LOGICAL RHETORICAL PREDICATES IN AMA DISCOURSE

by

Sören Årsjö

<u>Content</u>

Logical Rhetorical Predicates in Ama Discourse

Abbreviations used in the Inter-linear Translation of Texts and Examples and in Propositional Displays.

Accomp. Purp.	- Accomplished Purpose	Man.	- Manner
Act. Time	- Actual Time	neg.	- negation or negative
Adv., adv.	- Adversative	new	- new information, by the speaker not considered to be in the hearer's mind at the time of speaking
(Ag.)	- Agent		
alt.	- alternative		
Anal.	- Analogy	o.	- object
Attr.	- Attributive	(Obj.)	- Object
Cond.	- Condition	p.	- person
Conj.	- Conjunction	P	- Paragraph
cont.	- contineous action	past	- past tense
Cy.	- Cycles	(Pat.)	- Patient
dem.	- demonstrative pronoun	pl.	- plural
dep.	-dependent clause marker	pos.	- positive
dl.	- dual	poss.	- possesive
E	- Episode	Purp.	- Purpose
ex., excl.	- exclusive	quest.	- question
(Exp.)	- Experiencer	(Ref.)	- Referent
Equ.	- Equivalence	refl.	- reflexive pronoun
f.	- feminine	Rel.time	- Relative time
foc.	- focus	s.	- subject
fut.	- future tense	semi colon;	- marker of phonological feature in time relationships
Gen./Spec.	- General/Specific		
(Gl)	- Goal	Seq.	- Sequence in time
Ident.	- Identification	sg.	- singular
imp.	- imperative	sim.	- simultaneous
impl. marg.	- implied speech margin	spec.	- specific
in., incl.	- inclusive	stative	- stative clause
instr.	- instrumental	Temp. Cond.	- Temporal Condition

0.   Outline

LOGICAL RHETORICAL PREDICATES IN AMA DISCOURSE

Sören G. Årsjö

1.   ## Introduction

The following definition of rhetorical predicates is found in Litteral
(1977): 'Rhetorical predicates have propositions with either lexical or
rhetorical predicates as their arguments and have as their function
the organization of the discourse.'

This paper will cover Logical Rhetorical Predicates in Ama[*] Discourse.
It will include the different ralizations and why the different reali-
izations are used. A propositional display of a short discourse of
each type (narrative, dialogue, procedural, descriptive and hortatory)
will be attached. (See Årsjö, Britten 1978 and Årsjö, Sören 1978)
I have relied heavily on Litteral (1977) for the model and definitions
for this paper. A further definition for this paper is that a rhe-
torical predicate, on the very lowest level, also may have specific
items as its arguments.

----

[*]The Ama language is one of six languages in the Arai Family.
They are Ama, Rocky Peak, Bo, Iteri, Nimo, and Owiniga. Total
number of speakers are apprx. 1500. The Arai Family does not com-
bine with other families. Laycock (1975) refers to the Arai
Family as the LEFT MAY PHYLUM/Left May Stock/Arai Family.
    The Ama area is south of the Sepik River and west of the May River
in the far west of the East Sepik Province. There are 350 speakers
in 7 villages and several one-house hamlets. All villages are with-
in a radius of 20 miles.
    Data was collected during field work under the auspices of the
Summer Institute of Linguistics from 1973 through 1978 in the village
of Kauvia. 1977 was spent away from the area. The data consist of
many texts from all five discourse types. Several men from the
village of Kauvia has helped with the texts.
    The Ama language has 19 phonemes, 11 consonents and 8 vowels.
They are: Consonents: p t k f s h m n l w y

Vowels:	i		u
	e	ᵻ	oo
			o
	a	aa	

2. Logical Rhetorical Predicates with Implication

This group includes result, purpose and condition. These three are also called covarience by Grimes (1972). Responce will also be included here, as that is considered a subtype of result. Implication can be symbolized by A B, meaning B, the consequent, is dependent on A, the antecedent.

