

# 7

## Complex sentences

### 7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I describe the means by which independent clauses are conjoined and how subordinate clauses are linked to their main clauses. Independent clauses can stand on their own, expressing a complete proposition, while subordinate clauses are those that cannot stand on their own and are linked to a main clause by way of subordinators. In §7.2 and §7.3, I describe coordinate clauses, including a discussion on juxtaposition and three coordinators. Apart from these, adversative and disjunctive coordination are discussed in §7.3.5 and §7.4 respectively. Subordination is dealt with in §7.5 with a focus on complement clauses (§7.5.1), relative clauses (§7.5.2), adverbial clauses (§7.5.3), conditional clauses (§7.5.4), negative conditionals (§7.5.5) and concessive clauses (§7.5.6).

### 7.2 Coordinate clauses

Nese employs three types of coordination strategies to link clauses and phrases: conjunctive, adversative and disjunctive coordination; these are presented in Table 7.1. Expression of conjunctive coordination comes in six different forms, compared to the adversative and disjunctive coordination patterns each of which only takes one form. Noun phrases may be linked via juxtaposition along with the conjunctions *rrun* and *min* and via disjunctive *deve*. Prepositional phrases, however, can only be linked via the conjunction *din* while clauses allow more conjunction patterns compared to noun phrases and prepositional phrases, as shown in Table 7.1.

**Table 7.1: Coordination strategies**

Type of coordination	Coordination strategy	NP	PP	Clauses
Conjunctive	Juxtaposition	✓	✗	✓
	<i>rov</i>	✗	✗	✓
	<i>din</i>	✗	✓	✓
	<i>ale</i>	✗	✗	✓
	<i>rrun</i>	✓	✗	✗
	<i>min</i>	✓	✗	✗
Adversative	<i>be</i>	✗	✗	✓
Disjunctive	<i>deve</i>	✓	✗	✓

## 7.3 Conjunctive coordination

### 7.3.1 Juxtaposition

Nese clauses and noun phrases may be joined paratactically, with no overt coordinator. Lynch et al. (2011, p. 89) state that in Proto Oceanic, clauses were linked paratactically as well as through the medium of coordinating conjunctions, and in many Oceanic languages today clauses can be coordinated with no coordinator, thus it is not surprising that this is also the case in Nese. Clauses joined paratactically in Nese can be identified by intonation patterns, whereby the end of a clause is characterised by a falling intonation and a short pause and the beginning of a new clause by a rising intonation. Construction (7.1) is an example of three clauses in Nese that are linked paratactically with no overt coordinator.

- 7.1    *Ale*        *bur-lol*,                      *bir-v'an*,                      *bur-suwo*.  
         CONJ    1PLEXCL:REAL-stay    1PLEXCL:REAL-go    1PLEXCL:REAL-swim  
         ‘Then we stayed and we went and swam.’  
         (2011\_12\_21 obrojo01003 00:00:26.000-00:00:30.000 natural text)

In (7.1), a sequential reading of the events described by each clause may be deduced: each clause has the same subject and the speaker is relating these events in the order in which they occurred.

Nese also allows the conjoining of clauses containing different subjects to be joined with no overt means of coordination. When two clauses with different subjects are joined paratactically, a contrast is being made of the

activities the two subjects will be involved in simultaneously. For example, in (7.2), while the subject of the first clause will be at church, the subject of the second clause will be at home, cooking.

- 7.2    *Kani      kirr-v'an            rengen      sukul,      khina      jo-kbro*  
          2PL      2PL:REAL-go      loc           school      1SG           1SG:IRR-stay  
          'You guys go to church, I will stay  
  
          *jo-kuk-u.*  
          1SG:IRR-cook-3SGOBJ  
          I'll cook.'  
          (2012\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:03:36.000-00:03:38.000 natural text)

Noun phrases may also be juxtaposed, as illustrated in (7.3), where they are given as a list of items.

- 7.3    *Risi-vita-i                      nese?      naram      sikh-sikha,      **navij**      buro*  
          1PL:IRR-put-3SGOBJ      what      yam           REDUP-NEG      banana      GENMOD  
          'What are we going to put? There is no yam, only bananas,  
  
          ***novusbuak,**              **maniok,**              **kumala.***  
          taro                      manioc              kumara  
          taros, maniocs and kumara.'  
          (2012\_05\_16 obanhy01003 00:08:14.000-00:08:23.000 natural text)

In clauses where noun phrases are joined paratactically, there is a pause after each noun phrase to indicate the phrasal boundary. The intransitive verb *rov* 'finish' is also used in Nese as a completive marker, and when it occurs at the end of a clause that is joined paratactically with another clause, it indicates that the event described in the first clause has ended, therefore inferring a sequential order of events. It does not have this function in relation to noun phrases or prepositional phrases. So in (7.4) the cleaning takes place after the registration. The two clauses, which are joined paratactically with *rov*, indicating that the event in the first clause has ended, do not necessarily have to have the same mood and subjects. This is shown in example (7.4), where the mood of the borrowed Bislama verb *rejista* 'register' is realis and the subject is 2PL while the mood of the clause after the coordinator *rov* is irrealis and the subject is 3PL.

- 7.4 *Rri-si-ma,        birr-rejista                    v'an        rov,        rri-si-vekhsein*  
 3PL-IRR-come    2PL-REAL-register        go        COMPL        3PL-IRR-clean  
 'They will come, we will get registered and when this is over, they  
 will clean  
  
*naine    te        rri-si-natur                    min-i...*  
 house    SUB    3PL-IRR-sleep                    PREP-3SGOBJ  
 the house in which they will sleep.'  
 (2014\_02\_18 naaksi01001 00:07.000-00:07:05.000 natural text)

Apart from being used as an indicator of sequential events expressed by clauses joined paratactically, *rov* is also used in conjunction with the coordinator *ale*. This is illustrated in (7.5).

