray   that.ct.like do.sim.SR

<u>nombua.mane</u>   <u>da</u>   <u>javono</u>   <u>gat-edo</u>

their.ancestors   pos clan.name split-seq.SR

<u>s-edo</u>   <u>gh-useri</u>...

say-seq.SR   continue-dp.3p.ind.

'Before they would prepare for battle, while

they were acting like they were praying, they

would call on the ancestors, using their clan

names and say...'

Simultaneity and overlap is handled across clause and

sentence boundaries by the expression, <u>ainda jokada</u>

'within that'.

(20) ...<u>ne</u>   <u>ga-etero</u>   <u>airi</u>

they   spear.SP-seq.r.3p.DR   go.SP.seq.r.3s.DR

<u>ga-etero</u>   <u>oj-iri</u>

spear.SP-seq.r.3p.DR   come.SP-seq.r.3s.DR

<u>jor-e</u>   <u>fugari</u>   <u>g-iri</u>

break.off-seq.IA   to.throw.away   see.SP-seq.r.3s.DR

<u>ainda</u>   <u>joka-da</u>   <u>buv-eri</u>.

that.pos inside-of   arrive.SP-tp.3p.ind.

'They (the dancing group) were moving this

7   way and that and breaking off and joining up

           again, (and) inside of that (activity) (the

           boys) arrived.'

For a fuller discussion of time words in Korafe, see

Farr and Whitehead (1981 ms:7).

2.2   Coordination (AND)

Coordination is of two types: logical (putting

things together which belong together in the real world

of speaker and addressee) and temporal (described at

some length in section 2.1). Unmarked coordination

(or collection as Grimes calls it) in Korafe is logical

coordination, which is expressed by juxtaposition:

juxtaposition of noun phrases, adjectives (presumeably,

because none occur in texts), and medial verb clauses

(See section 2.1). Example (21) illustrates noun phrase

coordination or listing.

(21)   ...ne   embo   boka,   fuka,

       they   laplap loincloth pigs

guri,   okia   ava   b-u

traditional.jewelry pots   that.ct. get.SP-seq.IA

vos-edo.   mut-eoro...

descend.SP-seq.SR give.SP-seq.proc.3p.DR

'they would take down tapa cloth, pigs,
traditional shell jewelry, (and) pots
(and) give (them)...'

The external conjunction AND in Korafe is the same
as the medial demonstrative root <u>a</u> 'that'. Because the
conjuncts on either side of this conjunction can be freely
permuted, it is operating as a paratactic conjunction. It
coordinates noun phrases, adjectives, locative phrases,
medial verb clauses, and final verb clauses within the
boundaries of the sentence[8] and across sentence boundaries.

(22) ...<u>kiki</u>   <u>Korafe</u> <u>geka</u>   <u>a</u>   <u>English</u> <u>geka</u>
           stories   Korafe   talk   and   English   ttalk
      <u>aimi</u>   <u>teg-edo</u>...
      that.con.t.   read.SP-seq.SR

(23) <u>Nunda</u> <u>tamo</u> <u>ingago</u> <u>a</u>   <u>foyago-ri</u>.
      his   body   black   and   white-e.
      'Its body is black and white.'

(24) ...<u>ika</u>   <u>toka-da</u> <u>a</u>   <u>enda</u>   <u>toka-da</u>
           tree   hole-in   and   ground   hole-in

ir-ia-gh-eraira.

remain-dur.ir.-continue-proc.3s.ind.

'...it lives in holes in trees and holes in

the ground.'

The external conjunction a is used to conjoin Korafe
verbal constructions to break the normal temporal sequence
expectancy, neutralizing the temporal relationship between
the two conjuncts.

(25)   goroba   aimi   af-e   gagaᵈedo

       spear   that.con.t.   throw-seq.SR spear.SP-seq.SR

       a   ghamana   aimi   b-udo

       and rock   that.con.t.   get.SP-seq.SR

       i-e   bas-ari

       gash.SP-seq.SR   bore-seq.ir.3s.DR

       '(he) would spear (the man) by throwing

       spears, and he would take rocks, gash, (and)

       cut (him) up'

(26)   nene   s-e   gogogho   aoro

       they.con.   say-seq.IA   well   do.seq.ir.3p.DR

       ning-ase,   a   gengi   gavi

       hear.SP-h.2s. and limepot limestick

ijug-aoro   g-asel

show-seq.ir.3p.DR   see.SP-h.2s

'let them thoroughly explain (that) for you

to hear, and let them show you the ceremonial

limepot and limestick for you to see for yourself.'

In the verbal examples above, the verbal forms that are
coordinated are equal in syntax (medial verbs paired
together, etc.) and in status. I believe the Korafe a
coordinates elements of equal status, therefore the medial
verb must have equal status with the final verb, in contrast
to what McCarthy (1965) and Wurm (1977;171) posit. In
example (27), a medial different referent verb form
is coordinated with a final verb form.

(27) ...na K2.50 fit-eno   a

    I   K2.50 put.down.SP-seq.r.1s.DR   and

grass gaf-umuta.

grass cut-yp.3s.ind.

'I put down the two kina and 50 toea, and

he cut the grass.' (My part of the bargain

was to pay the money for petrol, his to cut

the grass.)

The conjunction atá 'and frustratingly enough' adds
the frustrative marker ta on to the a 'and' discussed
above. It illustrates an internal 'and', in that the
connective frustration is totally in the mind of the
speaker. In example (28), it seems to be functioning as
an interjection as well as a conjunction.

(28)   Etero   g-ido,   geraku
        do.seq.r.3p.DR see.SP-seq.SR frogs

        s-eteri,   "Atá!
        say-tp.3p.ind.   that.frus.

        Doy-ovo   namonde
        leave.off.SP-seq.ir.2p.DR   we.inc.

        ir-ise,   gegenembo taima-da
        remain-sim.SR men   bush-to

        y-aovo   g-ido   namane
        go.LP-seq.ir.2p.DR see.SP-seq.SR we.exc.

        eming-edo   gheaeteri."
        do.this.way-seq.SR   continue-subj.1p.ind.

        'Seeing that they (the men) had done (that -
        beaten them up), the frogs said, "Foiled
        again! If you would have left us remaining
        (in this way), if you men would have continued
        going off to the bush (and leaving your wives

behind for us to enjoy), we would have con-
tinued acting in this way."

(29) Roera   digari kau   eni   taf-useni.

      things many   kind another find.LP-dp.1s.ind.

      Atá   nu   genembo javo Harija,

      that.frus.   spec.   man   name Harija

      ava   noaro.mane isambu 15 a   nunda

      that.ct   his.wives   all   15 and   his

      sasingu   isambu 25,   nunda   fuka.mane

      children   all   25   his   pigs

      isambu   5,000   amingo-ri.

      all   5,000   like.that-e.

      'I found many things different (from my cultural
      world view). And one of them frustratingly enough
      was that there was a man named Harija who had
      15 wives in all, 25 children in all, and
      something like 5,000 pigs in all.'

The basic internal AND, which Halliday and Hasan
refer to as the additive AND THEN, is manifested by the
medial forms of 'do": edo, etiri, use, and iri. For the
purposes of this discussion, I will focus on the medial
sequential same referent form edo. It usually conjoins

propositions and maintains in most contexts the relationship
of temporal sequence between them.

(30)   Etiri,   dungut-useri.   Edo

        do.seq.r.3s.DR burn.LP-dp.1p.ind   and.then

        ghaf-useri.

        dig.LP-dp.1p.ind.

        'It did (dried the slashed vegetation), (and

        then) we burned it. And then, we dug up and

        prepared (the ground).'

Sometimes edo expresses a logical conjunctive relationship
between the two conjuncts.

(31)   ...evetu dae   rosemo

        woman   on.account.of   grieving.mother

        s-eraera.   Genembo dae   mo

        say-proc.1p.ind. man   on.account.of t.

        tamboro   s-eraera.   Edo

        grieving.father say-proc.1p.ind. and

        evetu genembo ghae ne   jigho jo

        woman man   with spec. comb   not

        gay-ae   ir-ia-gh-eraera.

        spear-not.do remain-dur.ir-continue-proc.3p.ind.

'...we call the grieving mother <u>rosemo</u>.

The grieving father we call <u>tamboro</u>.

ʌ<u>And</u> the couple remain (in mourning) without

combing their hair.'

In example (31), there is no temporal relationship

between the donjuncts, only the logical relationship

between the two as the speaker views it.

The medial verb forms of 'do': <u>edo</u>, <u>etiri</u>, <u>use</u>,

and <u>iri</u> often replace the verbal copy in tail-head

linkage between sentences as the head of the second

sentence. The use of this more generic verbal form

indicates that the speaker is signalling a larger chunk

of discourse such as a paragraph or a focus space is

beginning at this point. The <u>edo</u> forms make the tail-head

linkage much more prominent than the normal tail-head

linkage with verbal copy would have.

Occasionally <u>edo</u> is used with noun phrases.

(32) <u>tax</u> <u>8</u> <u>kina</u> <u>edo</u> <u>court</u> <u>fine</u> <u>8</u> <u>kina</u>

      tax 8 kina and court fine 8 kina

      <u>ainghae</u>   <u>dabade</u>   <u>16</u> <u>kina</u> <u>b-u</u>

      that.con.with   together   16 kina   get.SP-seq.IA

      '(he) will get (his) 8 kina tax money together

      with (his) 8 kina fine (making) 16 kina...'

In this context, the offender did not pay his taxes, so the speaker begins with the 8 kina he didn't pay and logically adds to it the fine that he will receive for not paying his taxes. Because the first amount precedes the other in logical order, the speaker used edo rather than a for 'and'.

There is one more set of internal AND's in Korafe: kotu 'footprint' and kotugo 'like footprint'. These can best be translated 'furthermore, in addition, besides, incidentally, by the way, in the same way, moreover, and (occasionally) alternatively, or on the other hand.'

(33) Sivoro   mo, nu   enda   joka-da
      earthworm   t.   spec. ground   inside-of

      ir-a-gh-eraira.   Kotu,
      remain-dur.ir.-continue-proc.3s.ind.   footprint

      nu   jo   gamb-ae   eraira.
      it   not bite.SP-not.do   do.proc.3s.ind.

      'The earthworm lives in the ground. By the way, it doesn't bite (people).'

(34) Nunda   tamo kokoi-ri. Nunda   mendo   mo
      its   body red-e.   its   nose   t.

      kotugo   kokoi-ri.
      footprint.like   red-e.

'Its body is red. <u>In addition</u>, its nose is red.'

(35)   <u>Nu</u>   <u>giti</u>   <u>afa.mane</u>   <u>mind-ido</u>   <u>gh-useri</u>.

       it   first   fathers   eat.SP-seq.SR   continue-dp.3p.ind.

       <u>Ava-ta</u>   <u>kotugo</u>   <u>afa.mane</u>   <u>ne</u>

       that.ct.-frus.   footprint.like   fathers   spec.

       <u>dara</u>   <u>useri</u>.

       great.mistake   do.dp.3p.ind.

       'At first, (our) forefathers ate it (lizard).

       But <u>on the other hand</u>, they erred greatly.'

2.3   Alternation   (OR)

       Grimes (1975:210) claims that alternation is one of
the 'two purely paratactic predicates." Korafe speakers
do not differentiate between inclusive and exclusive
disjunction, but at this point in time, they do seem
to differentiate between external and internal (relationship
in the mind of the speaker) disjunction. The disjunctive
that is most often used in an external way is <u>o</u>, which
our Korafe instructor, Warrington Isari, claims is
a loan word from English: 'or'. Example (36) illustrates
the use of <u>o</u> between terms and (37) between propositions.

(36) <u>Nunda</u> <u>bayau</u> <u>mo</u> <u>ika</u> <u>o</u> <u>asi</u> <u>yuji-ri</u>.

its   food   t.   tree   or   vine   fruit-e.

'Its food is fruit from trees or vines.'

(37) ...<u>aya</u>   <u>afa</u>   <u>ghae</u>   <u>dabade</u>   <u>tat-edo</u>

mother father   with   together   join-seq.SR

<u>ir-ero</u>   <u>duro</u>   <u>eraira</u>.

remain-sim.r.3p.DR glory   do.proc.3s.ind.

<u>O</u>   <u>aya</u>   <u>nu-suka</u>   <u>ir-aetira</u>,

or   mother   spec.-alone   remain-subj.3s.ind.

<u>gari</u>   <u>jo</u>   <u>eveva</u>   <u>ir-ae</u>   <u>arira</u>.

to.see   not   good   remain-not.do   do.f.3s.ind.

*When mother and dad are alive and living

together, there's a glory in the situation.

<u>Or</u> if mother should remain by herself, (that)

doesn't present a good appearance.'

Halliday and Hasan (1976:242) include the adversative

contrastive relationship of 'however, on the other hand,

at the same time' under BUT for English. If the disjuncts

have different surface structure subject-topics, this

particular adversative contrastive relationship is

encoded in <u>o</u> in Korafe, as examples (37) and (38)

illustrate.

(38) ...<u>bebego</u>,   <u>etodaba</u> <u>aimi</u>,

      firstborn.ones   three   that.con.t.

      <u>isoro</u> <u>edo</u>   <u>ghᵽuseri</u>,   <u>o</u>

      war   do.seq.SR continue-dp.3p.ind. or

      <u>ambo</u> <u>beka</u> <u>mo</u> <u>reighi-da</u> <u>ir-ise</u>...

      last   true   t.   place-in   remain-sim.SR

      'Those three firstborn (sons) were off fighting,

      <u>on the other hand</u>, the youngest was staying

      at home...'