2.1. Result

In the result rhetorical predicate there is a time sequence between the antecedent and the consequent. Both these parts are also assumed to be real. The consequent argument is caused by the antecedent argument. Intention is not involved in result.

Result in Ama discourse can be expressed with either the realization of the antecedent or the realization of the consequent mentioned first. The order of the realizations of the arguments has to do with prominence falling on the first item used in a result construction.

Result will first be divided into direct result and responce.

2.1.1. Direct Result

Direct result include either prominence on the antecedent or the consequent with different realizations of each possibility. There may be same or different agents for the realizations of the arguments in all realizations of direct result rhetorical predicate.

2.1.1.1. Prominence on the Antecedent

Three realizations of this are found. The realization of the antecedent is in this case the item mentioned first.

This may be realized by a free conjunction as connector and marker between the realizations of the arguments. This conjunction is nameneina - 'so'.

Example: (1) Nini   maa   pamukaa-sai,   namenei-na
            Woman new prostitute-from, conj-dem
            The woman was a prostitute, so

            tuklu-saa-sili-ki.
            kill-3p.sg.f.o.-throw-past
            he killed her and threw her in the water.

        (2) Asa-maa nisaani kwai-a,"Aluwou fuso t-ome-no."
            1p.sg.s-new there hear-past,"Dog pig-at pres-bark-3p.pl.s!"
            There I heard," The dogs are barking at a pig."

            Namenei-na   fuma-kna.
            Conj-dem run-down.
            So I ran down.

        (3) Namenei-na-mo; episode or paragraph resulting from
            Conj-dem-new   something mentioned at the end of the
            So then   preceding episode or paragraph.

The conjunction nameneina also has other functions, e.g. in Manner.
The arguments may be lexical propositions and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct result, realized like this, may also dominate larger portions of a discourse. (See example 3). This overt marking of result with prominence on the antecedent is used, when the relation would not be understood without the marking. The relation itself is also very prominent in this realization.

This may also be realized by a conjoining affix -menei - 'because of' at the end of the realization of the antecedent argument.

Example: (1) Ai-menei   ti-tumo,   Kawia-so.
            Sick-because of pres-come, Kawia-to.
            Because he was sick he came to Kawia.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct result, realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger portions of a discourse. This realization does not give as much prominence to the relation as the previous one.

The third realization of result with prominence on the antecedent is expressed by juxtaposition.

Example: (1) <u>Sa siali amu-knaa-ki</u>, <u>palulaa pa-tumo-kaa-ki-saa</u>.
Rain big come-down-past, plane ng-come-refl-past-neg.
It rained hard, <u>so</u> the plane did not come.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct
result realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger
portions of a discourse. This realization of result with juxta-
position is used when the relation between the arguments is understood
as result.

2.1.1.2. <u>Prominence on the Consequent</u>

Only one realization of this is found. The realization of the conse-
quent is in this case the item mentioned first.

This is realized by a conjoining affix as marker at the end of the
realization of the antecedent argument. The affix is <u>-menei</u> -'because
of'. This means that the order is reversed of the realizations of the
arguments of direct result in the second realization under 2.1.1.1.

Example: (1) <u>Kawia-so ti-tumo</u>, <u>ai-menei</u>.
Kawia-to pres-come, <u>sick-because of</u>.
He came to Kawia, <u>because</u> he was sick.

The conjoining affix <u>-menei</u> also has other functions, e.g. in pur-
pose, see 2.2.1.1., where it joins on to the realization of the
consequent. The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical proposi-
tions. Direct result, realized like this, does not dominate larger
portions of a discourse.

2.1.2. <u>Responce</u>[*]

Responce can either be quoted speech in responce to or as a result
of an earlier quote by a different agent. (Example 1). It can also
be an event or events in responce to or as a result of an earlier
quote or event. In both cases the realization of the antecedent is

---

[*] Responce rhetorical predicate may in certain circumstances rather
be classified as accomplished purpose. That is so, when a predicate
indicating intention is added, implicitly or explicitly.

mentioned before the realization of the consequent. There are no

obligatbry markers, so it is realized by juxtaposition.