- 7.5 *Rri-si-vita-i* *khojkhoj* *v'an* **rov** **ale** *rri-si-bin-i...*  
 1PLINCL-IRR-PUT- be.proper go COMPL CONJ 1PLINCL-IRR-pin-  
 3SGOBJ 3SGOBJ  
 'We put it and once that is over then we have it pinned...'  
 (2012\_07\_12 obaksi01001 00:16:11.000-00:16:14.000 natural text)

### 7.3.2 *Din* ‘and’

*Din* 'and' is a coordinator that is used to conjoin independent clauses; however, it is no longer used productively in current speech. Its only attestation in the current data is during a recording session in which seven Nese speakers were involved in a conversation and prior to the commencement of the recording they had been discussing the status of *din* and resolved that *din* should be the coordinator they ought to be using rather than Bislama *ale*, which is an introduced form. They thus indicated their awareness that *din* was originally a productively occurring coordinator in Nese, and that it has been replaced by *ale*. The use of *din* in this context is shown in (7.6), where the referent of the subjects in the coordinated clauses are the same.

- 7.6 Ø-derr            natan        **din**        ale        Ø-v'an            maro.  
 3SG:REAL-dig    ground    CONJ    CONJ    3SG:REAL-go    up  
 'He digs the ground and then, then he goes up.'  
 (2012\_08\_27 obnesp01001 00:13:56.000-00:14:05.000 natural text)

*Ale*, a borrowing from French *allez* 'you (PL) go' via Bislama *ale* 'so, then, ok', functions as a clausal coordinator as well as the interjection 'okay'. It is the only commonly used coordinator in the current speech of all Nese speakers. The use of *ale* as a conjunction excludes phrases and is restricted to clauses, linking sequential actions as well as signalling the result of an action as illustrated in (7.7).

*bir-kij-i*                      *ko ale bir-bat-e,*  
 1PL:REAL-remove flesh of coconut go CONJ 1PL:REAL:make-3SGOBJ  
 we removed the coconut flesh to a certain point where we made it

(2011\_12\_21 obroj01003 00:00:05.000-00:00:01.000 natural text)

287

- 7.8    *Tav'at*    *yat!*    *Yat*    *iekkhetan*    *khe*    *na!*    ***ale***  
 woman    sit    sit    DEM    DEM    now    CONJ  
 'Woman sit, sit down here now! Okay
- rri-si-varvar*    *min*    *norian*    *s-ar*    ***ale***  
 1PL-IRR-pray    PREP2    food    CLED-1PLINCL:POSS    CONJ  
 we will pray for our food then
- rri-si-woj*    *norian*    ***ale***    *khorkhorbul!*  
 1PL-IRR-eat    food    CONJ    close.eyes  
 we'll eat the food, okay close your eyes.'
- (2012\_06\_12 obaksi01001 00:11:07.000-00:11:17.000 natural text)

### 7.3.4 *Rrun* 'and'

*Rrun* is a coordinator that links noun phrases. Noun phrases coordinated by *rrun* may occupy subject position, as shown in (7.9), or object position, as illustrated in example (7.10).

- 7.9    *Khai*    ***rrun***    *nat-ne*    *ri-vial*    *ri-ma*    *khe.*  
 3SG    CONJ    child-3SG:POSS    3PL:REAL-walk    3PL:REAL-come    DEM  
 'She and her daughter they walked to here.'
- (2014\_02\_18 naaksi01001 00:00:20.000-00:00:22.000 natural text)

As shown in (7.9), a subject noun phrase composed of two coordinated noun phrases may consist of an independent pronoun and a lexical noun phrase. Full noun phrase objects may also be coordinated by *rrun* as shown in (7.10).

- 7.10    *No-vol*    *tin*    *nanaj*    *sakhal*    ***rrun***    *makrroni*    *khe*    *rru.*  
 1SG:REAL-buy    tin    fish    one    CONJ    noodles    DEM    two  
 'I bought one canned fish and two noodles.'
- (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:04:37.000-00:04:44.000 natural text)

There are cases showing *rrun* linking a verb complex containing an object pro-index and a full noun phrase, as illustrated in (7.11). In these cases, however, *rrun* may be better analysed as a preposition meaning 'with'. This prepositional meaning is perhaps more evident in example (7.12), where *rrun* acts as a link between the subject of the intransitive active verb *khro* with a possessive noun phrase.

- 7.11 *Bur-kuk-u* *ale* *bir-waj-i* *rrun*  
 1PLEXCL:REAL-cook-3SGOBJ CONJ 1PLEXCL:REAL-eat-3SGOBJ CONJ  
 ‘We cooked it and we ate it with  
*norrulnasasakh.*  
 rice  
 rice.’  
 (2012\_06\_11 obrojo01005 00:02:45.000-00:02:49.000 natural text)

- 7.12 *Ro-khro* *rrun* *nenetin* *Tomatin.*  
 3PL:REAL-stay CONJ child-3SG:POSS Tomatin  
 ‘They stayed with Tomatin’s child.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:37:17.000-00:37:20.000 natural text)

### 7.3.5 Adversative *be* ‘but’

Adversative *be* ‘but’, a borrowing from Bislama *be* ‘but’, is used to contrast propositions. Nese only allows clauses to be coordinated by adversative *be*. In (7.13), two clauses are conjoined using *be* where the subject of the first clause is the same as the subject of the second clause.

- 7.13 *Nemere* *khar* *ro-khro* *be* *khar*  
 people 3PL 3PL:REAL-stay CONJ 3PL  
 ‘The people were there but they  
*ro-rong-o* *sikha* *te* *re-bet* *sukul.*  
 3PL:REAL-want-3SGOBJ NEG SUB 3PL:REAL-make school  
 didn’t want to go to church.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:11:19.000-00:11:23.000 natural text)

In (7.14), the subjects of the two coordinated clauses are different and, in this case, the clause is elliptical since the verb is omitted because it is understood as being similar to the one in the first clause. The verb *ma* in the main clause is functioning as a directional particle that is not necessarily indicating physical direction toward the speaker but expresses a direction in temporal terms toward a specific point of reference, which is the point at which the speaker is speaking.