The original Korafe disjunctive form was <u>ai</u>, the demon-
strative 'that' with the control clitic. This form is
either homophonous or a polyseme with the <u>ai</u> that means
'yes, true'. At this present point in time, it seems
to be widely used as an internal disjunctive, that
logically orders the disjuncts and indicates that they
may not be reversed, because the speaker sees them
occurring in that order. The <u>ai</u> disjunctive also
displays the inclusive-exclusive distinction.

(39) Inclusive: <u>dara</u>   <u>ai</u> <u>dubo</u> <u>mema</u> <u>eni</u>

                  trouble   or   neck   pain   any

                  <u>tefo-ri</u>.

                  nothing-e.

      'There's no mishap or sadness here.'

At first, it would seem that the terms in example (39)
could be re-ordered, but in the Korafe world view which
the speaker is expressing, by his use of ai, that 'sadness'
arises out of 'trouble', which is most often associated
with death. So here, the speaker is euphemistically
proclaiming, "No one has died here, so we're not in
mourning." Therefore, the dara must precede the dubo
mema.

(40) Exclusive: doy-arira,   ai   mindafu

                  leave.off.SP-f.3s.ind. or   great

                  sumb-arira?

                  run.SP-f.3s.ind.

      'Will (the cyclone) cease, or will it keep

      on blowing?"

That ai means 'yes' is significant. In example (40), the
speaker is actually presenting a biassed alternative; his
hope is that the cyclone will cease blowing, so he presents
that as his first alternative. Example (41), which also
is a quotation, illustrates this semantic idea of a
biassed alternative again.

(41) Oroko mind-aresa   ai,   nang-aresi?

      today eat.SP-f.2s.ind. yes...or do.what-f.2s.q.

      'Will you eat (it) now, or what will you do?'

To further confirm the use of _ai_ as a biassed disjunctive,
which is of course an internal usage, I mention briefly
here the use of _ai_ as the 'yes' tag on a yes-no question.
In Korafe, most yes-no questions are only tagged with
_ai_ instead of the _ai-tefo_ combination. As in English, the
use of the _ai_ alone signals that the speaker expects 'yes'
for an answer.

2.4 _Nu_, the AND-BUT narrowing focus conjunction

Halliday and Hasan (1976:250) state that " 'but'
contains the element 'and' as one of its meaning components."
Marge Reis (1978:541ff), in discussing the German _aber_, says
that it has an AND-BUT sense, in that _aber_ adds in some
way to the information provided by the first conjunct.
The Korafe specifying pronoun _nu_ seems to perform this role
as a paratactic conjunction. In the following examples,
it narrows the scope of the initial conjunct to give a
clearer delineation of the item under discussion.

(42)	_Na_	_reju_	_geka_	_ava_	_s-aoni-ta?_
	I	what.spec.	talk	that.ct.	say-h.1s.q-frus.
	_Nu,_	_Kenneth_	_vos-e_		_f-usira._
	spec.	Kenneth	descend.SP-seq.IA		come.LP-dp.3s.ind.

'Whatever shall I talk about? Oh, yes,
Kenneth came.'

(43) Roera jo teria ir-ae-ri. Nu
thing not great remain-not.do-e. spec.

botoro ainda geka sari dae erena.
bottle of.that talk to.say pur. do.pr.1s.ind.

'It's not a great matter. But I'm going to
talk about the bottle.'

(44) Na jo namonde business erera,
I not we.inc. business do.pr.1p.ind.

against use jo s-ae erena-ta.
against do.sim.SR not say-not.do do.pr.1s.ind.-frus.

Nu, Gode tumond-use Gode dae
spec. God believe-sim.SR God pu.

fut-use namonde da business dae
give.LP-sim.SR we.inc. pos. business pur.

fut-use gh-arera.
give.LP-sim.SR continue-f.1p.ind.

'I am not saying that I am against us doing
business. But (I am saying that) while we
are trusting God, we will be giving to Him
and to our businesses.'

As can be seen in the above examples, the nu is an AND-BUT
conjunction, because it does not change either the topic
or the direction of the discourse flow (as ava/avata 'but'
do. See section 3.3.), but it gives the speaker's
perspective on the topic.

2.5   Semantic relationships encoded in juxtaposition of
      semi-final and final verb forms

Korafe semi-final and final verb forms often terminate
clause clusters that are immediately juxtaposed, hence by
definition, paratactic. The relationships which these
juxtapositions encode are coordination of both temporal
and logical types, adversative, equivalence, and cause-
effect.

Coordination is the rhetorical predicate encoded
in example (45).

(45)   Jughu   d-eraira,   vare
       under.the.house   sweep.SP-proc.3s.ind. garden

       vive   eraira,   bayau   it-iraira.
       weed   do.proc.3s.ind.   food   cook.SP-proc.3s.ind.

       'She sweeps underneath the house, weeds the

       garden, (and) cooks the food.'

Halliday and Hasan (1976:250) mention two components of adversative: contrastive and contrary to expectation. Usually, this conjunctive relationship is syntactically a hypotactic one in Korafe, manifested by the conjunctions ava and avata. However, the semantics of adversative AND-BUT can be encoded in the paratactic juxtaposition of semifinal and final verb clause clusters. However, one of the clause clusters must be in the negative mode.

(46) Sasingu   ava   usera,   jo
      children   that.ct.   do.dp.3p.SR   not

      amb-ae-ri.
      die.SP-not.do-e.

      'The children did that, but (and) they
      didn't die.'

(47) Na gos-usena,   jo   tumond-ae-ri.
      I   see.LP-dp.1s.SF   not   believe-not.do-e.

      'I saw (it), but (and) I couldn't believe (it).'

Longacre (1972:57) discusses the semantic relationship of equivalence under the heading of paraphrase, which he subsumes as identity-equivalence, generic-specific, statement-specification, negated antonym, summary, contrac-

tion, and amplification. Grimes defines equivalence as a hypotactic relationship. However, in Korafe, equivalence is encoded structurally as both a paratactic and hypotactic relationship. Paratactically, juxtaposed semi-final and final clause clusters demonstrate equivalence conjunction in some instances.

(48) Nu   jo   ghumb-ae   eraira.   Nu

      he   not   fly.SP-not.do   do.proc.3s.ind.   he

      enda-da   deingh-eraira.

      ground-on   walk-proc.3s.ind.

      'He (the cassowary) doesn't fly. He walks
      about on the ground.'

(49) Dara   eming-useri.   Arada   amo

      error   do.this.way-dp.3p.ind.   lizard   that.t.

      b-udo   kae   bor-iseri.

      get.SP-seq.SR   poison   roast-dp.3p.ind.

      'They erred greatly in this way. They took
      the lizard and made black magic poison for

      sorcery.'

(50) ...vasai   da   kirumu ari   dae

      trading.partners   pos. feast   to.do   pur.

      edo   gh-usera,   giti fuka

      do.seq.SR continue-dp.3p.SF first pigs

      digarigo und-udo   gh-useri.

      many   nurture⊤SP-seq.SR continue-dp.3p.ind

      '(When) they were about to make a trading

      partner feast, first they would raise many

      pigs.'

Juxtaposition of final verbs may also encode a
causal relationship, either of a necessary or sufficient
nature. Example (51) encodes both equivalence and cause-
effect.

  (51)   A   eva-da   y-aresa,   nu aminda

       and ocean-to go.LP-f.2s.ind. he   there

       ghumb-udo   irurari

       fly.SP-seq.SR go.LP⸱seq.dur.ir.3s.DR

       g-aresa.

       see.SP-f.2s.ind.

       'And (if/when) you go to the ocean, you will

       see him flying along there.'

A special example of this juxtaposition if the sequence
of two clause clusters, the first of which terminates with
a final verb in the imperative mode, and the second with a

final verb in the hortative mode, often denotes a causal
relationship. Although the relationship between the two
conjuncts is semantically hypotactic, this relationship
is viewed structurally as a paratactic one, because of
the verbal juxtaposition.

(52)   Y-asi   b-ase!

go.LP-2s.imp. get.SP-h.2s.

'Go, get (it).'

(53)   S-e   ning-ore!

say-2s.imp. hear.SP-h.3p.

'Tell (them) so that they hear!'

(54)   Ne   Bubu   isambu,   enda   ghojaba   edo

you.2p. Bubu all   land   knife   do.seq.SR

i-evu,   fas-edo   iji   av-are!

chop-SP-2p.imp. lie.down-seq.SR   sun   dry-h.3s.

'All you Bubu clan members, chop down the
bush on your land, so that the sun can dry it.'

(55)   D-e-g-e   amb-are!

hit.SP-IA-continue-2s.imp. die.SP-h.3s.

'Kill him!'   (Hit him, so he dies!)

2.6 Paratactic cause-effect in medial verb strings

The concatenation of any two medial verbs may embody
a cause-effect relationship, but the juxtaposition of
different referent medial verb forms more often signifies
this relationship, which can be described as external,
related to the nature of the interaction itself. Thus,
the combinations 'hit-die', 'put-go down', 'say-come
into being' are all very strong cause-effect relationships
that need no demonstrative conjunctions to highlight
the relationship. Syntactically, these occur as two
consecutive clauses in a concatenation of clauses
terminating in medial verbs (unless they occur in sentence
final position), that are in a paratactic relationship
to each other. Semantically, the second conjunct is
caused by the first, and the relationship, which is
usually one of sufficient cause, is hypotactic.

(56) Nu   genembo   d-etiri
      he   man   hit.SP-seq.r.3s.DR
      ambu-dudur-usira.
      die.SP.IA-fall.down.LP-dp.3s.ind.
      'He hit the man, (and) he died.'   (He caused
      the man to die.)

The medial same referent verb form _gido_ 'seeing'
is often used in a non-contextual, internal way as a
weak causal conjunction encoding the necessary causal
relationship. When _gido_ follows a different referent
medial verb form and has no overt subject-topic role
in its predication, it appears to be used in this
conjunctive sense.

(57)   <u>Soini   jeka</u>

     flies   small.bits.of.rubbish

     <u>kisigh-eraira</u>.   <u>Ari</u>   <u>gido</u>

     deposit-proc.3s.ind. do.seq.ir.3s.DR seeing

     <u>jingabu</u> <u>amo</u>   <u>siror-eraira</u>.

     snakes   that.t. be.born-proc.3s.ind.

     'Flies deposit small bits of rubbish. They

     do (that) <u>so</u> those maggots come into being.'

Semantically, this is a hypotactic predication, but
syntactically, the medial verbs are still arranged in
a paratactic collection.

The negation of the juxtaposed medial verb causal
relationships suggests an interesting difference between
those concatenations which encode necessary cause and
those which encode sufficient cause. Ordinarily, the

negation limiting adverb _jo_ 'not' delimits the backward

scope of the negation in the sentence, and the predicate

negation marker _ae_ 'not doing' attached to the verb delimits

the forward scope of the negation. Normally, all the verbal

actions within this delimitation are negated, as is the

case in the following example, which illustrates necessary

cause.

(58) Na   _jo_   s-ari   _ning-ae-ri._

      I   not   say-seq.r.3s.DR   hear.SP-not.do-e.

      'He didn't tell me, (so) I didn't hear.'

However, in some sequences which evidence sufficient cause,

both verbs are not necessarily negated.

(59) Na   _jo_   jigh-ono   amb-ae-ri.

      I   not   hold.SP-seq.r.1s.DR   die.SP-not.do-e.

      'I didn't poison him (so) he died.'(Korafe

      speakers understand from this sentence that

      someone is dead and that the speaker is

      denying a causal relationship, on his part,

      to that death.

The negated antonym of the imperative-hortative cause-

effect conjunction is a medial verb-final verb

concatenation in the negative hortative mode.

(60) Erama   noi   numamo
      do.dur.ir.SR (don't) his.mother his.father

      mandi amo   doy-eovo,
      boy   that.t. letvSP-seq.neg.h.2p.DR

      town-da y-eure!
      town-to go.LP-neg.h.3s.

      'Don't you, the mother and father of that
      boy (who was expelled from school) let him
      go to town (to become a 'rascal').'

3.0 Hypotactic Rhetorical Predicates

Grimes (1975:212) sees the hypotactic relationship
as having a central argument with other arguments subor-
dinate to that central argument. "The hypotactic
proposition is added as an extra argument to some other
proposition so that the hypotactic proposition as a whole
is subordinate to the rest of the dominating proposition."

Reesink (1981 ms.:1) states that "subordinating
clauses share the pragmatic function of presupposition
with each other and with topical NP constituents. A
topic is what the speaker wants to talk about. Once the
topic has been identified, it may be referred to as if it
were within the speaker and hearer's perceptual field.
Languages often choose a far deictic for such anaphoric
reference. Whatever deictic is used to refer to a given
nominal constituent, this deictic is then also used to
mark relative clauses and other subordinate clauses:
conditionals, temporals, reasons, and sometimes
purposive clauses."