    Example: (1) See display and text of Imaafa (narrative) where
             clauses 11,12 are the anteoedent argument, and
             clauses 13-15 the consequent argument.

           (2) See display and text of Imaafa (narrative) where
             clauses 3,4 (quote) are the realization of the ante-
             cedent argument, and clauses 5-8 (resultant events)
             are the realization of the consequent argument.

           (3) See display and text of Lialini Imaa (dialogue), where
             each quote is a paragraph.

Responce rhetorical predicate may have lexical and/or rhetorical pro-

positions as its arguments. It may also dominate larger portions

of a discourse. (See example 2 which forms a paragraph). This is

also especially true in dialogue discourse, where each argument is

a paragraph. (See example 3).

2.2.   Purpose

In the purpose rhetorical predicate there is a time sequence between

the antecedent and the consequent. Only the antecedent is assumed to

be real, although in accomplished purpose the consequent is also

assumed to be real. In purpose there is also an added predicate in-

dicating intention, that is simultaneuos with the antecedent and

must have the same agent as the antecedent.

    Purpose in Ama discourse can be expressed with either the reali-

zation of the antecedent or the realization of the consequent men-

tioned first. The order of these arguements has to do with prominence

falling on the first item used in a purpose construction.

    Purpose will first be divided into non-accomplished purpose and

accomplished purpose.

2.2.1.   Purpose, non-accomplished

Non-accomplished purpose includes either prominence on the antecedent

or consequent realized in different ways. The consequent is not assumed to be real.

2.2.1.1. Prominence on the Antecedent

Two realizations of this is found. The realization of the antece-dent is in this case the item mentioned first.

This may be realized by a conjoining affix as marker at the end of the realization of the consequent argument. The affix is -menei - 'in order to'. This realization may take same or different agent for the realizations of the two arguments. If there is a verb in the realization of the consequent, that verb is of a non-indicative form that does not take any tense.

Example: (1) Kawia-so ti-tumo, malasino-menei.
Kawia-to pres-come, medicin-in order to.
He came to Kawia in order to get medicin.

(2) Nakaa ti-samukookaa, fu-menei, fu-yo
Man pres-watch, pig-because of, pig-prop
A man watches (his garden), in order to

naa-ka-tumaa-menei.
eat-3p.pl.o-come-because.
hinder pigs from coming to eat.

This is also displayed in Isi Isikaa Aino Imaafa, clauses 13-15.

The conjoining affix -menei also has other functions, e.g. in result, see 2.1.1.2., where it joins on to the realization of the antecedent. The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Purpose, realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger portions of a discourse. This overt marking of purpose with prominence on the antecedent is used, when the relation would not be understood without the marking.

The second realization of non-accomplished purpose with prominence on the antecedent is expressed by juxtaposition. This realization may take same or different agent for the realizations of the two arguments.

The verb in the realization of the conse-quent is of non-indicative form.

> Example: (1) <u>Na</u> <u>tu-kunaa-nake</u>, <u>anu</u> <u>anu</u> <u>tuma-knaa-nake</u> <u>maa</u> <u>anu.</u>
> Theme pres-go down-1p.pl.ex.s., there come-down-1p.pl.s.
> We (excl) went down, <u>in order to</u> come down there. new th.
>
> This is also displayed in Imaafa, clauses 7,8,

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Purpose, realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger portions of a discourse. This realization is used, when the relation between the arguments is understood as purpose without overt marking.

2.2.1.2. <u>Prominence on the Consequent</u>

Two realizations of this are found. The realization of the consequent is in this case the item mentioned first.

The realization of this takes place within a compound verb with the same agent for the two roots. There is also a conjoining affix [-a-] (-oo-) - 'in order to', in between the two roots.

> Example: (1) <u>Kalapus</u> <u>mano</u> <u>maa</u> <u>ke-a-tumaa-ki-nake.</u>
> Prison man new look-<u>in order to</u>-come-past-1p.pl.ex.s.
> We (excl) came <u>in order to</u> see the prisoner.
>
> (2) See also the display and text of Imaafa (narrative) in clauses 2,9,18,20 and 21.