- 7.14 *Khai Ø-s-be-num-num-te rrenrran ma be*  
 3SG 3SG-IRR-NEG1-REDUP-drink-NEG2 always come CONJ  
 ‘He does not always drink it,  
*Gregory, bentaru benanev.*  
 Gregory two days ago yesterday  
 but Gregory, two days ago, yesterday. (He drank it two days in a row.)’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:48:51.000-0049:00.000 natural text)

## 7.4 Disjunctive *deve* ‘or’

The conjunction *deve* ‘or’ is employed to express alternative or contrastive choices. It is used to conjoin noun phrases (7.15) and clauses (7.16). In (7.15), the two noun phrases have temporal meanings and function as adjuncts in the main clause. In example (7.16), two clauses are being conjoined with *deve* in which the referent of the subject of the second clause is the same as that of the object of the first clause.

- 7.15 *Bur-khos laine bung, naleng haf*  
 1PLEXCL:REAL-reach house:LOC night maybe half  
 ‘We reached the house at night, at maybe half  
*pas fo deve haf pas faef.*  
 past four CONJ half past five  
 past four or half past five.’  
 (2011\_12\_21 obrojo01003 00:00:20.000-00:00:26.000 natural text)
- 7.16 *Je-kol-o lue nua deve Ø-se-tokh buro?*  
 1SG:IRR-carry-3SGOBJ out water CONJ 3SG-IRR-stay GENMOD  
 ‘Should I take out the water or should it just stay?’  
 (Fieldnotes, natural text)

When *deve* is followed by a clause consisting only of negative *sikha*, it expresses an alternative that is the negated proposition in the first clause (7.17).



- 7.17 *Khina j-be-rongvuson-te sakhal Ø-se-ma deve sikha.*  
 1SG 1SG:IRR-NEG1-know-NEG2 one 3SG-IRR-come CONJ NEG  
 ‘I don’t know whether one will come or not.’  
 (2014\_02\_18 naaksi01001 00:04:01.000-00:04:05.000 natural text)

## 7.5 Subordinate clauses

The types of subordinate clauses that exist in Nese are complement clauses (§7.5.1), relative clauses (§7.5.2) and adverbial clauses (§7.5.3). Nese does not have a complicated system of overtly marking subordination; instead, there is a general subordinator *te*, which is used to introduce both complement clauses and relative clauses. This general subordinator combines with other forms to introduce adverbial clauses. The subordinators are laid out in Table 7.2.

**Table 7.2: Subordinators and functions**

<i>te</i>	introduces a complement clause
<i>te</i>	introduces a relative clause
<i>neten te</i>	introduces a temporal adverbial clause of reason ‘because’
<i>neren te</i>	introduces a temporal adverbial clause ‘when’
<i>neren</i>	‘during’, ‘at’
<i>belek te</i>	introduces a similitive adverbial clause

Table 7.2 shows that all forms of the subordinator include *te* except for *neren*, which may or may not co-occur with *te*, the two forms being semantically distinct from each other.

### 7.5.1 Complement clauses

Complementation is defined by Noonan as ‘the syntactic situation which arises when a notional sentence or predication is an argument of a predicate’ (1985, p. 44). The two types of clauses in Nese are transitive and intransitive clauses, the former having two core arguments and the latter possessing a single core argument that is the subject. Nese allows clauses to occupy subject and object position. There are only two examples showing clauses occupying subject position, although a greater number of transitive verbs can take sentential complements as objects. These verbs fall into different semantic categories, which Dixon (2006, p. 9) describes as

primary and secondary types. Verbs in the primary type are those that can take both arguments as NPs, with a distinction made between Primary A type and Primary B type based on the former obligatorily taking both arguments as NPs while the latter being permitted to take one argument as a clause instead. However, verbs in the secondary type are those in which one argument must be a clause with the distinction between Secondary B and Secondary C based on the latter having the tendency to contain different subjects in the main and complement clauses (Dixon, 2006, pp. 9–13). The current data shows that Nese has verbs that come under the Primary B type and Secondary C types. Complementation in Nese is expressed in two distinct ways. Firstly, via the subordinate marker which signals the commencement of the complement clause. Secondly, in the absence of *te*, Nese requires the verb in the complement clause to be marked with the aspectual marker *-ti-*.

### 7.5.1.1 Verbs that take one clausal argument

As stated above, some Nese verbs fall into the category of Primary B verbs as defined by Dixon (2006, p. 10), a category that is composed of verbs falling into four semantic types: verbs of attention, thinking, liking and speaking. Each of these semantic types is explored in this subsection. Verbs of attention include *les* ‘see’ and *rong* ‘hear’. The transitive verb *les* ‘see’ can take either a complement clause (7.18), where the complement clause is introduced by the subordinator *te*, or an NP as the object argument (7.19).

- 7.18 *Kho-les*                      [*te*    *tenge*            *Ø-s-be-khirkhir-vusokh-te.*]  
           2SG:REAL-see            SUB    thing            3SG-IRR-NEG-move-proper-NEG2  
           ‘You see that (how) the thing does not move the properly.’  
           (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:39:12.000-00:39:16.000 natural text)

In (7.18), the complement clause consists of a negated clause.

- 7.19 *Mary*    *khai*            *Ø-les*                      *saen*            *sakhal.*  
           Jayven    3SG            3SG:REAL-come            sign            one  
           ‘Mary she saw a sign.’  
           (2012\_08\_22 elanhy01011 00:19:30.000-00:19:33.000 elicitation)

In the absence of the subordinator *te*, complement relationships are expressed via the presence of the aspectual marker *ti* in the complement clause, as shown in (7.20), where the subject of the main clause is not expressed but is different to that of the complement clause.