In Korafe (Farr, Lowe, and Whitehead), the medial
(near the addressee) deictic a is used to mark topics,
embed relative clauses, and also embed subordinate
clause clusters. All of these structures may in
themselves be assertions, but an assertion often becomes

a presupposition for a subsequent proposition in the text.
In discussing the hypotactic relationship between embedded
constructions and main constructions in a sentence, I
am basically focussing on the presuppositional character
of the embedded proposition with respect to the main one.
Because they have a pragmatic function as presuppositions
for the rest of the sentence, these embedded propositions
are usually the first conjunct in the sentence, in
accordance with the communicative dynamism principle,
developed by the Prague school, which states that speakers
move trom the known to the unknown. In the Korafe causal
conjunction expressions, these subordinate clause
clusters may move into 'tail' position in the sentence;
the 'tail' is characterized as following a final or
existential verb form with sentence final intonation and
being composed of either a phrase or a subordinate embedded
clause. The speaker still regards the 'tail' information
as a presupposition for his speech act (internal
presupposition as discussed in section 0.), but the
addressee receives this presupposition after the assertion,
so that it loses some of its presuppositional force and may
take on the force of an assertion.

Most hypotactic propositions in Korafe are expressed
by a clause cluster that terminates in a final or semi-

final verb followed by an appropriate form of the medial
deictic. However, the comitative relationship, which is
usually a hypotactic coordination between noun phrases is
marked by the usage of one of two relationals. The purpose
relationship is also designated in its minimal form by a
relational. Comparison and pretense are also conveyed by
a relational.

The hypotactic relationships in Korafe which are
presented in this paper include hypotactic coordination,
condition and equivalence implications, adversative,
cause and reason, purpose and prevention, pretense,
and comparison.

3.1   Hypotactic Coordination

The comitative relationship between two noun phrases
is a hypotactic relationship. In Korafe, it is expressed
by a central noun phrase followed by a noun phrase subor-
dinated to the central one by the dual comitative ghae or
the plural comitative de. The normal usage is to indicate
accompaniment; one central preson or item is accompanied
by one or more persons or items. In example (61), Goliath
has a definite subordinate status, which is reflected in
the fact that the person marking on the verb only co-
references with first person singular Na 'I'.

     (61)   Na   oroko   Goliath   ghae   isoro   arena.

             I   today   Goliath   with   war   do.f.1s.ind.

            'Now, I will fight with Goliath.'

The above example is taken from a sermon about David and
Goliath.

The comitatives also express an AND relationship,
and even though the initial noun phrase receives the most
prominence, all may be referenced in the personal deference
on the verb.

     (62)   Afa   Conrad   noaro   Eura   Joyce   ghae

             father   Conrad   his.wife   Eura   Joyce   with

amboda   iseri.

afterwards   go.LP.dp.3p.ind.

'Uncle Conrad and his wife Eura Joyce went

afterwards.'

(63)   Sasingu   noi   de   aera.

children   their.mother   with   go.SP.tp.3p.ind.

'The children and their mother went!'

The comitative relationship sometimes expresses the

generic-specific equivalence. The Rhoda ghae in (64)

exhibits obligatory pronominal delection of na 'I',

since it is strongly presupposed in namane 'we, exclusive'.

(64)   Namane   Rhoda   ghae   eveva   ava   erera.

we.exc. Rhoda   with   good   that.ct. do.pr.3p.ind.

'We, (I mean) Rhoda and I, are doing fine.'

The dual comitative ghae has an extended usage as

an encoder of internal attitude, condition, or manner;

the plural comitative de additionally encodes external

condition.

(65) dumo   ghae   vos-edo...

      sulking   with   descend.SP-seq.SR

      'he went down sulking...'

(66) Nu   bibita   ghae   sumb-ira.

      he   speed   with   run.SP-tp.3s.ind.

      'He ran quickly.'

(67) Fegha   nu   mandi   gugua   de...

      Fegha   spec. boy   possessions   with

      'Fegha (was) a wealthy young man...'

Finally, the ghae comitative is used with temporal expressions to designate any time within the day which the speaker is marking as his coding time.

(68) oroko   sifo   ghae

      today   day   with

      ¹this morning'

(69) sife   ungobungobuhae   ghae

      yesterday   afternoon   with

      'yesterday afternoon'

The plural comitative <u>de</u> exhibits a much more restricted temporal usage. It is used with two time expressions to reflect time adjacent to the speaker's coding time of 'today'. Thus, 'last night' is translated <u>tumbade</u>, and 'tomorrow' is <u>sifode</u> in Korafe.

3.2   Implication   (IF,\\WHEN, SINCE, GIVEN THAT)

Longacre (1976:119) discusses implication as a logical relationship that subsumes pure conditions, conditions with a universal quantifier on term, contingency, and proportions.

In "Conditionals are Topics," Haiman (1978:564) claims, "Conditionals, like topics, are givens which constitute the frame of reference with respect to which the main clause is either true (if a proposition) or felicitous (if not)." In Korafe, topics (cf. Dik's (1978:19) theme) occur initially in the sentence or in the clause cluster for which they are presuppositions. They are often marked by the topicalizing clitic <u>mo</u> or the demonstrative topicalizing form <u>amo</u>[9] a combination of the medial demonstrative root <u>a</u> and the topic marker <u>mo</u>.

(70) ...<u>rika</u> <u>kafu</u> <u>amo</u>,   <u>nu</u> <u>vasa</u> <u>a</u>

          bird owl   that.t. he   place ᵗthat

         <u>d</u>-<u>odo</u>...

         leave.SP-seq.SR

         'Regarding that bird, the owl, he leaves

         that place...'

Hypothetical conditionals, contrafactual conditionals,

equivalence implications, and temporal contingencies

also occur in sentence initial positions and are

optionally[10] marked by <u>amo</u> (occasionally by <u>emo</u> 'this').

(71) <u>Rika</u> <u>kafu</u> <u>s</u>-<u>eraera</u>   _<u>amo</u>,   _<u>nu</u>

      bird owl   say-proc.1p.ind. that.t. he

      <u>taima</u>-<u>da</u> <u>ir</u>-<u>a</u>-<u>gh</u>-<u>eraira</u>.

      bush-in   remain-seq.dur.ir.SR-continue-proc.3s.ind.

      'When we're discussing the bird, the owl,

      (we can say) it lives in the bush.'

(72) ...<u>tamo</u> <u>kae</u>   <u>semb</u>-<u>arira</u>   <u>amo</u>,

        body poison cross.SP-f.3s.ind. that.t.

     <u>tumba</u> <u>urur</u>-<u>arira</u>   <u>rika</u> <u>kafu</u> <u>nu</u>

     night dur.sim-do.f.3s.ind. bird owl   spec.

     <u>taima</u>-<u>da</u>ᵣ<u>ghe</u> <u>f</u>-<u>ua</u>...

     bush-from   come.LP-seq.dur.ir.SR

'...when sickness spreads to (people's) bodies,
(then) during the night, the owl comes from
the bush...'

In his article, Haiman states that topics are givens,
presuppositions, and left-dislocated constituents. Although
conditions, like topics and left-dislocated constituents,
are marked by the demonstrative topic marker amo, I feel
uneasy about calling them givens or presuppositions in the
same sense that topics are givens and presuppositions.
Topics correspond to what I have termed the textual knowledge
sense of presupposition, already defined and established
by the context. Conditions are related to the speech si-
tuation, but they do not correspond directly to the real
world knowledge sense of presupposition, because the
speaker does not necessarily assume that the hearer contains
this information in his real world knowledge. Rather,
the speaker's stance is: "Let us assume for the sake
of argument that 'x' is true. If 'x' is true, then
'y'." Conditions are presuppositions or topics, given
for the sake of argument. Equivalences and temporal
contingencies match topics more directly in being givens,
presuppositions, left-dislocated constituents, and
syntactically marked by the demonstrative topic marker
amo in Korafe.

3.2.1 Conditional Implications (IF)

Haiman claims that relevance, not cause, is implied in
conditionals. Lowe (1981 ms:35ff) claims that conditionals
and causals can be very closely related. He lists seven
categories of conditionals, some of which are related to
causals: law-like conditionals, loose law-like conditionals,
facilitative or enabling conditionals, conditional relevance,
conditional promises and threats, conditional commands, and
miscellaneous conditionals. Korafe conditionals manifest
these relationships.

Conditional structures are more tightly knit than
equivalence structures in Korafe. Hypotheticaloconditions
must occur with future tense forms of the verb at the
conclusion of the protasis. Contrafactual conditions
specify subjunctive forms of the verb at the conclusion
of the protasis. Both future and subjunctive forms are
irrealis.

3.2.1.1 Hypothetical Conditions

The following are examples of hypothetical conditions.
Example (72) illustrates a law-like conditional, encoding
sufficient cause. Conditionals encoding cause manifest
future verb forms at the conclusion of both the protasis
and apodosis.

(72) <u>Nu</u> <u>fat-aresa</u>   <u>amo</u>,

it press.SP-f.2s.ind. that.t.

<u>gamb-arira</u>.

bite.SP-f.3s.ind.

'If you step on it, it will bite (you).'

The following example illustrates a facilitative or
enabling condition, that manifests necessary cause.

(73) <u>Na</u> <u>Tufi</u> <u>y-arena</u>   <u>amo</u>,   rice <u>bag</u>

I Tufi go.LP-f.1s.ind. that.t. rice bag

<u>eni</u> <u>omb-arena</u>.

a   buy.SP-f.1s.ind.

'If I go to Tufi, I will buy a rice bag.'

Conditional relevance and conditional commands evidence
final forms other than the future tense forms in the
apodosis. Example (74) illustrates conditional relevance,
and example (75) conditional command.

(74) <u>Ni</u> <u>usu</u>   <u>uju</u> <u>aresa</u>   <u>amo</u>,

you coconut want do.f.2s.ind. that.t.

<u>maketa-da</u> <u>ir-ira-re</u>.

market-at remain-pr.3s.ind.-im.

'If you want coconuts, they're right here at the
market.'

(75) <u>Ni</u>   <u>Tufi</u>   <u>yari</u>   <u>uju</u>   <u>aresa</u>   <u>amo</u>,

      you Tufi to.go want do.f.2s.ind. that.t.

      <u>nanda</u>   <u>ghaka</u>   <u>b-udo</u>   <u>_y-asi!</u>

      my   canoe   get.SP-seq.SR   go.LP-2s.imp.

      'If you want to go to Tufi, take my canoe.'

3.2.1.2 Contrafactual Conditions

Subjunctive verbs normally occur as the last verb
at the end of both the protasis and apodosis propositions.
These forms are composed of the verb stem, the irrealis
marker <u>a</u> followed by the today's past/perfective aspect
of the verb: <u>y-a-eteni</u> 'I should/would go'. The semi-
final verb form distinction occurs with this set of
conjugated verb forms. Our language teacher, Warrington
Isari, allowed the final form of the verb to occur in
the protasis without the demonstrative topicalizer <u>amo</u>,
but he insisted that the use of the semi-final verbal
form in the protasis required an obligatory <u>amo</u>.

(76) <u>Namonde</u>   <u>fura</u>   <u>eni</u>   <u>dotut-usera</u>   <u>ominda</u>

      we.inc.   week   one   leave.LP-dp.1p.SF   there.distal

      <u>f-ur-aetera</u>   <u>amo</u>,_   <u>emboro</u>

      come.LP-dur-subj.1p.SF   that.t.   path

seriri   aetira.

slippery   do.subj.3s.ind

'If we would have come last week, the path

would have been slippery.'

(77)   Y-aetera   amo,   nou

go.LP-subj.1p.SF   that.t.   whip.snake

f-ua   gamb-aetira.

come.LP-seq.dur.ir.SR   bite.SP-subj.3s.ind.

'If we should go, the whip snake would come

(and) bite (us).'

3.2.2   Equivalence Implications (WHEN)

Grimes uses the term equivalence, and Longacre

the term paraphrase to discuss the implication relationships

of identity-equivalence, negated antonym, summary, con-

traction, and amplification.   Section 2.4   illustrates

the juxtaposed sentences that designate this relation-

ship.   In this section, the juxtaposed sentences are

conjoined by the demonstrative topic marker amo, but

they are still encoding the same relationships.

(78)   Edo   nunda   munju   fumb-uraira   amo,

and   its   eggs   lay.SP-proc.3s.ind.   that.t.

babai   ava   fumb-uraira.

large   that.ct.   lay.SP-proc.3s.ind.

'And when it lays eggs, it lays large ones.'

(79)   ...ava   roera   dábako   jo   ae-ri

        that.ct.   thing   one   not   not.do-e.

amo   okia   jo   uvu   ghae   bayau   it-ae-ri.

that.t.   pot   not   water   with   food   dook-not.do-e.

'...but they thing' that they didn't do (was)

they didn't cook the food with any water in

the pot.'

(80)   Nunda   bayau   mind-iraira   amo,

        its   food   eat.SP-proc.3s.ind.   that.t.

jo   g-ae   eraera.

not   see.SP-not.do   do.proc.1p.ind.

'When it eats its food, we're not observing (it).'

Although evaluation is not exactly an equivalence relationship,

it takes the same format as the equivalence constructions.

(81)   Ne   y-a   jung-edo   ne-suka

        they   go.LP-seq.ir.SR   hide.SP-seq.SR   they-alone

<u>fet-edo</u>   nemonde   <u>beka</u>   <u>s-edo</u>

stand.SP-seq.SR   they.inc.   mouth   say-seq.SR

<u>gh-useri</u>.   Amo   <u>ari</u>   <u>eveva</u>   <u>bekā</u>

continue-dp.3p.ind   that.t. deed   good   true

<u>ava</u>   <u>edo</u>   <u>gh-useri</u>.

that.ct.   do.seq.SR   continue-dp.3p.ind

'They would go off and privately and carry

on their couŕtship. That was a very good thing

they did.'

3.2.3 Temporal Contingency

Temporal contingency is usually encoded in the medial

verb chaining system. However, more marked examples of

temporal contingency include the conjunction <u>amo</u> between

two clause cluster conjuncts.