The arguments may only be lexical propositions in this case.

The second realization of non-accomplished purpose with prominence on the consequent may have ^{same or} different agents in the realizations of the two arguments. The order is reversed of the realizations of the arguments of the first realization under prominence on antecedent, see 2.2.1.1. The realization of the consequent will then be mentioned first and be marked by -menei - 'in order to', and the realization of the antecedent will follow.

Example: (1) <u>Aino-menei</u> <u>simaiso</u> <u>mana-ki</u>, <u>Jenuai-so.</u>
Pandana<u>pin order to</u> quickly go-past, Genewe-to.
In <u>order</u> <u>to</u> get some pandanas he quickly went to Genewe.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Purpose,
realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger portions
of a discourse. *This realization makes the consequent more prominent.*

2.2.2. <u>Purpose, accomplished</u>

Accomplished purpose may sometimes be difficult to detect in a text,
as it is not marked in the surface structutre as purpose. It may
rather look like a conjunction rhetorical predicate with events in
sequence. It seems to be accomplished purpose, if the events in the
two arguments are related or are in the same script. Litteral (1977)
mentions script with same agent and event sequence with same agent as
a test for accomplished purpose. In Ama there can also be different
agents for the realizations of the arguments in accomplished purpose.

Accomplished purpose include either prominence on the antecedent
or the consequent. Both antecedent and consequent are in this case
assumed to be real, and therefore the verbs in the realizations of
both these arguments are of indicative form.

2.2.2.1. <u>Prominence on the Antecedent.</u>

There is only one realization of accomplished purpose with prominence
on the antecedent, which is expressed by juxtaposition of the realiza-
tions two arguments. It can be either same or different agent for the
realizations of the two arguments.

Example: (1) <u>Tali</u> <u>ta-yo</u>, <u>ti-fafaumo.</u>
Light fire-prop, pres-burn.
He lights the fire, and it burns.

This is also displayed in Isi Isikaa Aino Imaafa,
clause 7,8.

(2) <u>Sileno</u> <u>na</u> <u>t-i-a-knaa</u>, <u>auto</u> <u>maa</u> <u>ti-tipasa-fli</u>. (cut-throw.
Sören theme pres-cut-in order to-go down, kvila new pres→
Sören went down to cut, and he cut and threw away the kvila.

This is also displayed in Imaafa, clauses 9,10.

(3) <u>Ti-kiaa-saa-nake</u>, <u>funa</u> <u>na</u> <u>t-ulua-ka-knaa</u>. (3p.pl.o-go down.
Pres-move-3p.sg.f.o.-1p.pl.ex.s., feet theme pres-wash→
We (excl) moved out of her way, and she went down to wash

This is also displayed in Imaafa, clauses 17,18. her feet.

The arguments of accomplished purpose may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Accomplished purpose, realized like this, is not observed to dominate larger portions of a discourse.

2.2.2.2. <u>Prominence on the Consequent</u>

There is only one realization of accomplished purpose with prominence on the consequent, which is expressed by marking the realization of the antecedent as an instrument with <u>-yo</u>, if within that instrument there is some reference to an event. It may be same or different agents for the realizations of the arguments. The following English example may help clarify what is meant: He changed the world <u>by</u> his love.

Example: (1) <u>Aplafamo</u> <u>vali</u> <u>maa</u> <u>Kana</u> <u>asi-so</u> <u>nu-ki</u>, <u>Kootoni</u> <u>imaa-yo</u>.
Abraham line new Kana ground-to go past, God-poss talk-Inst.
Abraham and hisline went to Kana because of God's talk.

(2) Discourse, episode or paragraph. <u>Namenei-na</u> <u>Yaa-ki</u>,
That-dem do-past,
That is what he did,

<u>Kooto-ni</u> <u>imaa-yo</u>.
God-poss talk-<u>instr</u>.
<u>according to</u> God's talk.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Purpose, realized like this, may also dominate larger portions of a discourse. (See example 2). This realization is used, when emphazis is wanted on the instrumental act of the antecedent to cause the consequent, which still is prominent.