- 7.20 *Wolei! les nemerjian khe Ø-ti-mul nge.*  
 Oh! see old man DEM 3SG-ASP-return DEM  
 ‘Oh! see that old man returning.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:11:28.000-00:11:30.000 natural text)

In cases such as (7.20) where the subject of the complement clause is a 3SG noun phrase, it is mandatory for the verb in the complement clause to carry the aspectual marker *ti* when the associated action is set in a non-future temporal setting and when the subordinator *te* is absent. However, the mandatory presence of the aspect marker is not relevant when the subordinator *te* is present, as illustrated in (7.21), which is also a case of the verb *les* taking a complement clause as its object with the meaning of understanding or knowing rather than actual seeing. In this example where the subject of the main clause is different to that of the complement clause, *les* is functioning as a perception verb rather than one that is related to the sense of seeing.

- 7.21 *Kho-les [te Aklyn, khai Ø-rong-o Ø-se-ma.]*  
 2SG:REAL-see SUB Aklyn 3SG 3SG-want-3SGOBJ 3SG-IRR-come  
 ‘You see that Aklyn, she wants to come.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:08:16.000-00:08:18.000 natural text)

The verb *les*, with a sensory denotation, undergoes haplology when negation is involved and the object is a complement clause introduced by the subordinator *te*. Haplology involves the deletion of one of two identical syllables and with sensory *les* haplology affects NEG2. This is shown in (7.22), where the subordinator *te* is not present, although in a non-negated construction the subordinator *te* is used, as shown in (7.23).

- 7.22 *J-be-les-te nause Ø-se-ma.*  
 1SG:REAL-NEG1-see-NEG2 rain 3SG-IRR-come  
 ‘I don’t see that it’s going to rain.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

- 7.23 *Ne-les* [te nause Ø-se-ma.]  
 1SG:REAL-see SUB rain 3SG-IRR-come  
 ‘I see that the rain will come.’  
 (Fieldnotes elicitation)

Three Nese verbs encountered that come under the same sub-classification of verbs such as *les* are derived from the root *rong*. These are presented in Table 7.3.

**Table 7.3: Nese verbs derived from the root *rong***

<i>rong</i> ‘hear’, ‘listen’, ‘want’, ‘like’ and ‘feel’
<i>rongvusun</i> ‘know’
<i>rongneleng</i> ‘forget’

When a nominal object argument of *rong* ‘hear’ ‘listen’ is present, the subordinator *te* is absent, as shown in (7.24), contrasting with instances where the complement of the verb *rong* ‘hear’ is obligatorily introduced by the subordinator *te*, as illustrated in (7.25).

- 7.24 *Iven* Ø-ti-*rong* *natas* *khe*.  
 Iven 3SG:REAL-ASP-hear sea DEM  
 ‘Iven heard the sea.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:28:01.000-00:28:02.000 natural text)

- 7.25 *John* *khai* Ø-*rong-o* [te *khari*  
 John 3SG 3SG:REAL-hear-3SGOBJ SUB 3PL  
 ‘John heard that they  
*ri-ve* *Pita* Ø-se-*lakh*.]  
 3PL:REAL-say Peter 3SG-IRR-marry  
 said that Peter will get married.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

I have indicated (§4.4) that an object argument is realised either by a noun phrase or by an object suffix, the simultaneous co-occurrence of both being impermissible. However, although most complement-taking verbs abide by this, there are sporadic instances only in relation to the verb *rong* where the object pro-index co-occurs referring to the complement clause. Compare examples (7.25) and (7.26), the latter example being the most predominant where the object pro-index is not present.

- 7.26 Ne-turo v'an v'an **ne-rong** **te**  
 1SG:REAL-stand go go 1SG:REAL-feel SUB  
 'I stand until I feel that  
 Ø-se-rurrngo ale je-yat.  
 3SG-IRR-sore CONJ 1SG:IRR-sit  
 it's going to be painful then I'll sit.'  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:58:33.000-00:58:37.000 natural text)

As seen also with the examples containing *les* 'see' in (7.23), the object suffix does not co-occur with a complement clause object. On the other hand, example (7.27) suggests that the presence of the subordinator *te* is not necessary, and the complement clause may be simply juxtaposed to the main clause.

- 7.27 **Ne-rong-o** kho-skhashkho rengen nebe sakhal.  
 1SG:REAL-hear-3SGOBJ 2SG:REAL-sing LOC song one  
 'I heard that you sang a song.'  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

Verbs that fall into the semantic category labelled as 'thinking' are *rromrrom* 'think, believe', *rongvuson* 'know' and *rongneleng* 'forget'. While the verb *rromrrom* may take a noun phrase as an argument, as illustrated in (7.28), it may also take a complement clause that is introduced by *te* (7.29), or the main clause containing *rromrrom* may be simply juxtaposed beside its complement clause, as shown in (7.30).

- 7.28 Khai Ø-rromrrom nau-ne  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-think spouse-3SG:POSS  
 'He is thinking about his spouse.'  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)
- 7.29 Khina **no-rromrrom** [te khai Ø-s-be-rrorovokh-te]  
 1SG 1SG:REAL-think SUB 3SG 3SG-IRR-NEG1-play-NEG2  
 'I think that she won't play.'  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

- 7.30 *No-rromrrom terrterr je-rov naul s-ak.*  
 1SG:REAL-think strong 1SG:IRR-finish school CLGEN-1SG:POSS  
 ‘I am thinking strongly that I will finish my studies.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

The verb *rongvuson* ‘know’ takes either a nominal argument, as shown in (7.31), or a complement that is obligatorily introduced by the subordinator *te*, as shown in (7.32).

- 7.31 *Khai Ø-rongvuson nanalokh buro.*  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-know kava GENMOD  
 ‘He knows kava only.’ (i.e. kava is all he knows)  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:24:46.000-00:24:48.000 natural text)

- 7.32 *Nev’enu khai Ø-ti-nanas ne-rongvuson-i*  
 place 3SG 3SG:REAL-ASP-be.dry 1SG:REAL-know-3SGOBJ  
 ‘The place is dry, I know  
*[te nevre nokhobonian.]*  
 SUB month garden  
 that it is the gardening month.’  
 (2012\_08\_27 obnesp01003 00:03:36.000-00:03:42.000 natural text)

Although the constituent occurring after *te* resembles a noun phrase, it is analysed here as a complement clause because it does not mean that ‘I know the gardening month’, but rather it means that ‘I know that it is the gardening month’, which means that it predicates the existence of the month rather than simply referring to it.