(82) ...<u>mandi</u>   <u>fumb-uraera</u>   <u>amo</u>,

boy   bear.SP-proc.3p.ind.   that.t.

<u>fat-i</u>   <u>git-ioro</u>

press.SP-seq.IA   crush.by.hugging-seq.proc.3p.DR

<u>amb-uraira</u>.

die.SP-proc.3s.ind.

'...when they produce a baby boy, they crush

him to death.'

The following example encodes evidence as well as temporal contingency. Evidence does not seem to have the strong connotations in Korafe that it does in English; it seems to be more tied in with necessary than sufficient cause.

    (83)   Namane   nu   sife   gos-umutari,

            we.exc. him   yesterday see.LP-yp.1p.ind.

            amo,   nu jo   amb-ae-ri.

            that.t. he   not   die.SP-not.do-e.

            'Given that we saw him yesterday, he has not died.'

3.3 Adversative (BUT)

Longacre sees contrast as the basic component of
the adversative relationship. Halliday and Hasan
(1976:250) state that "the basic meaning of the
ADVERSATIVE relation is 'contrary to expectation'."
Lowe (1981 ms:17) includes both contraexpectation and
contrast as basic manifestations of this relationship,
and he adds a third category, limitation, which the
others also mention. Lowe states, "The adversative
relation in English expresses change of direction in
argument, sometimes unexpected."

The terms, change of direction and contrast,
seem to characterize the Korafe conjunctions ava and
avata which are equivalent to 'but', 'on the other
hand', nevertheless','though', 'however', 'yet', and
'only'. For Korafe, contraexpectation seems to be
a subset of contrast. Haiman (1978:584) mentions two
types of topics: resumptive themes (which are marked
in Korafe by amo) and contrastive themes (which are
marked in Korafe by ava). (See Farr, Lowe, and Whitehead
manuscript.) Reesink describes the BUT relationship as
paratactic, and it is true that semantically many of
the adversative conjuncts tend to be of equal status.
However for Korafe, the syntactic use of ava embeds the

the first proposition in the BUT predication. An embedded
proposition is involved in a hypotactic relationship.

    Limitation in Korafe is often handled in a phrase.
Whatever item is being described as the 'only one, the
exception' will be modified by ava nembo 'only that
contrastive one' or vanembo 'in contrast only'.

(84)   ...reighi   aminda   evevetu   ava   nembo
           place   there   women   that.ct.   only
        ir-era.
        remain-pr.3p.ind.
        '...only women live in that place.'

(85)   ...oka   jo   mind-ae,   nu   bayau
           fish   not   eat.SP-not.do   she   food
        vanembo   mind-ido   gh-usira.
        only   eat.SP-seq.SR   continue-dp.3s.ind.
        '...she didn't eat fish; she ate only
        vegetables.'

    Lowe (1981 ms:29) indicates that the English con-
junction BUT has among its semantic components the ideas
of contrast and contraexpectation. He differentiates
between the two usages in English in the following way:

"if the second clause is new information to the addressee, it's contraexpectation. If the second clause is old information to the addressee, it's contrast." The Korafe conjunction _ava_ 'but' manifests the contrastive morpheme _va_ 'change of direction' in its composition. It indicates contrast, and in some instances contraexpectation, between the two conjuncts on an external plane. In addition to having the contrastive component _va_, the conjunction _avata_ 'but' occurs with another morpheme _ta_, which functions basically on an internal plane. The _ta_ indicates that the speaker feels frustration about the situation. The usage of _ta_ is often broadened to include the semantic component of contraexpectation as well. Thus, the conjunction _avata_ signifies frustrative contrast in some contexts and contraexpectation in others, along the lines that Lowe has established. In the following examples, contrast is the basic semantic relationship involved. Example (86) manifests the semantic component of èxcèptiònꞮ as well.

(86)   ..._jo   nanda totofo eni nanda letter_
            not   my   folks any my   letter
       gemb-udo   _dengoro ind-ae_
       write.SP-seq.SR   ears   instruct.SP-seq.SR
       eraera,   _ava nine   usesi_...
       do.proc.3p.ind.   but   you.con.   do.dp.2s.ind.

'...not any of my folks have written a letter
giving me advice, but you did...'

(87)   ...na bako bunari-ri.   Avata afa

       I   hole not.know-e.   but   father

ijuga⌐etiri   ·   ghaf-useni.

teach.do.seq.r.3s.DR   dig.LP-dp.1s.ind.

*I didn't know how to make a pit (for

snaring pigs). But dad showed me, and I

dug it.'

The following examples encode contraexpectation.

(88)   Nangae fugut-usera,   ava oka ttamo

       we.two throw.LP-dp.3p.SF   but fish body

jo   der-ae-ri.

not touch.SP-not.do-e.

'In spite of the fact that we threw out (our

lines), the fish didn't bite.'

(89)   Boke   da gari   kau mo, nu

       cassowary pos to.see kind t.   spec.

rika da kaugo-ri. Avata boke   mo

bird pos kind-e.   but   cassowary   t.

jo   ghumb-ae   eraera.

not   fly.SP-not.do   do.proc.3p.ind.

'The cassowary looks like a bird. However,

cassowaries do not fly.'

The Korafe avata occasionally manifests the AND BUT

relationship, discussed by Halliday and Hasan (1976:250).

(90)   Virutu   mo   ika   ghousa-ri,   avata   fakara

        stave   t.   stick long-e.   but   hard

ambari-ri.

dying-e.

'The fighting stave is a long piece of wood,

but (and) as a matter of fact, it is extremely

hard.'

Although ava is used as the conjunction BUT, its primary

function is as contrastive topic marker (See Farr, Lowe,

and Whitehead manuscript.) The avata occurs primarily

as the conjunction BUT.

3.4 A note on speech events and _sedo_/_sise_ in particular

Speech events are encoded in a mental process
construction that has a mental process proposition
before and/or after a quotation proposition. When the initial
mental process verb precedes an _amo_ or when the concluding
mental process verb follows an _ava_, the relationship is
definitely hypotactic. There is also some grounds for
calling the relationship between a quotation proposition
followed by a mental process proposition a hypotactic
one.

    (91)   Jingabu g-ido   "Aji!"   s-edo

         snake   see.SP-seq.SR   Yikes! say-seq.SR

       '(He) saw the snake (and) said, "Yikes!"

In example (91), the quotation is definitely the object
of _sedo_ 'saying'. And when the mental process verb
follows the quotation, one can say that the quotation
is the object of the mental process verb. However, there
are problems with viewing all mental process constructions
as hypotactic ones. I will deal more fully with these
problems in sections 4.0, 4.1, and 4.2.

The sequential medial same referent form of 'to
say' _sedo_ is used quite frequently with demonstrative
forms (_ava_ _sedo_ and _aindae_ _sedo_) to express internal
causation relationships. Occasionally if simultaneity or

overlap temporal relationships exist between the cause-
effect conjuncts, the simultaneous medial same referent
form of 'to say' sise replaces sedo in the causal conjunc-
tions.

(92) s-aoro   nune   s-ari

      say-seq.ir.1p.DR   he.con.   say-seq.ir.3s.DR

      ning-arera,   aindae.sise

      hear.SP-f.1p.ind.   therefore(on.account.of.that.
                                        speaking.sim.SR)

      nu oj-igh-ira.

      he come.SP-completive-tp.3s.ind.

      'in order that we might tell him to speak to

      us that we might hear (his message), he came.'

I will not refer to sise again in the subsequent discussion
of cause, reason, and purpose, but there is the viable
option that sise can substitute for sedo wherever it is
used in conjunction formation.

A word of explanation about necessary or enabling cause
and sufficient or strongly motivating cause (To be
read in relationship to section 3.5 and in particular
sections 3.5.2.1 and 3.5.2.3.)

Necessary or enabling cause is a term for a
cause-effect relationship where the cause given in
the causal conjunct is one of many events which is
a possible or enabling motivator for the resultant
action or effect. The causal conjunct says, "Since
this has happened, this effect may occur."

Sufficient or strongly motivating cause is a
term for a cause-effect relationship where the event
presented in the causal conjunct is the single event,
which, by itself, must and does precipitate
the resultant action or effect in the subsequent effect
conjunct. The sufficient cause conjunct says, "This
has happened, so now this must happen (or has happened)
as a direct and automatic result or effect of the
cause given."

The conjunctions on the left side of Table 2
(a gido, avo gido, ava sedo, aindae sedo, and aindae)
conjoin cause-effect relationships described by Lowe
(1981 ms.:31-2,34ff). The conjunctions on the right side
of Table 2 (ai resira amo, ainda tuka mo, ainda susu mo,
and ainda beká mo) conjoin grounds and evidence
relationships which Lowe (1981 ms.:33) also discusses.

3.5   Cause, Reason, Purpose

It is very difficult to separate the concepts of
purpose, cause, and reason. Webster's dictionary defines
purpose as "intention, resolution, and determination."
Donald Davidson (1968:79ff) lists two components involved
in reason: "(a) having some sort of pro attitude toward
actions of a certain kind, and (b) believing (or
knowing, perceiving, noticing, remembering) that his
action is of that kind." He proceeds to specify (a) as
including such items as wantings, desires, urges, etc.
One half of his definition of reason, namely (a) includes
the element of purpose. He further states that "the
primary reason for an action is its cause." "Causal
statements entail laws, and causal explanations involve
laws," he claims. The dictionary definitions for reason
indicate that reason is: "1. a statement ordered in
explanation or justification, 2. a rational ground or
motive, 3. a sufficient ground of explanation or
logical defence, and 4. a thing that makes some fact
intelligible." The dictionary equates reason and cause
in its definition of cause as: "1. something that brings
about an effect or result, and 2. a reason for an action
or condition." These definitions blend the three concepts
together.

Lowe (1981 ms:31ff) discusses several types of causal relationships. He (personal communication) defines strong cause as a "law-like effect that one set of affairs compels another or makes it likely." Strong cause, or sufficient cause, is that cause which is strong enough to motivate by itself the resultant action. (SO) causals encode necessary cause, a cause which enables a resultant action to occur. Another causal relationship which he mentions is evidence-grounds. The dictionary defines evidence as "outward signs, indications." I have found the dictionary definitionoof reason as an explanation or justification helpful in my analysis of Korafe reasons, explanation being defined as "something that gives the reason for or the cause of something that shows the logical development of."

Whitehead (personal communication) suggests: "cause, being law-like, does not involve a decision on the part of the actor. Reason, on the other hand, begins with the agent's thought process (reasoning ability), but the decision reached can become so binding as to be law-like, therefore, a reason can become a cause. Purpose is then, the result of the reasoning thought process without the move to cause."

Whitehead's suggestion arises out of his study of the literature and the Korafe causal system with me and appears to be approaching an approximate definition of the Korafe causal framework. That this area is important to Korafe speakers is signalled by the fact that there are five conjunctions expressing the cause-effect relationship, four conjunctions expressing the concept of reason, and four conjunctions expressing the purpose relationship. However, there is significant overlap between the usages of the various conjunctions in their respective categories. The following discussion breaks the presentation of these concepts into three areas: 1. a presentation of purpose, cause, and reason at phrase level, 2. the encoding of cause and reason at clause level and higher levels, and 3. the encoding of purposes and prevention at clause and higher levels.

3.5.1 Purpose, cause, and reason in Korafe phrases

The morpheme dae, used usually to indicate purpose, can be broken down into the components da 'locative, goal' and e 'this', or compositely 'this goal'. The morpheme dae is used to signify the syntactic indirect object, manifesting recipient or benefactive role. When both the recipient and benefactive roles occur together, there are some very important

restraints on the relational usages. 'He gave the axe
to\Michael for me' can be expressed in several ways.

(93) a. Karivako   nandae   sedo   Michael dae mutira.

         axe   me.for   saying Michael to he.gave

     b. Karivako   nandae   sedo   mutira, Michael

         axe   me.for   saying he.gave Michael

         kena.

         to/toward

   *c.   Karivako   nandae ssedo   mutira, Michael

         axe   me.for   saying he.gave Michael

         dae.

         to

     d. Karivako   Michael   dae   mutira, nandae

         axe   Michael   to   he.gave me.for

         sedo   mutira.

         saying   he.gave

     e. Karivako   nandae   sedo   Michael dae

         axe   ,   me.for   saying Michael to

         mutiri   bira.

         he.gave.DR   he.received

     f. Karivako   nandae   sedo   Michael kena

         axe   me.for   saying Michael to/toward

         mutiri   aira.

         he.gave.DR   it.went

*g. **Karivako   nandae   sedo   Michael   kena**

  axe   me.for   saying Michael   to/toward

  mutiri   bira.

  he.gave.DR he.received

The benefactive (or ultimate goal) has the mental process
sedo occurring with it ('with me in mind') whenever an
intermediary goal is present. The **dae** relationship must
always be nuclear to the clause, hence the ungrammaticality
of sentence c. The **dae** relationship evidences a stronger
recipiency relationship than **kena**, therefore sentence e.
manifests 'Michael' with a **dae** marking the recipient
relationship, which is co-referential with the verb
bira 'he received (it)'. This also explains why sentence
g. is not allowed. The **kena** marking on 'Michael' does not
strongly indicate a recipient relationship, so it may not
be co-referential with **bira**. These **dae** relationships are
all goal-oriented, relating to the semantic notion of
purposes. There are, however, clearer examples of phrase
level purpose.