The arguments of direct condition may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct condition, realized like this, is very common in descriptive discourse, but it does not dominate larger portions of the discourse.

The second realization of direct condition is expressed by juxtaposition of the realizations of the arguments. In this realization in Ama both arguments of the rhetorical predicate are assumed to be real, as the verb forms used in the realizations of the two arguments are of indicative forms and take tense. It may also take the form of a negative condition with the normal negative pa- -saa on the verb of the realization of the antecedent.

> Example: (1) <u>Ulaa maa walioo na ti-wi, nia ti-nu-kne.</u>
> Sun new alright theme pres-clear, theme pres-go-1p.pl.in.s.
> <u>If</u> it clears we will go.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct condition, realized like this, is not found to dominate a larger portion of a discourse. This is used where the condition is understood without the overt marking as in the first realization.

2.3.2. <u>Contrary to Fact Condition</u>

Only one realization of this is found. The implicit alternative to a contrary to fact condition has arguments, which are real. Contrary to fact condition is expressed by marking the verb of the realization of the antecedent with <u>pi- -mo</u> - 'cond- -dep', and the verb of the realization of the consequent with <u>pi-</u> - 'cond'. Both these verbs are of a non-indicative form, as they are assumed not to be real. It may take the form of a negative contrary to fact condition when the marker <u>pi- -mo</u> is replaced with <u>simesaamo</u> -'without! There would still be non-indicative verb forms in the realizations of both arguments.

Example: (1) <u>Sa-yo</u> <u>tumo</u> <u>simesaamo</u>, <u>na</u> <u>pi-tumo</u>.
Rain-prop come without, theme <u>cond</u>-come.
<u>If</u> it had not rained, I would have come.

(2) <u>Ifaa-wei</u> <u>Atamo-wei-yo</u> <u>a</u> <u>wamo</u> <u>naa-kaa</u> <u>simesaamo</u>,
Eve-and Adam-and-prop tree fruit eat-3p.pl.o. without,
<u>If</u> Adam and Eve had not eaten the fruit,

<u>milaa</u> <u>kayau</u> <u>pa-pi-tanamaa-kne-saa</u>,
road bad neg-<u>cond</u>-follow-1p.pl.in.s-neg,
we would not have followed a bad way,

<u>walioo</u> <u>na</u> <u>pi-si-kne</u>, <u>milaa</u> <u>itauniamo-so.</u>
alright theme <u>cond</u>-sit-1p.pl.in.s, road good-at.
but we would have sat alright on the good road.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Condition, realized like this, is not found to dominate larger portions of a discourse. The implicit alternative to the above example would be:
It did rain, I did not come.

2.3.3. <u>Temporal Condition</u>

Only one realization of this is found. It is expressed by marking the verb of the realization of the antecedent with <u>-aki-</u> <u>-mo</u> — 'time cond.-(-dep)'. In this case it seems like the verb of the realization of the antecedent is not assumed to be real and a non-indicative form is used, but the verb of the realization of the consequent is assumed to be real and an indicative verb form is used.

Example: (1) <u>Kooto-ni</u> <u>milaa-so</u> <u>aluai-aki-kne-mo</u>,
God-poss road-at follow-<u>cond</u>-1p.pl.in.s.-<u>dep</u>,
If (or when) we follow God's road,

<u>mai-maa</u> <u>nakaa</u> <u>ititauni</u> <u>na</u> <u>si-menei.</u>
1p.pl.in.s.-new man good theme sit-1p.pl.in.s.fut.
we (incl) will sit like good men.

This is also displayed in Paipoolo Imaa Paluaiwo, clause 7,8.

(2) <u>Kooto</u>, <u>tani</u> <u>milaa-so</u> <u>aluai-aki-kne</u>, <u>ulai</u> <u>mlei</u>?
God, 3p.sg.-poss road-at follow-<u>cond</u>-1p.pl.in.s.,again how?
If (or when) we follow God's road, what will happen?