The verb *rongneleng* ‘forget’ may take a nominal object argument, as shown in (7.33), and a complement clause as the object, illustrated in (7.34). Sentence (7.34) with the complement-taking verb *rongneleng* ‘forget’ illustrates an example where the 3SG subject of the complement clause is co-referential with the subject of the main clause and the verb taking the potential mood. When the verb in the subordinate clause is marked for the potential mood, the 3SG subject is not marked on the verb in the complement clause. This can be seen in (7.34) in which the verb is only marked with the potential *-bo-*. The data does not contain any examples

where the subject in the complement clause is not co-referential with that of the main clause and where the verb in the subordinate clause is marked for the potential mood.

- 7.33 *No-rongneleng*      *neng*      *s-en*      *nuak*      *khe*.  
 1SG:REAL-forget      name      CLGEN-3SG:POSS      boat      DEM  
 ‘I forgot the name of that boat.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

- 7.34 *Sera*      *khai*      *Ø-rongneleng*      [*te*      *ba-kuk*.]  
 Sera      3SG      3SG:REAL-forget      SUB      POT-cook  
 ‘Sera she forgot to cook.’  
 (2012\_08\_22 elanhy01011 00:11:16.000-00:11:20.000 elicitation)

Verbs that come under the semantic category of ‘liking’ always take the subordinator *te* to introduce their complement clauses and these are *rongo sat* ‘be sorry’, *rnonrronivele* ‘regret’ and *rong* ‘want’. The former two verbs do not take nominal object arguments. When the verb *rongo sat* ‘be sorry’ takes a complement clause as its object, the subject of the subordinate clause is not required to be co-referential with the subject of the main clause, as illustrated in (7.35). In this example, the main clause has the head verb *rongo sat*, with the subject position being filled by the 1SG subject cross-index, while the subject of the complement clause is represented by the 3SG pronoun.

- 7.35 *No-rong-o*      *sat*      [*te*      *khai*      *Ø-nas*.]  
 1SG:REAL-feel-3SGOBJ      bad      SUB      3SG      3SG:REAL-bad  
 ‘I am sorry that he died.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

Unlike the two verbs described previously under the semantic category of ‘liking’, the verb *rong* may take both a nominal object argument, as illustrated in (7.36), and a complement clause as an object argument.

- 7.36 *Khai*      *Ø-rong*      *tenge*      *nial*.  
 3SG      3SG:REAL-want      thing      red  
 ‘He wants the red thing.’  
 (2012\_08\_22 elanhy01011 00:15:59.000-00:16:02.000 elicitation)

Example (7.37) illustrates the verb *rong* ‘want’ with a complement clause as object, where the subject of the complement clause being the 3SG pronoun is co-referential with the subject of the main clause. In both cases, the subject is not marked on the verb in the complement clause, and the verb is marked for potential mood. In a desiderative complement with the verb *rong* ‘want’, the verb cannot take realis marking as the event of the complement is a potential rather than a real event. The subordinator *te* cannot be omitted with a desiderative complement. When the subject of the complement clause is not co-referential with that of the main clause, the subject pro-index must be affixed to the verb in the complement clause, as shown in (7.38).

- 7.37 *Khai Ø-rong* [te Ø-ba-num nanalokh buro.]  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-want SUB 3SG:REAL-POT-drink kava GENMOD  
 ‘He only wants to drink kava.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:13:03.000-00:13:06.000 natural text)

- 7.38 *Ø-Se-rong* [te rri-si-rej-rej min-i.]  
 3SG-IRR-want SUB 1PLINCL-IRR-REDUP-speak PREP2-3SGOBJ  
 ‘She wants for us to speak it.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:08:18.000-00:08:21.000 natural text)

The current data indicates a preference for the use of the potential mood marker *ba* to be indexed on the head verb in the complement clause, when the subjects of the main and complement clause are co-referential and the main clause contains the verb *rong* marked for the realis mood, although the action or event expressed by the verb in the complement clause is unreal. Another example is given in (7.39) where the subject of the main clause is expressed via the 2PL realis cross-index and the verb in the complement clause is also indexed by the 2PL realis pro-index in conjunction with the potential marker *ba*.

- 7.39 *Seve kirr-rong* [te kirr-be-les-ia,  
 COND 2PL:REAL-want SUB 2PL:REAL-POT-see-1SGOBJ  
 ‘If you guys want to come and see me,  
*kirr-ma.*]  
 2PL:REAL-come  
 you guys come.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:05:59.000-01:06:03.000 natural text)



The only deviation from this pattern involving the usage of potential *ba* in conjunction with co-referential subjects is when the subject of both the main and complement clauses is expressed by the 1SG, as shown in (7.40), where the 1SG subject cross-index in the complement clause is expressed by the 1SG irrealis form *de-*.

- 7.40 *Ne-rong* [te *de-natur.*]  
 1SG:REAL-want SUB 1SG:IRR-sleep  
 ‘I want to sleep.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:06:41.000-00:06:43.000 natural text)

There is no evidence to suggest that the head verb in the complement clause is marked with the irrealis subject cross-index when the subjects of both clauses are co-referential and the head verb in the main clause is marked for realis mood. Negation of the verb *rong* ‘want’ is achieved via the negative *sikha* occupying the slot preceding the subordinator *te*, as shown in (7.41).

- 7.41 Khai *Ø-rong-o* *sikha* [te *bo-sukul.*]  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-want-3SGOBJ NEG SUB POT-school  
 ‘He does not want to go to school.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:13:06.000-00:13:19.000 natural text)

When the verb *rong-* ‘want’ is negated, the 3SG object pro-index is always present. Lastly, the intransitive verb *rnonrronivele* ‘regret’ does not take any nominal object argument, although it takes a complement clause as an argument.