(94) ...**nunda   reima   mo   daka   dae   rur-useri.**

  its   ribs   t.   limestick for   take-dp.1p.ind.

  'We took his ribs for (to make) limesticks.'

Besides encoding purpose, <u>dae</u> may also function
at the phrase level in the semantic domain of cause-reason.

(95) ...<u>nu-mo</u>   <u>uvi</u>   <u>dae</u>   <u>oju</u>

          he-t. fireflies on.account.of   fear

          <u>eraira</u>.

          do.proc.3s.ind.

          'He is afraid of fireflies.'   (The cause or

          grounds for the fear expressed is the fireflies.)

3.5.2 Cause and reason at levels above the phrase

          The following table summarizes the conjunctions
used to express cause and reason in Korafe and their
specific domains. The right group appears to be the reverse
of the left group, hence the use of B and C to indicate
the two conjuncts. The basic thought underlying the
concepts expressed in this table is that a reason(A)
is the mental motivation behind a law-like cause (B),
which then produces an effect (C).

Table 2: Korafe Cause and Reason Conjunctions

	CAUSE–EFFECT	EFFECT–REASON	
B specifically encodes:	$B \longrightarrow C$ B causes C.	$C \longleftarrow {}^{A}_{B}$ᵘ The reason A for the effect C is cause B.	${}^{A}_{B}$ encodes:
necessary cause	a gido 'seeing that' *avo gido 'seeing that contrastive potntl*	ai resira (amo) 'that says that'	internal reason
explanatory cause – explanation, justification for action C – speaker or internally oriented	ava sedo 'saying that'	ainda tuka (mo) 'the point of that' *specific-generic*	external reason
internal sufficient cause	aindae sedo 'speaking on account of that'	ainda susu (mo) 'the source of that' *generic-specific*	
external sufficient cause	aindae 'on account of that'	ainda beká (mo) 'the reality of that' *generic-specific*	

In Table 2, B and C represent propositional conjuncts
that the listed conjunctions connect. A, however,
represents the reason conjunctions: <u>ai</u> <u>resira</u> <u>amo</u>,
<u>ainda</u> <u>tuka</u> <u>mo</u>, <u>ainda</u> <u>susu</u> <u>mo</u>, and <u>ainda</u> <u>beká</u> <u>mo</u>. All
these reason conjunctions manifest in their surface
structure the element of volitional control (the morpheme
<u>i</u>), an element also present in Donaldson's definition of
primary reason. The contentcoffsthexxpasoñ+cause propo-
sition (^AB) of <u>ai</u> <u>resira</u> <u>amo</u> is co-referential with
that of the cause conjunct (B) of <u>a</u> <u>gido</u> and <u>ava</u> <u>sedo</u>.
In similar fashion, the content of the reason-cause
conjuncts (^AB) of <u>ainda</u> <u>tuka</u> <u>mo</u>, <u>ainda</u> <u>susu</u> <u>mo</u>, and <u>ainda</u>
<u>beká</u> <u>mo</u> iseco-referential in different contexts with that
of the causal conjuncts (B) of <u>ava</u> <u>sedo</u>, <u>aindae</u> <u>sedo</u>, and
<u>aindae</u>. The conjunctions <u>ainda</u> <u>tuka</u> <u>mo</u>, <u>ainda</u> <u>susu</u> <u>mo</u>,
and <u>ainda</u> <u>beká</u> <u>mo</u> appear to be used almost interchangeably.
Moreover, the borderlines between <u>a</u> <u>gido</u>, <u>ava</u> <u>sedo</u>, <u>aindae</u>
<u>sedo</u>, and <u>aindae</u> in that order are not clearly defined.
Rather, the conjunctions appear to be on a continuum, so
in some contexts, Korafe speakers may use <u>a</u> <u>gido</u> and <u>ava</u>
<u>sedo</u>, <u>ava</u> <u>sedo</u> and <u>aindae</u> <u>sedo</u>, or <u>aindae</u> <u>sedo</u> and <u>aindae</u>
interchangeably.

The conjunctions at the top of Table Two on the
left side seem to indicate a much weaker causal relation-
ship, at least in the mind of the speaker, than the ones

further down the table. Hence, a gido, a combination of
a less emphatic demonstrative form with a perception
verb, is weaker than ava sedo, which is a combination of
a contrastive demonstrative form with a performative verb.
All the other conjunctions in the table share a component
(ai). The reality of the Korafe term (ai) is somewhat
broader (than its initial definition as the semantic
actor-instrument), having the semantics of control behind
it. And in these causals and reasons, one definitely sees
an element of control operating between the events
described in the two conjuncts.

3.5.2.1 Necessary or Enabling Cause (SO)

The Korafe phrase a gido 'seeing that', spoken as
one phonological word and written by some Korafes as
agido, denotes necessary cause as the relationship the
B conjunct has to the C conjunct (the effect). There
are some rules which goven the use of a gido. The verb
forms in conjunct B may be assymetrical with those found
in conjunct C; that is: conjunct B may exhibit verbs
in the negative mode and conjunct C verbs in the imperative
mode. Both conjuncts terminate with a final, semi-final,
or existential verb form. The presupposition that a gido
embeds may not be moved to the tail position in the sentence.

The connection is an external one, verifiable by the
addressee. The conjunction a gido encodes expectancy
and keeps the thought flow established in propositionBB
moving in the same direction. Either or both of the
conjuncts may be off the main event-line of the discourse.
When that happens, they are introducing a hypothetical
situation.

(96) Jo   redae   s-ae-ri.   Damana

     not   what.for   say-not.do-e.   stars

     vit-ira,   agido   ava

     ascend.SP-tp.3s.ind.   so   that.ct.

     s-aovo   ningari   s-eteno

     say-seq.ir.2p.DR   to.hear   say-seq.r.1s.DR

     buv-evu!

     arrive.SP-tp.2p.ind.

     'I haven't spoken about anything in

     particular. The stars have gone up (the

     season has come for holding feasts), so

     I've called you together to discuss (holding

     a feast).'

(97) ...na-mo   doriri   kena   siror-useni.

     I-t.   mountain   towards   be.born-dp.1s.ind.

A.gido   na   kau   nanangedo   oka   mokogo

so   I   kind   how   fish   for.the.most.part

bambari   amo   na   bunari-ri.

to.catch   that.t.   I   not.to.know-e.

'I was born uphill (away from the ocean).

Therefore, I don't know all the ins and outs

of catching fish.'

In English, excuses usually involve strong or sufficient

causes. However, in Korafe as seen in example (97),

excuses are viewed as enabling.

There is another necessary causal phrase that is

stronger than a gido and used in marked situations: avo

gido 'seeing that significantly contrastive (event)!.

It is used two ways in one explanatory discourse (with

some hortatory elements): as a pivotal point to intro-

duce the main topicsoof the discourse and at the end of

the discourse to mention the last things the audience

should keep in mind. Below are the translations of

these sentence, rather than the interlinears, as these

sentences are quite lengthy.

Pivotal point marking topic switch in two succeeding

sentences:

(98) Our whole life style has changed. Consequently

(avo gido), moreover, we must use all our wits
to help each other.

(99) But without money, this area won't stand (on
its feet economically). Therefore (avo gido),
we who have gathered together here are
speaking about new things.

Ultimate points in the discourse:

(100) I have spoken in order that Korafes should
hear about how Popondetta is beginning
(economic development). So (avo gido),
(now) we will all speak our piece, not just
one of us.

(101) With this discussion, I've done the spadework.
So (avo gido) (now) we will all speak about
what we will do to acquire money.

3.5.2.2 Explanatory Cause

Just as there was an element of contrast in the
pivotal avo gido, so the Korafe expression that encodes
explanatory cause manifests as its conjunction the phrase
ava sedo, composed of the contrastive topic marker ava and
the speech performative verb sedo 'saying'. This is the
most heavily used cause conjunction in Korafe. Conjunct B

encodes the explanation or justification, which the speaker
deems an appropriate cause for the event in conjunct C.
Although at this point, I'm viewing conjunct B as operating
in the realm of cause, it is the causal conjunct in the set o
of four that moves the closest to coalescing with reason.
The combination of conjunct B with the conjunction ava
sedo has the same structure as the mental process
constructions, discussed in section 4.1 It definitely is
operating in the internal plane, indicating that the
speaker has some sort of belief, which he expresses in
conjunct B; he also has a pro-attitude toward that
concept. These are the two conceptual pre-requisites
that Davidson claims a primary reason has, and certainly
ava sedo is operating in the area of mental motivation.
However, ava sedo seems to be functioning as the
conjunction linking a causal explanation, "one that
involves laws," to its effect. It functions differently
from the reason conjunctions (on the right side of Table
2) in that they actually encode the reason in themselves,
not in the conjunct that precedes them, and the ava sedo
makes conjunct B into an explanation or justification.

There are several rules which apply to the use of
ava sedo. Both conjuncts must terminate with a final,
semi-final, or existential verb form, but these verbs do
not need to correspond to each other in tense or mode.

The conjunct dominated by <u>ava sedo</u> often occurs in the
tail position in a sentence; i.e. the explanation for
an event is often an afterthought.

(102)   ...<u>nangae</u>   <u>saramana</u> <u>tuturo</u>   <u>edo</u>

we.two   work   begin   do.seq.SR

<u>arera</u>,   <u>nangae</u> <u>da</u>   <u>irari</u>,

do.f.1p.ind.   we.two pos.   to.remain

<u>ava.sedo</u>.

because.of.that

'...we two will begin to work, because of
our (desire to have a good) lifestyle.'

In example (103), the entire explanation conjunct is
hypothetical and off the main line of the discourse.

(103)   ...<u>oka-i</u>   <u>omb-udo</u>   <u>irari</u>

fish-con.   catch.SP-seq.SR to.remain

<u>ava</u>   <u>kot-isira</u>.   <u>Ainda</u>   <u>beká</u>

that.ct.   think-dp.3s.ind.   of that   reality

<u>mo</u>: <u>sifo</u> <u>jo</u> <u>at-e</u>   <u>simbug-ae</u>,

t.   day   not dawn.SP-seq.IA prepare-not.do

<u>ava.sedo</u>.

because.of.that

'He thought that a fish had gotten hung up

(in the net). The reason he thought that
was because the day hadn't dawned yet (and
he couldn't see well).'

As mentioned before, there must be some element of
contrast in the <u>ava</u> <u>sedo</u> conjunction relationship, because
<u>ava</u> is a contrastive marker. It can be a syntactical
contrast: positive versus negated verb forms as example
(103) evidences. It may be a logical contrast as in the
story where 'the girl thought the spirit girl was a real
person, <u>therefore</u> (<u>ava</u> <u>sedo</u>) she took off and went fishing
with her as she would with a real person'. Conjunct C
often encodes persuasion, directed toward the textual
addressee or the speech event addressee.

Persuasion directed to the textual addressee:

(104)   <u>nanda</u> <u>yasa</u>   <u>uju</u>   <u>eraena,</u>   <u>aminda</u>

.   my   place   want   do.proc.3p.ind. there

         <u>buv-eri,</u>   <u>ava.sedo</u>   <u>nangae</u>

         arrive.SP-tp.1p.ind.   therefore   we.two

         <u>anga</u>   <u>oroko.ava</u>   <u>fug-arera.</u>

         anchor   right.now   throw.SP-f.1p.ind.

         'we have arrived at my favorite spot,

         therefore, we will heave the anchors

         right now (anchors aweigh!).'

Persuasion directed to the speech event addressee:

(105)   ...isambu   mendeni_ jo   ae   eraera.

         all   some   not   not.do   do.proc.3p.ind.

         Ava.sedo,   namonde   isambu God   da   Bible

         therefore,   we.inc.   all   God   pos. Bible

         teg-aeteri.

         read.SP-subj.1p.ind.

         '...everybody is not doing (showing love).

         Therefore, we should all read God's Bible.'

3.5.2.3   Sufficient or Strongly Motivating Cause

Sufficient cause in Korafe operates on both an external (contextual) and internal (speech event) plane. The external conjunction is made up of the controlling (agent-instrument) demonstrative ai plus the purpose marker dae, discussed in section 3.1: aindae. Here, intention is overtly marked as part of the cause, as well as control. The internal conjunction is a combination of aindae and the speech performative verb sedo 'saying'.

Some of the governing rules apply to the usage of both of these conjunctions; others only apply to one of them. Conjunct C must follow conjunct B in temporal or logical succession, even if conjunct B

occurs as the sentence tail. In contrast to all the
other causal conjunctive constructions, conjunct B may
terminate with a medial verb form as well as a semi-final
or final one. This supports the idea that aindae and
aindae sedo are marking strong causal conjuncts. The
stronger the causal relationship is viewed to be in
the Korafe world understanding, the more likely it is to
be expressed by a concatenation of medial verbs. Thus,
the Korafe expression for 'murder' is composed of 'hit.
different referent medial verb-die.final verb form' or
'perform sorcery.different referent medial verb-die.
final verb form'. In example (108), the passage of
body waste is seen as an unquestionable outcome of the
process of eating, therefore, a medial verb form was
used before aindae.

(108)   ...na   reju   ava   b-u
        I   what   that.ct.   get.SP-seq.IA

r-ise   aindae   foka
eat.LP-sim.SR   on.account.of.that   excrement

uju   ari   s-aono...
want   to.do   say-seq.ir.1s.DR

'...whatever have I eaten that I should
say that I want to defecate?'