<u>Mai-maa</u> <u>kumaki-so</u> <u>na</u> <u>nu-menei</u>, <u>pleso</u> <u>itauniamo-so.</u>
1p.pl.in.s-new heaven-to theme go-1p.pl.in.s.fut, place
We (incl) will go to heaven, to the good place. /good-to.

The negative realization of this relation is not found, but it could probably be expressed by using s<u>i</u>mesaamo on the realization of the antecedent. The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Condition, realized like this, has not been found to dominate larger portions of a discourse.

3.   <u>Logical Rhetorical Predicates without Implication</u>

This group includes adverstive, alternative and conjunction. The two arguments are of equal standing (one is not dependent on the other) in these three. The two arguments are not called antecedent and consequent when no implication is involved.

3.1.   <u>Adversative</u>

Adversative rhetorical predicate focuses on contrast. It has only two arguments, and have two elements in each argument that is in contrast. Both arguments are assumed to be real, and they may be simultaneous or in sequence. The time may be one of the two contrasts.

In Ama discourse it seems to be motivated to first divide the adverstive rhetorical predicate into direct adver̄sative and frustrated intention.

3.1.1. <u>Direct Adversative</u>

Two realizations of this are found.

One realization is expressed by marking the NPs of the realization of the sef̄ond argument with <u>-soo</u> - 'exclusion marker'.

    Example: (1) <u>Ta-maa</u> <u>pa-ti-tumo-saa</u>, <u>asa-soo</u> <u>ti-tumo</u>.
                  He-new neg-pres-come-neg, 1p.sg.s.-<u>exclusion</u> pres-come.
                  He did not come, <u>but</u> I came.

              (2) <u>Ya-maa</u> <u>ausaani</u> <u>nimaiso</u> <u>mana-ki</u>, <u>tata-soo</u> <u>simaiso</u> <u>mana-ki</u>,
                  1p.sg.s-new there slowly go-past, 3p.sg.s-<u>exclusion</u> quickly
                  I went there slowly, <u>but</u> he went quickly.   (go-past.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Adversa-

tive, realized like this, is not found to dominate larger portions
of a discourse. With this marker the prominence is on the relation.

The second realization is expressed by juxtaposition of the reali-
zations of the arguments.

Example: (1) <u>Mai-maa</u> <u>milaa</u> <u>kayau-so</u> <u>aluai-mo</u>, <u>wiaau</u> <u>ti-yaamu</u>.
1p.pl.in.s.-new road bad-at follow-dep, no pres-say.
I do not like that we (incl) follow a bad road,

<u>Milaa</u> <u>itauniamo-so</u> <u>aluai</u> <u>maa</u> <u>walioo</u>.
Road good-at follow new alright.
<u>but</u> to follow a good road is alright.

This is also displayed in Paipoolo Imaa Paluaiwo,
clause 2-4.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Adversa-
tive, realized like this, is not found to dominate larger portions of
a discourse, although it does play an important role in the hortatory
discourse, where adverstive is used to contrast bad and good. The re-
lation is understood without marking

3.1.2. <u>Frustrated Intention</u>

This realization is expressed by using the particle <u>lauwa</u> in the verb
phrase of the realization of the first argument.

Example: (1) <u>Palulaa</u> <u>maa</u> <u>lauwa</u> <u>ti-tumo-kaa</u>, <u>ifau</u>.
Plane new <u>adverstive</u> pres-come-refl, back.
The plane wanted to come, <u>but</u> it turned back.

(2) See display and text of Imaafa (narrative), where
clause 1 is the realization of one argument and
clauses 2-21 the realization of the second argument.

The event marked by <u>lauwa</u> may also actually take place, but it did
not turn out as expected. The arguments may be lexical and/or rhe-
torical propositions. Adversative, realized like this, is also
found to dominate a whole narrative discourse, (See example 2).

3.2. <u>Alternative</u>

The alternative rhetorical predicate assumes that only one argument

is real, and it is not limited to two arguments. It focuses upon only one difference between the arguments. The time for the arguments are usually identical, unless time is the difference between the arguments.