- 7.42 *No-rnonrronivele* [te *je-be-v’an-te.*]  
 1SG:REAL-regret SUB 1SG:IRR:NEGI-go-NEG2  
 ‘I regret that I did not go.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

In (7.42), the intransitive verb *rnonrronivele* takes an extended argument in the form of the complement clause whose subject is co-referential with the subject of the main clause.

The last semantic category into which Nese verbs taking complement clauses fall is associated with the notion of speaking. Generally, the argument occupying the position of subject in a verbal clause containing a verb of locution as the head verb conveys information to an addressee.

On the other hand, the information in the complement of the predicate refers to whether or not the reported speech is quoted directly (i.e. repeated word for word) as it was originally uttered. The verbs of locution in Nese are *ver* ‘tell’, *ve* ‘say’, *vervis* ‘reveal’ and *us* ‘ask’. The predicates *ver* ‘tell’, *ve* ‘say’ and *vervis* ‘reveal/disclose’ do not take subordinators or complementisers to introduce their complement clauses. In these cases, the complement clauses are simply juxtaposed paratactically and a pause is made to signal the clausal boundary.

The predicate *ve* takes a noun phrase (7.43) and an indirect or direct reported speech as its complement (7.44).

- 7.43    *Khina*        ***ne-ve***                      ***nokhod-me***                      ***khe.***  
          1SG            1SG:REAL-say            grandchild-1SG:POSS            DEM  
          ‘I say this is my grandchild.’/I call her grandchild.’  
          (2012\_05\_16 obanhy01003 00:09:11.000-00:09:13.000 natural text)

- 7.44    ***Ne-ve***                      *sikha*    *khai*    *Ø-ve*                      *Ø-se-ma*                      ***khe.***  
          1SG:REAL-say    NEG    3SG    3SG:REAL-say    3SG-IRR-come            DEM  
          ‘I said, “no she said that she will come, she will really come”.’  
          (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:16:14.000-00:06:18.000 natural text)

In (7.44), the subject of the main clause expressed via the 1SG independent pronoun is not co-referential with the subject of the complement of the predicate. The complement of the predicate also contains the same verb *ve* and in this instance the speaker is reporting what she had mentioned about someone else planning to visit her.

Nese does not make tense distinctions; therefore, the only way in which direct speech may be distinguished from indirect speech is through the use of the independent pronouns and the subject cross-indexes. When the subject of the complement clause is expressed by the 1SG irrealis cross-index, it is the choice between *de* and *je* (§5.4.1.2) that could determine whether the complement clause is direct speech or indirect speech. The form *de* is never used in main clauses and is only used in clauses that are functioning as complements of the verb *rong* when it means ‘want’ and of the verb *ve* ‘say’. In contrast, *je* cannot be used in complement clauses and can only be used in matrix clauses.

- 7.45 *Khina ne-ve de-vile bin khe...*  
 1SG 1SG:REAL-say 1SG:IRR-clean bean DEM

‘I said that I will clean these beans...’

(2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:04:11.000-00:04:13.000 natural text)

Since *de* cannot be used in main clauses, the complement clause in (7.45) can be understood as being a case of reported speech rather than direct speech. Example (7.46) is not a grammatical construction if it is occurring as a main clause, although (7.47) is grammatical.

- 7.46 \**De-vile bin.*  
 1SG:IRR-clean bean  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

- 7.47 *Je-vile bin.*  
 1SG:IRR-clean bean  
 ‘I will clean the bean.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

Another example involving the 3SG pronoun is given in (7.48), where the subject of the main clause is co-referential with the subject of the complement clause.

- 7.48 *Khai Ø-ve Ø-se-ma.*  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-say 3SG-IRR-come

‘She said she will come.’

(2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:16:14.000-00:06:18.000 natural text)

The use of the 3SG cross-index in the complement clause indicates that it is indirect speech since if it was a case of direct speech the 1SG cross-index *je* would have been used, as that would have been the words that the speaker who is here referred to by the 3SG pronoun would have said. This is illustrated in (7.49).

- 7.49 *Khai Ø-ve ‘je-ma.’*  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-say 1SG:IRR-come  
 ‘She said, “I will come”.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

A similar analysis applies to (7.50) where the use of the subject 1PL EXCL pronoun in the complement clause suggests that it is a case of direct speech because if the speaker had reported what was spoken by the people represented by the 3PL subject noun phrase of the verb *ve*, the construction would be as shown in (7.51) where the 3PL pronoun is used as the subject of the first clause in the complement clause.

- 7.50 *Re-ve* [no **kanan** *bir-si-khro* *v'an* *v'an...*]  
 3PL:REAL-say no 1PLEXCL 1PLEXCL-IRR-stay go go  
 'They said, "no as for us, we will stay here for some time".'  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:18:46.000-00:18:50.000 natural text)

- 7.51 *Re-ve* [no **khar** *ri-si-khro* *v'an* *v'an...*]  
 3PL:REAL-say no 3PLEXCL 3PLEXCL-IRR-stay go go  
 'They said, "no as for them, they will stay here for some time".'  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

It is more problematic to differentiate between direct speech and indirect speech when the subjects of the matrix clause and the complement clause are not co-referential and when the subject in the complement clause is a proper noun phrase, as shown in (7.52).

- 7.52 *Re-ve* [mm *Lana khota* Ø-*s-be-me-te* *khe.*]  
 3PL:REAL-say um Lana DEHORT 3SG-IRR-NEG1- come-NEG2 DEM  
 'They said, "umm Lana will not come here".'  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:06:11.000-00:06:14.000 natural text)

Nese does not use any morphological means to distinguish whether participants represented by pronouns or cross-indexes functioning as subjects of the matrix clause and the complement clause are co-referential, and speakers rely solely on contextual information to distinguish the referents of the subjects represented by pronouns functioning as subjects of clauses. For example, in construction (7.53), the referent of the subject of the complement clause could be the subject of the matrix clause or it could be another person.