In sentence initial position, conjunct B encodes
sufficient cause; in tail positions, it also encodes
the semantic component of explanation that is of sufficient
proportion to motivate the act. Example (109), which is a
translation of a Korafe sufficient cause construction
illustrates that.

(109)   'If you go and see him (the New Ireland Fruit

         Pigeon), you will be startled and you will

         quiver all over. The reason for that: (you

         will be thinking) how you should kill and

         eat this bird, <u>on account of this reason</u>

         (<u>aindae</u>) (you will quiver all over).'

The main difference between <u>aindae</u> and <u>aindae</u> <u>sedo</u>
is the external-internal distinction. Both conjuncts in
the <u>aindae</u> predication are easily assumed to be related
by sufficient cause in the real world context of the
speaker and addressee, so that the addressee can predict
the content of conjunct C.

(110)   <u>Nano.namendi</u>   <u>amb-earo</u>

         brothers   die.SP-seq.proc.3p.DR

aindae   dubo   vevera   ari

on.account.of.that neck   hot   do.seq.ir.3s.DR

aindae   kae   bor-earo

on.account.of.that poison   roast-seq.proc.3p.DR

siror-eraira.

be.born-proc.3s.ind.

'Brothers die, therefore, they (kinsfolk)

become upset, therefore they prepare sorcery

potions.'

In example (110), I have no trouble perceiving the causal

connection between the first two conjuncts: it is natural

for one to be upset and grieving at the death of his

brother. However, one must appreciate the Korafe real

world view to understand the sufficient causal connection

that the second aindae is conjoining. Korafes believe

that a brother has a moral obligation to pay back his

brother's death by performing retributory sorcery on a

member of the clan that caused the brother's death.

The sufficient cause manifested by aindae sedo may

not be perceived as strongly and clearly by the addressee

as sufficient cause, therefore, the speaker indicates his

causal view of the relationship between the two conjuncts

by using the speech performative verb form sedo. There

tends to be considerable overlap in usage between the two

conjunctions involving the speech performative _sedo_:
aindae sedo and _ava sedo_. _Aindae sedo_ links a sufficient
cause to its effective or resultant action. _Ava sedo_
links an explanation or justification to the effective
or resultant action.

(111)   _Na_ _tamo_ _mino_   _rur-use_   _aindae.sedo_
         I   body   response   get-sim.SR   on.account.of.that
         ghaito _a_   _tatau_
         mat   and   string.bag.for.a.baby
         _b-u_   _esimbug-erena._
         get.SP-seq.IA   prepare-pr.1s.ind.
         'I am feeling something happening in my
         body, therefore, I'm preparing a sleeping
         mat and a string bag for the baby.'

(112)   _Saki_ _nunda_ _mandi_ _siror-etira_,
         Saki his   boy   be.born-tp.3s.ind.
         aindae.sedo _oka_ _bayau_ _b-u_
         therefore   fish   food   get.SP-seq.IA
         simbug-edo   _kirumu_ _edo_...
         prepare-seq.SR   feast   do.seq.SR
         'Saki's son was born, therefore, he prepared
         food and made a feast (for his wife's male
         relatives)...'

3.5.2.4   Internal Reason

The felicitous or supporting reason motivating a necessary or explanatory cause is expressed in Korafe by the conjunction ai resira (amo or mo) 'that says that'. The internal reason construction is composed of three parts: the first conjunct being an effect (C), the conjunction which encodes the reason (A) for that effect (C): ai resira amo, and the conjunct (B) which arises from that reason and is the cause for the action in the first conjunct. In example (113), the second conjunct (conjunct A:B) encodes the semantic component of evidence as well as that of an enabling reason.

(113)   Nu-mo   ungobu   ghae   fas-e
        he-t.   afternoon   with   lie.down-seq.IA

av-iraira.   Ai   re-s-ira
sleep-proc.3s.ind.   that.con.   dur.-say-pr.3s.ind.

amo: nu-mo   uvi   dae
that.t.   he-t.   fireflies   on.account.of

oju   eraira.
fear   do.proc.3s.ind.

'He lies down and sleeps in the late afternoon. That implies that he fears fireflies (that come out at night).

Because of its length, I will just give the translation of example (114).

> (114)   'I have closed down boat and air traffic.
>
>   The reason for that is (ai resira amo)   that
>
>   people are going to Tufi and mocking the
>
>   Korafe people in the suffering that they're
>
>   experiencing. Therefore (ava sedo),   I
>
>   have closed down all boat and air traffic.'

The internal aspect of this reason conjunction is manifested morphologically by the speech performative verb form resira 'it says', used as the central component in this reason conjunction. It is obvious from these examples that the reason for the effects of 'the cassowary bird sleeping in the late afternoon and at night' and 'the district commissioner's closing down boat and air traffic' is totally in the mind of the speaker, and the hearer cannot possibly deduce it from this information given in conjunct C in sentence initial position.

3.5.2.5   External Reason

There are three conjunctions which are used to motivate the causes that ava sedo, aindae sedo, and aindae presuppose in different contexts. They are

ainda tuka (mo) 'the point of that', ainda susu (mo) 'the
source of that', and ainda beka (mo) 'the reality (truth)
of that'. That these conjunctions are external (joining
propositions which the addressee can logically connect
without reference to the speaker's internal point of view)
is evident in their morphology; they occur without any
form of the speech performative verb 'saying'. They
set up reasons, which motivate causes which lead to
effects, which are predictable in and consistent with the
Korafe view of the real world. These three conjunctions
are used seemingly interchangeably to signify the third
and fourth dictionary definitions of reason: "3. a
sufficient ground of explanation or logical defence, and
4. a thing that makes some fact intelligible." Like
the internal reason construction, they are tri-partite:
the first conjunct (C) encodes an effect, the conjunction
encodes the reason (A) for that effect (C) and motivates
the cause in the second conjunct which is so strongly
tied to the reason that I have labelled it conjunct (^AB),
as per Lowe's suggestion. The following examples illustrate
how the reason conjunctions are used in combination with
the causal conjunctions in sentences.

(115) Jingabu   da   javo   s-arera,   na

snake   pos. name   say-f.3p.ind.   I

sorara arena,   ainda. tuka.mo:

cry   do.f.1s.ind.   the.point.of.that

afa   jingabu nunda kae   usira,

father   snake   his   poison   do.dp.3s.ind.

ava.sedo   na barago ava   erira.

therefore I   also   that.ct. do.pr.3s.ind.

'If they will mention the word, snake, I

will cry; the reason for that is that snakes

were my father's poison, therefore I do the

same thing.'

(116) Nunda ata   g-aresa   amo,   gegha

its   legs see.SP-f.2s.ind.   that.t. laugh

s-aresa.   Ainda. bekä.mo: nu

say-f.2s.ind.   the.reality.of.that   spec.

ata   memeyako g-aresa,   aindae.sedo

legs   short   see.SP-f.2s.ind.   because.of.that

'If you see its legs, you will laugh. The

reason for that: you will see it (has)

short legs, because of that (you will laugh).'

(117) Amo   gegenembo uju   beká   eraera.

that.t.   men   want   truly   do.proc.3p.ind.

Ainda.susu: gegenembo isambu rika

the.source.of.that men   all   bird

emo   ne   b-udo   digh-ido

this   they get.SP-seq.SR   tie.SP-seq.SR

yaru   divari   dae   sedo

song   to.dance.and.sing pur.   saying

aindae   uju   eraera.

therefore   want   do.proc.3p.ind.

'Men desire that (bird) very much. The
explanation for that: all men take this
bird, tie together (its feathers) in order
to dance, therefore, they want it.'

As a statistical note, ava sedo is the only causal con-
junction that occurs overtly in constructions with the
reason conjunction ainda tuka mo. Although ava sedo does
occur with ainda beká mo, aindae and aindae sedo are used
more frequently with this reason conjunction.

3.6 Purpose and Prevention

The simplest expression of purpose or intention in Korafe is found in the purpose phrase, composed of an infinitive verbal form and the purpose clitic <u>dae</u> discussed in section 3.1.

(118) <u>uvu</u>   <u>gut-ari</u>   <u>dae</u>

       water   bathe-to.do   pur.

       'in order to bathe, with the intention of bathing'

Anticipation is designated by the purpose phrase plus some form of the verb 'do'.

(119) <u>Na</u> <u>yari-dae</u>   <u>erena</u>.

       I   to.go-pur.   do.pr.1s.ind.

       'I'm about to go. (I'm getting ready to go.)'

Desire is also expressed in the same construction.

(120) <u>Ghato</u>, <u>na</u> <u>uvu</u>   <u>mindari</u> <u>dae</u>   <u>erena</u>.

       cousin   I   water   to.eat   pur.   do.pr.1s.ind.

       'Cousin, I want a drink of water.'

There are two parameters that occur in connection
with purpose, the parameter of the presuppositional status
of the purpose and that of focus on the mental intention
of the speaker. When the speaker is emphasizing the
presuppositional nature of his purpose, thus giving more
force to it, he adds <u>aindae</u> 'for that reason, purpose'
to the purpose phrase. If he is focussing on his intention,
he adds the performative verb <u>sedo</u> 'saying' to the purpose
phrase. Table 3 illustrates these parameters.

Table 3: Parameters of Purpose

	simple purpose	mental intention of speaker in focus
no marked presuppositional status	<u>dae</u>	<u>dae</u> <u>sedo</u>
marked presuppositional status	<u>dae</u> <u>aindae</u>	<u>dae</u> <u>sedo</u> <u>aindae</u>

The presuppositional forces is probably introduced in
example (121), because this sentence is discourse initial.

(121)   <u>Na</u> <u>boare</u> <u>dari</u>   <u>dae</u>   <u>aindae</u>

         I   tatoo   to.hit   pur.   on.account.of.that

usena...

do.dp.1s.SF

'When I was about to be tatooed...'

(122) _taima_ _da_   _ambe_ _j-edo_   _dari_

bush   pos. sago   chop.SP-seq.SR   to.hit

dae   _sedo_   _aera_.

pur.   saying go.SP.tp.1p.ind.

'We went, intending to chop down and beat

sago in the bush.'

(123) ..._yaru_ _divari_   _dae_   _sedo_

song   to.sing.and.dance pur.   saying

aindae   _uju_   _eraera_.

on.account.of.that   want do.proc.3p.ind.

'...they want (it) for the intended purpose

of making a singsing!'

All of the above examples illustrate a purpose that
the speaker himself intends to execute. When the speaker
intends for someone else to perform the action (someone
other than the referent manifested by the subject of the
clause following the purpose expression), he substitutes
a sequential irrealis (or future) different referent medial

form or a hortative form for the infinitive in the purpose
expression, which then more closely resembles a purpose
clause.

(124)   ...oka   naufasa   ava   b-udo
        fish   enormous   that.ct.   get.SP-seq.SR

f-ur-ari   gay-one

come.LP-dur.-seq.ir.3s.DR   spear.SP-h.1s

dae   erira.

pur.   do.pr.3s.ind.

'It's doing (the wind's blowing) in order
that it may bring me a large fish that I
will spear.'

(125)   ...ava   ning-aso   dae
        that.ct.   hear.SP-seq.ir.2s.DR   pur.

re-s-ena.

dur.-say-pr.1s.ind.

'...I am speaking in order that you might
hear that.'

In Korafe, prevention constructions closely resemble
purpose constructions. In fact, prevention could also
be entitled negative purpose for Korafe data. The verb

that terminates the prevention conjunct has the form of
a negative hortative medial or final form. The sentential
negators (era, erama, erua, eruama: durative irrealis
forms of the sequential same referent medial form of 'do')
that occurs with the negative hortative forms is optionally
present at the onset of the prevention construction.

(126)..ne   jo   uju   ae-ri   nenda   enda

     they   not   want   not.do-e. their   land

     gitofu   imi   b-eoro   dae

     enemy   con.t.   get.SP-seq.neg.h.3p.DR   pur.

     sedo   aindae   fakina edo

     saying on.account.of.that   power   do.seq.SR

     gh-useri.

     continue-dp.3p.ind.

     '...they didn't want their enemies to take

     their land, so they strengthened themselves.'

(127)   Erama   noi   numamo

        do.seq.dur.ir.SR   his.mother   his.father

        mandi   amo   doy-eovo,   nu

        boy   that.t. let.SP-seq.neg.h.2p.DR   he

        town da y-eure   dae   re-s-ena.

        town to go.LP-neg.h.3s. pur.   dur.-say.pr.1s.ind.

        'I am telling you parents not to let that

        (expelled) boy go to town.'

3.7 Comparison and Pretense

Halliday and Hasan (1976) discuss two different

types of comparison: (a) comparative reference, which is

subsumed as identity, similarity, and difference, and

(b) nominal substitution, which evidences similarity.

They (p. 95) indicate, "In reference there is a

total referential identity between the reference item and

that which it presupposes; nothing is to be added to the

definition. In substitution there is always some re-

definition. Substitution is used precisely where the

reference is not identical, or there is at least some

new specification to be added." They (p. 115) further

specify that some area of contrast is implied in

substitution: "Like the nominal substitute 'one',

the verbal substitute 'do' is typically associated with

contrast."

In Korafe, the distinction between referential

and substitutional similarity is reflected in the

two sets of comparative expressions that are used.

One set evidences the normal topic amo, which keeps

the flow of discourse moving in the same direction.

The other set uses the contrastive topic marker ava.