In Ama discourse two realizations of the alternative rhetorical predicate has been found.

One is expressed by the marker pei(mo) -'or' after each of the realizations of the arguments.

Example: (1) Ta-maa yasai tumo peimo, amai peimo.
He-new finished come alt., remain alt.
Has he come or not?

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Alternative, realized like this, is not found to dominate larger portions of a discourse.

The second realization is expressed by the marker se - 'or' after each of the realizations of the arguments."

Example: (1) Ti-tuklaa-meno se, ti-naa-meno se, popooa.
Pres-kill-1p.sg.o alt, pres-eat-1p.sg.o alt, spirit.
Will the spirit kill me or eat me?

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Adversative, realized like this, has not been found to dominate larger portions of a discourse. As peimo is the more common marker the use of se probably makes the relation more prominent.

3.3. Conjunction

Conjunction is the unmarked member of the logical rhetorical predicates. It is the surface features of several other logical predicates. It is the most common rhetorical predicate with few restrictions on its arguments. The components of the arguments must have some semantic similarity.

In Ama discourse there seems to be four realizations of conjunction.

They are: Phrase marker, juxtaposition, time conjunction and head-tail linkage.

3.3.1. Phrase Marker

This realization is marked by -wei - 'and' on the nouns of the realizations of the arguments that are conjoined.

Example: (1) Alu-wei tata-wei yau yau.
Child-and 3p.sg.s.-and dead dead.
She and the child are dead.
This is also displayed in Hani Hani Au Au, clause 16.

(2) See also display and text of Hani Hani Au Au (descr), where clauses 10 and 11 are joined by -wei on the nouns.

The arguments may be lexical propositions and/or specific items. (See 1, Introduction).

3.3.2. Juxtaposition

This realization is expressed by juxtaposition of the realization of the arguments.

Example: (1) See clause 10 in display of Imaafa (narrative). Compound vb.

(2) See clauses 12/13-15 in display of Isi Isikaa Aino Imaafa (procedural). Sentences.

(3) See clause 15 in display of Hani Hani Au Au (descr). Specific items.

(4) See clauses 2-4/5-8/9-14 in display of Hani Hani Au Au (discriptive). Paragraphs.

The arguments may be specific items, lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Conjunction, realized like this, seems to play and important role in the descriptive discourse and dialogue discourse. The conjoining relation is known without being overtly stated. The semantic context seems to decide if events are simultaneous or in sequence.

3.3.3. Time Conjunction

The time conjunction used to realize this realization is nisai- -

'and then'.

> Example: (1) See display and text of Imaafa,(narrative), clauses
> 16/17,18/19

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. The most common use is when conjunction, realized like this, dominates large portions of a discourse. This is especially true for a narrative discourse.

N±sai- - 'and then' has a double function. It gives the overt marking for conjunction, and it also gives the time setting for the following events. (See Årsjö, Britten, 1978(2)).

3.3.4.   Head-Tail Linkage

This is realized by a head-tail linkage.

> Example: (1) See display and text of Isi Isikaa Aino Imaafa (pro-
> cedural), clauses 16/17.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. The most common use is when conjunction, realized like this, dominates large portions of a discourse, i.e. joining the sections the clauses are in. This marking is used if extra prominence is wanted on the time sequence.

Head-tail linkage also has a double function. It marks conjunction and gives the time for the following events. (See Årsjö, Britten 1978).

There may also be a combination of time conjunction and head-tail linkage as another realization of conjunction.

4.   Conclusion

Condition had always been difficult to grasp. Especially the disinction between direct condition and contrary to fact. It now seems to be solved.

There has also been some problems in diffrentiating between result

and purpose. This is also much clearer now.

The non-indicative forms of verbs in the realization of arguments not assumed to be real has explained some of the problems experienced with tense.

It has been interesting to see that the realizations of arguments to a logical rhetorical predicate can span from large portions of a discourse down to specific items.

5.   <u>Texts and Displays</u>