- 7.53 *Khai* Ø-*ve* Ø-*se-ma...*  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-say 3SG-IRR-come  
 'She said she will come.'  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:06:16.000-00:06:17.000 natural text)

When pronouns and cross-indexes are used as subjects of the matrix and complement clauses, there is ambiguity in distinguishing between the referents; however, when proper nouns occur in subject position in both matrix and complement clauses, there is no ambiguity in the distinction regarding the co-referentiality of the subject arguments.

*Ver* ‘to tell, say’ is an extended transitive verb that can take four arguments: the subject noun phrase that may be represented by a pronoun; a lexical noun phrase or a cross-index; the direct object, which may be represented by a lexical noun phrase or a pro-index; and an optional prepositional phrase indicating the addressee. *Ver* contrasts with *ve* in that the latter is used primarily to report direct speech or indirect speech and does not take noun phrase arguments. When *ver* takes a direct object in the form of an object pro-index, the medial vowel in the verb is lowered to /a/, resulting in the form *var-i*. In (7.54), the complement is a possessive noun phrase and, in (7.55), the direct object is realised by the object cross-index, the dative prepositional phrase expresses the addressee and the complement clause has *ve* as its head verb. The complement of the verb *ver* can be either a complement clause where the head of the complement clause is the verb *ve* (7.55) or the verbal preposition *belek* ‘like’ (7.56).

- 7.54 ***Kirr-ver***                      *neng*                      *s-an*                      *O!*  
 2PL:REAL-say                      name                      CLGEN:3SG:POSS                      O  
 ‘Oh you guys say its name!’  
 (2012\_08\_27 obnesp01003 00:05:56.000-00:05:58.000 natural text)

- 7.55 ***Ne-var-i***                      *khin*                      *vinelekh*                      *ne-ve*  
 1SG:REAL-tell-3SGOBJ                      PREP I                      daughter in law                      1SG:REAL-say  
 ‘I told my daughter-in-law, I said,  
*ma*    *yat*    *iekhe*                      *ale*                      *v’an*    *te*                      *kuk*    *na*                      *netenge*  
 come    sit    DEM:LOC    CONJ    go    SUB    cook    HESIT    thingummy  
 “come sit here and go and cook um, the thingummy,  
*tubunbun*                      *nen*                      *norrulnasasakh*.  
 meat                      ASSOC                      rice  
 the meat for the rice”.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:01:19.000-00:01:28.000 natural text)

In example (7.55), the complement clause with *ve* as the head verb is composed of a clause in imperative form. As illustrated in (7.56), *belek* is always inflected for third person singular when it occurs as an adjunct argument of the matrix verb *ver* and the content of the noun phrase functioning as the object of *belek* has already been established earlier in discourse.

- 7.56 *Nua Ø-kol' Ø-var-i belek khe buro*  
 water 3SG:REAL-flow 1SG:REAL-say-3SGOBJ like DEM GENMOD  
 “The water is running,” she said it just like that.’  
 (2012\_01\_18 obrol01001 00:02:07.000-00:02:10.000 natural text)

In (7.57), the verb *vervis* ‘reveal, disclose’ takes an NP complement representing the addressee and a complement clause representing the content of the speech.

- 7.57 *Ne-var-i khin-err belek khe. be*  
 1SG:REAL-say-3SGOBJ PREP I-3PLOBJ like DEM CONJ  
 I told them like this but (That’s what I told them but)  
  
*j-be-vervis-te khunokh te khai Ø-se-ma.*  
 1SG:IRR:NEG I-reveal-NEG2 2SG SUB 3SG 3SG:IRR-come  
 I did not tell you that she will come.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:10:07.000-00:10:13.000 natural text)

The complement of the verb *us* ‘ask’ expresses reported speech as shown in (7.58). When the object expressed via a complement clause is present, the 3SG object pro-index is not present. This supports the fact that the complement clause is filling the object function. In this example, *naleng* is part of the second matrix clause with the head verbs marked for realis mood.

- 7.58 *Khina j-be-rongvuson-i naleng khunokh kho-v'an*  
 1SG 1SG:IRR:NEG I-know-3SGOBJ maybe 2SG 2SG:REAL-go  
 ‘I don’t know how about you go  
  
*kho-us te khai Ø-se-ma.*  
 2SG:REAL-ask SUB 3SG 3SG:IRR-come  
 and ask for him to come.’  
 (2014\_02\_18 naaksi01001 00:00:57.000-00:01:02.000 natural text)

The verb *us* ‘ask’ may also take a nominal argument in object position, as shown in (7.59), where the noun phrase *tenge kher khe* ‘these things’ forms the object argument.

- 7.59 *Khai Ø-us tenge kher khe.*  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-ask thing PL DEM  
 ‘She is asking all these things.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

### 7.5.1.2 Verbs with an obligatory clausal argument

Dixon’s subclass of Secondary C verbs comprises verbs of causation. Nese verbs that fall under this category are *bat-e* ‘make/cause’ (7.60), *ver terrterr* ‘force verbally’ (7.61) and *najnge* ‘agree, allow, let’ (7.62).

- 7.60 *Ne-bat-e te Ø-se-naskhe sirrsirr.*  
 1SG:REAL-make-3SGOBJ SUB 3SG-IRR-cooked be.quick  
 ‘I made/did it in such a manner that it will be cooked quickly.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

In (7.60), the referent of the object of the matrix clause is the same as that of the subject of the complement clause. This does not apply to similar referents in (7.61) and (7.62), where the referents of the subjects of the matrix clause and that of the complement clauses are not co-referential.

- 7.61 *Ne-ver terrterr te khai Ø-se-vervis-i.*  
 1SG:REAL-say be.strong SUB 3SG 3SG-IRR-reveal -3SGOBJ  
 ‘I forced (verbally) him to reveal it.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

- 7.62 *Khina ne-najnge te Ø-se-tekh ral-ok rengen*  
 1SG 1SG:REAL-agree SUB 3SG-IRR-take voice-1SG:POSS LOC  
 ‘I agree for her to record my voice using  
*tangatarr s-an khe.*  
 thing CLGEN-3SG:POSS DEM  
 those things of hers.’  
 (2012\_05\_16 obanhy01001 00:00:26.000-00:00:33.500 natural text)

### 7.5.1.2.1 Clauses in subject position

The only two examples in the data in which clauses occupy subject position is when the subject is composed of a verbal equational clauses (cf. §6.2.1), as illustrated in (7.63). In (7.63), the verbal clause in subject position is comprised of the copula verb *ve* functioning as the head verb occupying the slot between two noun phrases of equal status. The complement clause is introduced by the subordinator *te*.