Both amo and ava are suffixed with the comparison

relational go, used as a focus comparative marker,

or the comparison relational ga, used with thematic

elements in a clause or sentence. The resulting comparatives
aminga 'like that' and amingo 'like that (with focus or
comment elements in clause or sentence)' indicate
comparative reference. The comparatives, with an element
of contrast, avavaga, avaga[12] 'like that' and avavago, avago
'like that (with focus or comment elements in clause or
sentence)' indicate substitutional similarity or similarity
with contrast.

(128)   Nunda   kau   mo   soini   amingo-ri.

        its   kind t.   flies   like.that-e.

        'Its appearance is like that of the flies.'

(129)   ...iji   dabako   o   etoto   aminga

        day   one   or two   like.that

        dadab-eari...

        finish-seq.proc.3s.DR

(130)   Osevi,   nu   gari   da

        Keeled.Anglehead.Lizard   it   to.see pos.

        kau   arada   avago-ri,

        kind   Spotted.Monitor.Lizard   like.that-e.

        avata   osevi   nu   kiki   tefo-ri.

        but   spec. traditional.use nothing-e.

        'The Keeled Anglehead Lizard looks about like

        the Spotted Monitor Lizard, but it doesn't

have any traditional use.'

(131) <u>Aya</u>   <u>afa</u>   <u>datu.eraera</u>
       mother   father   make.marriage.and.bride.price
                         arrangements.proc.3p.ind.

       <u>avaga</u>   <u>kotugo</u>   <u>eminda</u>
       like.that   on.the.other.hand   here

       <u>datu</u> <u>jo</u>   <u>ae</u>   <u>useri</u>.
            not   not.do   do.dp.3s.ind.

'Mother and father normally make the marriage
arrangements and fix the bride price, but
we didn't make marriage and bride price
arrangements like that here.'

As the above examples demonstrate, the noun <u>kau</u>
'kind, likeness' is often used in comparison conjunction.
It combines with <u>daba</u> 'same one' and the contrastive
topic marker <u>ava</u>, as well as the demonstrative comparative
form <u>aminga</u> in some contexts. The resultant expressions
are <u>kau</u> <u>daba</u> <u>ava</u> 'that same kind', <u>kau</u> <u>daba</u> <u>avo</u> 'that same
kind (with focus or comment elements in sentence or clause)',
and <u>kau</u> <u>daba</u> <u>aminga</u> <u>ava</u> 'like that very one'.

(132)   Abua.mane   ne   isoro   kau   nu   David

        ancestors   spec.   war   kind spec.   David

        edo   gh-usira,   kau   daba

        do.seq.SR   continue-dp.3s.ind.   kind   one

        ava   edo   gh-useri.

        that.ct.   do.seq.SR   continue-dp.3p.ind.

        '(Our) ancestors conducted warfare just

        like David did.'

(133)   Kefata   nu   kau   daba

        long.fighting.club   spec.   kind   one

        avo-ri.

        that.contrastive.focus-e.

        'The long fighting club is just like

        that (very hard).'

(134)   Kau   daba   aminga   ava   Gaso

        kind one   like.that   that.ct. Gaso

        nengae   Tevari   ghae   vasai

        they.two   Tevari   with   trading.partner

        da   kirumu   eraera.

        pos.   feast   do.proc.3p.ind.

        (The preceding paragraph describes at great

length how the Bubu clan conducts its trading

partner feast with the Bujeje clan.) *In

that very same way, the Gaso clan together

with the Tevari clan conduct their trading

partner feast.'

Clausal pretense is manifested in Korafe by a

phrase, composed of an infinitive form of the verb, a

possessive relator and the word __kaugo__ 'like'.

(135)   __Ni__   __redae__   __bunari__   __da__   __kaugo__

     you   why   not.to.know   pos.   like

     __eresi?__

     do.pr.2s.q.

     'Why are you acting like you don't know?'

(136)   __John__   __sasingu__   __dari__   __da__   __kaugo__

     John   children   to.hit   pos.   like

     __etira.__

     do.tp.3s.ind.

     'John acted as if he were going to hit

     the children.'

When intention is involved in the pretense, the simultaneous irrealis (future) form of the medial verb is combined with the form arigo, which literally means 'like doing'.

(137) Ni   redae bun-ise   ari-go
       you   why   not.know-sim.SR to.do-like

       eresi?
       do.pr.2s.q.

       'Why are you pretending you don't know?'

(138) ...afa   Susugayari jimbi r-irurari
          father   Susugayari tail   eat.LP-sim.ir.3s.DR

       aya   Daisi Kotari gifua mindari dae
       mother Daisi Kotari head   to.eat   pur.

       ururari   ari-go   ere-gar-ena.
       do.sim.ir.3s.DR to.do-like dun-spear.LP-pr.1s.ind.

       'I'm spearing (fish) daydreaming (to myself)
       (or pretending) that my dad, Susugayari,
       might eat the tail, and my mother, Daisi
       Kotari, will eat the head.'

When a speaker recounts an event in the past that at that event time he misperceived, he uses the infinitive

of a mental process verb like _sari_ 'to say' or _kotari_
'to think' and the contrastive topic clitic _va_, which
in this context indicates contraexpectation.

(139)   _Nu_ _fuka_ _gayari_   _va_   _s-eteni_.

      he   pig   to.spear   ct.   say-tp.1s.ind.

      'I said (thought) that he speared the pig,

      (but he didn't).'

(140)   _Na_ _nu_ _avari_   _va_   _kot-iseni_.

      I   he   to.sleep   ct.   think-dp.1s.ind.

      'I thought that he was sleeping, (but

      he wasn't).'

(141)   ..._nunda_ _kotari_   _mo:_ _nunda_ _evetu_ _va_

      his   to.think   t.   his   woman   ct.

      s-etira.

      say-tp.3s.ind.

      '...his thinking was: he said that she was

      his wife, (but she wasn't).'

4.0 Quotations and Reported Speech

In Korafe, direct quotations, repartee, indirect quotations and reported speech are for the most part manifested by mental process constructions.

4.1 Mental Process Constructions

Lowe (1981 ms.:65) states, "Direct speech gives a verbatim (i.e. word for word) report of what a speaker actually said." The Korafe mental process sentence manifests the semantic concept of direct speech. It is described in "Korafe Grammar Essentials" (Farr and Farr 1974 ms.) as being a three-part structure: (a) a mental process proposition which concludes with some form of a cognitive verb, (b) a direct quotation that may encode an actual speech act or a thought which the speaker has, and (c) a second mental process proposition with a cognitive verb like 'say', 'question', 'report', 'think', 'teach', 'want', 'be unaware of', etc. Either the first or the second mental process proposition may be deleted. The following example illustrates two mental process sentences conjoined paratactically into one sentence that illustrates the repartee calculus (Longacre.1972:78-9), commonly termed dialogue.

(142)   S-etiri,   1.) na bun-edo

        say-seq.r.3s.DR   I   not.know-seq.SR

        s-isena,   "Afa,   tuka   redae

        say-dp.1s.SF   father   point   why

        aming-eresi?"   s-isena,

        do.that-pr.2s.q.   say-dp.1s.SF

        2.) afa   s-isira,   "Jingabu   nanda

             father say-dp.3s.ind.   snake   my

        kae-ri,"   s-isira.

        poison-e. say-dp.3s.ind.

        'After he spoke, 1.) I ignorantly said,

        "Father, why are you acting that way?" I

        said, and 2.) father said, "Snakes are my

        poison," he said.

(143)   "Nanda   ata   gafug-edo   fug-evu!"

        my   foot   cut.off-seq.SR   throw.SP-2p.imp.

        s-iseni.

        say-dp.1s.ind.

        '"Cut off my foot and throw it away!" I said.'

These examples occur within a single sentence boundary,
but the mental process construction also functions across
sentences. Actually, the first clause in example (142)
is a verbal copy of the final mental process proposition
in a preceding quotation. Both of the above examples

occur without demonstrative embedding conjunctions and appear to be paratactic in accordance with the structural definition of parataxis for Korafe presented in section 1.3, as each proposition manifests either a final or semi-final verb and the three propositions are immediately juxtaposed.

However, the Korafe mental process sentence can be modified in one of two ways, either of which subordinates one section to the other. The initial mental process proposition can be followed by a normal topic marker amo in a structure that resembles equivalence (see section 3.2.2, example (81)). Grimes (1975:69-70) discusses quotations as a subset of collateral information, background information, or evaluations. When amo occurs with the initial mental process proposition, it is often encoding evaluation.

(144) Na ere-kot-ena   amo,   saramana

I re.-think-pr.1s.ind. that.t. work

arera,   amo   eveva-go-ri.

do.f.1p.ind. that.t. good-like-e.

'I think it's good to do work.'

(145) ...na s-iseni   amo,   "Gego-á

I say-dp.1s.ind that.t. nothing-that

erira;   nange.ari   na oka

do.pr.3s.ind. what.do.seq.ir.3s.DR I fish

     beka   eni-ko   gay-ae   y-aone

     true   one-exc.   spear.SP-not.do   go.LP-h.1s

     dae   erira!"   s-edo...

     pur.   do.pr.3s.ind. say-seq.SR

     'I said, "That (sleepiness I'm feeling) is

     really nothing; what must I do in order that

     I don't go (home) without spearing one single

     fish!" saying...'

Besides the evaluation of the first clause, example (145)
also encodes a rhetorical question, which Grimes subsumes
under collateral information.

The speaker may also convert the paratactic mental
process construction to a hypotactic one by embedding
the central proposition of the speech act with a con-
trastive topic marker ava, which follows it. When this
configuration occurs, the direct quote section is often
encoding background or collateral information. In the
following sentence (146), it is indicating background in-
formation to bring the reader of the story up to date
on the status of the fish.

    (146) ...kot-edo,   "Emo   vos-aira

           think-seq.SR   this.t. descend.SP-top.3s.ind.

amb-ira,"   ava   s-ise

die.SP-tp.3s.ind.   that.ct.   say-sim.SR

anumb-ir-iseni.

sit-remain-dp.1s.ind.

'...thinking to myself,   "This (fish) has

sunk down and died,"   I was seated (there)

saying that.

Korafe speakers sometimes replace the ava in these sen-
tences with aminge 'doing that way'. The ava denotes
that the quote is subordinate to the speech act, but the
aminge says something about the nature of the speech act.
Just as aminga and amingo imply a more precies referential
correlation than avavaga and avavago do, so aminge implies
that the speaker is more nearly approximating the actual
words which were used in the corresponding speech events
in the real world.

(147)   Sifia   gimasa   g-ido   s-etira,

        Sifia   young.man   see.SP-seq.SR   say-tp.3s.ind.

        "Agá,   o   gagara   avejo-ri?"   aming-e

        Wow!   that   girl   who-e.   do.that.way- seq.IA

        s-etiri...

        say-seq.r.3s.DR

                    'Sifia, the young man, saw (her) and said,

                    "Wow! who is that girl?" he spoke thus...'

The cataphoric form of __aminge__ may be used in the mental

process construction before the direct quote. The

following example (148), which comes from a legend,

demonstrates the precise nature of the __aminge__/__eminge__

set of verbs. The direct quote is a rigid pattern that

is repeated in the legend, so one would expect it to

be quoted more precisely as it is well established in

the oral tradition.

(148) __Kori   mo   eming-e   s-etira__,

       shout   t.   do.this.way-seq.IA say-tp.3s.ind.

       "__Susugayari__, __nearo   Daisi   Kotari   evia__

       Susugayari   your.wife   Daisi   Kotari   this.ct.

       __d-odo   erese-re__!"

       leave.SP-seq.SR go.pr.2s.ind.-im.

       'She shouted this way, "Susugayari, you're

       leaving behind this your wife here, Daisi

       Kotari, at this very moment!"

Korafe speakers prefer to use the __aminge__/__eminge__ forms when

translating Jesus' direct quotes in the New Testament. When

they are indirectly quoting someone, they use the __ava__ form.

4.2   Reported Speech

Lowe (1981 ms:65) states that "indirect speech is to some degree or other, an interpretation." The subject in the mental process proposition is co-referential with the first person references within the direct quote. The object in the mental process proposition is co-referential with second person references within the direct quote, but co-referentiality is manifested by identical elements in indirect speech.

(149) (a.)   He said to me, "I'll see you tomorrow."

(b.)   He said to me that he would see me today. In example (149 a.), 'he' is co-referential with 'I', and 'me' is co-referential with 'you'. In (149 b.), 'he' co-references 'he', and 'me' with 'me'.

Korafe encodes indirect speech in three ways. The first two demonstrate hypotactic conjunction. All of them have the the common property of making the indirect speech the object in the sentence and placing the subject of the speech event before the reported speech and the mental process verb after the reported speech.

Reported speech = ± subject +reported speech + mental
process proposition

The usual construction encoding reported speech
that does not involve some kind of intention and purpose
is to use the mental process construction with _ava_
and to identify the referents with identity co-referencing
devices.

(150)   Nu   usira,   ava   s-etira.

        he   do.dp.3s.ind.   that.ct.   say-tp.3s.ind.

        'He said that he did (it).

(151)   ...nuvu   rea   etira   ava

             her.husband   what   do.3s.ind.   that.ct.

        s-etiri   ning-ira.

        say-seq.r.3s.DR   hear.SP-tp.3s.ind.

        '...he told her what her husband had done,

        and she heard.'

When the speech act involves intention or purpose
that an action be performed, the construction used is a
purpose one with a mental process proposition following it.

(152)   Na,   gagara fitari dae   s-etero,

        I   girl   to.put pur. say-seq.r.3p.DR

        d-odo   re-f-ena.

        leave.SP-seq.SR   dur-come.LP-pr.1s.ind.

        'They said that their clan member would marry

the girl, and I left and came home.'

However, there is one example where indirect
speech manifests a personal referencing system which
resembles the person switches that occur in direct speech.
In example (153), the speaker is saying that someone else
said that he wasn't there. In this example, the subject
of the quote is co-referential with speaker in the real
world speech event, rather than the speaker-subject of
the textual speech event: (A, who presents the discourse,
says) that B (context speaker) said that A was not there.

(153)   Lucas,   na   aminda   tefo,   s-etiri...
        Lucas   I   there   nothing   say-seq.r.3s.DR
        'Lucas said that I wasn't there...'

The subject, Lucas, is separated from his action,
setiri 'he spoke'. In the typical mental process con-
struction, 'Lucas said' would occur as one unit before
or after the quotation, so this construction is definitely
reported speech. Because the reported speech separates
the subject and verb in much the same way that an object
would in this SOV language, one is tempted to call it an

object, but it doesn't have the contrastive topic marker
to embed it and make it a hypotactic construction like the
other reported, non-intentional speech pattern does. The
whole construction needs further explanation; it is
unambiguously an indirect quote, but it does not manifest
hypotactic conjunctions in the same way that other types
of reported speech do.

5.0 Conclusion

The Indian philosopher, Tagore, is reported to have
said, "The intellectual that is sharp, but not broad gets
stuck at every point and doesn't get any further." This
paper has been an attempt to give an overview of Korafe
conjunctions, penetrating deep enough into the system to
be coherent, but not getting stuck on the individual
conjunctions. Further study might reveal that it's very
worthwhile to get stuck on the adversative, the cause-
reason, or the comparison set of conjunctions. But for
now, that's all for Korafe conjunctions.

Footnotes

[1]Korafe is a Non-Austronesian language of the Trans-New Guinea phylum. It belongs to the Binandere family. It is spoken by the 3,000 or so Korafe people living on the headlands of Cape Nelson around the Tufi sub-provincial headquarters and also by those Korafe people living and working in the towns and population centers of Papua New Guinea.

Korafe is an SOV language with a strong tendency to topicalize the subject (or object). The phonemes of the language are: /a/, /a̧/, /b/, /d/, /e/, /ȩ/, /f/, /g/, /g/ written as 'gh', /i̧/, /i/, /j/, /k/, /m/, /n/, /o/, /o̧/, /r/, /s/, /t/, /u/, /u̧/, /v/, and /y/.

The data for this paper were gathered on field trips by the author and her husband to Korafe villages between 1972 and 1981. This paper was written under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics at a field workshop held in 1981 at Ukarumpa in the Eastern Highlands Province of Papua New Guinea.

A concordance of 61,053 morphemes taken from oral and written Korafe texts was used in the analysis done for this paper. The concordance was prepared at the Ukarumpa Computer Laboratory.

Footnotes   (continued)

[2]Medial verbs which evidence a quasi or approximate tense marking system usually demonstrate a realis-irrealis distinction. The medial verbs that are non-finite do not indicate the realis-irrealis distinction in their morphology. Affixation in the medial verb system includes the following temporal aspects: succession, overlap, repetition, punctiliar aspect and/or durative aspect. The tense

Footnotes (continued)

marking system on the medial verbs is a cataphoric one in
that each verb in the clause cluster points to and depends
on the ultimate semi-final or final verb in its series to
give it a temporal value in the real world. Besides the
temporal desinences affixed to the medial verbs, referen-
tial desinences also occur as medial verb affixes. These
affixes monitor the reference system in the clause cluster
by cataphorically indicating whether or not the topic-
subject on one clause will be co-referential with the
topic-subject in the subsequent clause.

[3]List of Abbreviations:

con.	control
ct.	contrastive topic
dur.	durative aspect
dp.	distant past tense
DR	different referent desinence on medial verb
e.	existential verb
exc.	exclusive
f.	future tense
frus.	frustrative marker
h.	hortative mode
IA	integral action desinence on medial verb
im.	immediacy of action marker on verbs
imp.	imperative mode

Footnotes   (continued)

inc.	inclusive
ind.	indicative mode
ir.	irrealis aspect desinence on medial verb
LP	long process stem of verb
neg.	negative mode
np.	near past tense
p.	general past tense used with medial verb
pos.	possessive
pr.	present tense
proc.	procedural or gnomic tense/aspect
pur.	purpose
q.	question mode (used with content questions)
r.	realis aspect desinence on medial verb
seq.	sequential desinence on medial verb
SF	semi-final form of verb
sim.	simultaneous desinence on medial verb
SP	short process stem of verb
spec.	specifying pronoun indicating contrast in set
SR	same referent desinence on medial verb
subj.	subjunctive tense/aspect
t.	topic marker
tp.	today's past tense/perfect aspect
yp.	yesterday's past tense

Footnotes (continued)

1s.   first person singular person marking

2s.   second person singular person marking

3s.   third person singular person marking

1p.   first person plural person marking

2p.   second person plural person marking

3p.   third person plural person marking

[4]As far as I know, Korafe is the only language in the Binandere family that maintains this semi-final/final distinction. The others studied by my colleagues all manifest only the '-a' desinence in the indicative mode. The switch to '-i' is used in the Binandere language family to signal the question mode, the form the verb takes when a content question word (r-word or n-word for Korafe) is used in the sentence. Korafe is unusual in that past tense indicative forms occur with this '-i' desinence.

[5]This terminology was suggested by Ivan Lowe.

[6]Korafe demonstrative roots are e 'this, near speaker', a 'that, near addressee' and o 'that, distal'. To these root forms can be added clitics that indicate topic (mo), contrastive topic (va), control (i), and controlling topic (imi). Other clitics may follow these basic ones. See Farr and Whitehead manuscript and Farr, Lowe, and Whitehead manuscript.

Footnotes   (continued)

	Proximal	Medial	Distal
topic	emo	amo	omo
contrast	evia	ava	ovia
control	ei	ai	oi
controlling topic	eimi	aimi	oimi

[7]The wording 'discourse clock time' was suggested by Ivan Lowe.

[8]There are four criteria that help to determine the boundaries of a Korafe sentence:

1.) a marked fall in intonation.

2.) devoicing of the last syllables.

3.) a breath pause.

4.) a final verb form.

Three of these criteria must be present at the conclusion of a sentence.

[9]Haiman (1978:584) uses the term resumptive topic to mean a topic "established by previous contexts." Thus, the Korafe amo, that often has anaphoric reference, could be considered a resumptive topic. However, it also can be used to introduce the topic at the discourse onset. Therefore, it is best to consider it as a normal topic marker, moving the discourse along in the same direction.

[10]Many Korafe speakers delete the amo between the protasis and the apodosis, so that the structures take the syntactic shape of those discussed in section 2.4.

Footnotes (continued)

However, our present language instructor, Warrington Isari, feels that the inclusion of <u>amo</u> between the protasis and apodosis reflects more correct or proper Korafe. The situation parallels the English grammar school children's use in the classroom as opposed to that they use on the playing field.

[11] Ivan Lowe suggested the symbolization (^{A}B) to describe the relationship between reason and cause.

[12] Douglas Parrington (personal communication) states that Ewage, a language related to Korafe, has two related topic markers <u>awa</u> and <u>awawa</u>. One of the distinctions between them is the singular-plural one, i.e. the reduplicated form signals plurality. This may have been the original distinction between the Korafe forms <u>avaga</u> and <u>avavaga</u>. However, that distinction has blurred in current usage. In fact, some speakers, like Warrington Isari, do not have <u>avago</u> and <u>avaga</u> (the "singular" forms) in their vocabulary.

Bibliography

Bee, Darlene L. 1973. Neo-Tagmemics. Ukarumpa, Papua
    New Guinea: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Beekman, John and Callow, John. 1979. Part I of the
    semantic structure of written communication. Pre-
    publication drafe (4th revision). Available from
    the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Huntington
    Beach, California.

Callow, Kathleen. 1974. Discourse considerations in
    translating the Word of God. Grand Rapids: The
    Zondervan Corporation.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness,
    definiteness, subjects, topics, and points of view.
    Subject and topic, ed. by Charles N. Li, 16-22.
    New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Colburn, Mike. 1980. Erima disjunction. Syntax and
    semantics, ed. by Karl J. Franklin, 15-28.
    Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Davidson, Donald. 1978. Actions, reasons, and causes.
    The philosophy of action, ed. by Alan R. White,
    79-94. Oxford: The Oxford University Press.

Deibler, Ellis. 1971. Uses of the verb "to say" in
    Gahuku. Kivung 4, no. 2:101-110.

Dik, Simon C. 1978. Functional grammar. Amsterdam:
    North-Holland Publishing Company.

Dik, Simon C. 1980. Studies in functional grammar.
    London: Academic Press, Inc.

Farr, Cynthia J.M. 1976. I don't know whether I'm
    coming or going: a study of some usages of 'come'
    and 'go' in Korafe. Kivung 9, no. 2:126-55.

Farr, Cynthia J.M., Lowe, Ivan, and Whitehead, Carl R.
    1981. Topic, contrast, and control in Korafe.
    Unpublished manuscript in SIL archives at Ukarumpa.

Farr, Cynthia J.M. and Whitehead, Carl R. 1981. This,
    that, and the other. Unpublished manuscript in
    SIL archives at Ukarumpa.

Bibliography (continued)

Farr, James B. and Cynthia J.M. 1975. Some features of
    Korafe morphology. Pacific Linguistics, C, 29:
    731-69.

Farr, James B. and Cynthia J.M. 1975. Korafe grammar
    essentials. Unpublished manuscript in SIL
    archives at Ukarumpa.

Grimes, Joseph E. 1975. The thread of discourse. The
    Hague: Mouton and Co.

Haiman, John. 1978. Conditionals are topics. Language 54,
    no. 3:564-89.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1976. Cohesion
    in English. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Hopper, Paul J. 1979. Aspect and foregrounding in
    discourse. Syntax and semantics 12, ed. by Talmy
    Givon, 213-41. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Kempson, Ruth M. 1975. Presupposition and the delimitation
    of semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kroll, B. 1977. Combining ideas in written and spoken
    English: a look at subordination and coordination.
    Discourse across time and space, ed. by Edward O.
    Keenan and T.L. Bennett. Los Angeles: University
    of Southern California.

Lakoff, Robin. 1971. If's, and's, and but's about con-
    junction. Studies in linguistic semantics, ed. by
    Charles J. Fillmore and D. Terence Langendoen, 115-
    49. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

Longacre, Robert E. 1972. Hierarchy and universality of
    discourse constituents in New Guinea languages:
    discussion. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Longacre, Robert E. 1976. An anatomy of speech notions.
    Ghent: The Peter de Ridder Press.

Lowe, Ivan. 1981. Some features of narrative discourse.
    Unpublished manuscript.

Bibliography   (continued)

Lyons, John. 1977. Semantics 2. Cambridge: Cambridge
        University Press.

McCarthy, Joy M.   On gapping and the order of constituents.
        Linguistic Inquiry 3:101-8.

Parrington, Douglas. 1980. The functions of the Ewage
        demonstrative awa 'that' and awawa 'those'.
        Unpublished manuscript in SIL archives at Ukarumpa.

Reesink, Ger. 1978. Conjunctions in Usan. Unpublished
        manuscript in SIL archives at Ukarumpa.

Reesink, Ger. 1981. On subordination in some Papuan
        languages. Unpublished manuscript presented to
        the annual congress of the Linguistic Society of
        Papua New Guinea in September of 1981.

Reis, Marge. 1978. Further and's and but's about
        conjunction. CLS 10:539-50.

Schachter, Paul. 1973. Focus and relativization.
        Language 49, no. 1:19-46.

Stalnacker, Robert C. 1972. Pragmatics. Semantics
        of natural language, ed. by D. Davidson and
        C. Harman. 380-97. Dordrecht, Holland: D.
        Reidel Publishing Company.

Stalnacker, Robert C. 1978. Assertion. Syntax and
        semantics 9, ed. by Peter Cole, 315-331.
        New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Thurman, R. C. Chuave medial verbs. Unpublished
        manuscript in SIL archives at Ukarumpa.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. 1976. Springfield,
        Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam Company.

Wurm, S., Laycock, D. and Voorhoeve, C.L. 1975. General
        Papuan characteristics. Pacific Linguistics C 38:
        171-39. Canberra: School of Pacific Studies

A word of explanation about necessary or enabling cause
and sufficient or strongly motivating cause (To be
read in relationship to section 3.5 and in particular
sections 3.5.2.1 and 3.5.2.3.)

Necessary or enabling cause is a term for a
cause-effect relationship where the cause given in
the causal conjunct is one of many events which is
a possible or enabling motivator for the resultant
action or effect. The causal conjunct says, "Since
this has happened, this effect may occur."
Sufficient or strongly motivating cause is a
term for a cause-effect relationship where the event
presented in the causal conjunct is the single event,
which, by itself, must and does precipitate
the resultant action or effect in the subsequent effect
conjunct. The sufficient cause conjunct says, "This
has happened, so now this must happen (or has happened)
as a direct and automatic result or effect of the
cause given."
The conjunctions on the left side of Table 2
(a gido, avo gido, ava sedo, aindae sedo, and aindae)
conjoin cause-effect relationships described by Lowe
(1981 ms.:31-2,34ff). The conjunctions on the right side
of Table 2 (ai resira amo, ainda tuka mo, ainda susu mo,
and ainda beká mo) conjoin grounds and evidence
relationships which Lowe (1981 ms.:33) also discusses.