- 7.63 *Khai Ø-ve tenge lukho te kho-ma les*  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-be thing fearful SUB 2SG:REAL-come see  
 ‘It’s a very fearful thing that you came to see

*kanan.*

1PLEXCL

us.’ (‘It’s an honour that you came to see us.’)

(Fieldnotes, elicitation)

The other example in the data contains a non-verbal clause in subject position of the matrix clause. This is shown in (7.64).

- 7.64 *Norromian s-ak khai Ø-ti-terrtterr te*  
 thinking CLGEN-1SG:POSS 3SG 3SG:REAL-ASP-be.strong SUB  
 ‘As for my thoughts, it is strong that

*Ø-se-mavos.*

3SG-IRR-be.correct

it will be good.’ (‘I strongly believe that it will be good.’)

(Fieldnotes, elicitation)

In (7.64), the subject of the matrix clause and that of the subordinate clause that is represented by the 3SG irrealis subject cross-index are not co-referential. The matrix clause contains the topicalised noun phrase *norromian sak*.

## 7.5.2 Relative clauses

A relative clause is one that modifies the head noun in an NP and is embedded within that NP. The argument being modified must be co-referential with one of the arguments of the relative clause. Nese uses either the subordinator *te* to introduce relative clauses or, in cases where



*te* is not used, there is a lack of pausing and change of intonation between the NP head and the relative clause that marks a relative clause boundary. The discussion of relative clauses in this section will be mainly focused on their internal syntactic properties.

In (7.65), the head noun of the main clause is followed by a relative clause that gives additional information about that head noun. The head noun and the co-referential prepositional object pro-index make up the common argument, and they are underlined in (7.65). The common noun *naine* in this example is an extra clausal object of the clause and it is being modified by the relative clause.

- 7.65    ...*rri-si-vekhsein-i*,                    *naine*                    *te*  
           3PL-IRR-clean-3SGOBJ            house                    SUB  
           ‘...they will clean it, the house which
- rri-si-naturr*                    *min-i*                    *domitri*.  
           3PL:IRR-sleep                    PREP2-3SGOBJ            dormitory  
           they will sleep in it, the dormitory.’
- (2014\_02\_18 naaksi01001 00:07:02.000-00:07:05.000 natural text)

In the examples that follow, the common arguments will be distinguished from other elements by the use of bold font with underlining. Keenan (1985, p. 143) distinguishes two types of relative clauses, based on whether the common argument occurs outside or inside of the relative clause. These are called external or internal relative clauses respectively. The former is the prevalent pattern in SVO languages and is also applicable to Nese, as can be seen in (7.65), where the common noun is outside of the relative clause. Contrastively, internally headed relative clauses are those where the head noun is inside the relative clause. However, this is not applicable to Nese. The class of external relative clauses is further divided into two subclasses called post-nominal and prenominal external clauses. In the former, the relative clause occurs to the right of the domain noun and, in the latter, the relative clause occurs to the left of the common argument. Nese exhibits post-nominal external clauses only. Modifiers have a tendency to occur after the head noun in an NP; therefore, relative clauses, which also have a modifying function, occur post-nominally, although they are embedded in the NP.

### 7.5.2.1 Marking of the relative clause

Nese employs the subordinator *te* to mark relative clauses, as shown in (7.66), and when *te* is not present the relative clause is simply juxtaposed beside the common argument and there is no pause or change in intonation between the head of the NP and the following clause, as exemplified in (7.67).

- 7.66 *Kho-so-khuban renge navle te rri-les nalang*  
 2SG-IRR-garden LOC month SUB 1PLINCL:REAL-see wind  
 ‘You will do your gardening in the month in which we see the wind  
*Ø-sirsir.*  
 3SG:REAL-blow  
 blowing.’  
 (2012\_08\_27 obnesp01003 00:07:38.000-00:07:48.000 natural text)

- 7.67 *Vave! khunokh, netenge, nalok s-am khe*  
 Auntly 2SG thingummy laplap CLGEN-2SG:POSS DEM  
 ‘Auntly, that thingummy, your laplap  
*kho-var-i kho-bat-e khe, sobonon khai*  
 2SG:REAL-say-3SGOBJ 2SG:REAL-make-3SGOBJ DEM some 3SG  
 that you said you made, are there still some  
*Ø-ti-tokh?*  
 3SG:REAL-ASP-stay  
 left?’  
 (2012\_05\_16 obanhy01003 00:07:24.000-00:07:29.000 natural text)

In (7.66), the noun phrase, the object of the prepositional phrase, which is functioning as a non-core argument of the main clause, is being modified by the relative clause giving more information about the co-referential participant so that it is more easily identifiable. Example (7.67) shows the relative clause occurring beside the co-referential participant *nalok* ‘laplap’ with no intervening subordinator. In these cases, there is no pause after the noun phrase *nalok* ‘laplap’ and the beginning of the relative clause.

### 7.5.2.2 Marking of the common argument

A noun phrase, independent pronoun, pro-index or cross-index that is the common argument, regardless of its function in the matrix clause, must always be co-referenced with an argument in the relative clause either by means of an independent pronoun or an object cross-index. A co-referential constituent in the relative clause is never expressed as an NP. In cases where there is more than one argument in the main clause, the cross-indexes or pro-indices on the verb in the relative clause can assist in identifying which argument in the main clause is being co-referenced.

In (7.68), the common argument in the main clause is the 3SG object pro-index and the object pro-index in the relative clause is marked for singular, indicating co-referentiality between the 3SG object pro-index in the matrix clause and the object pro-index in the relative clause.

- 7.68 *Tentan-i jelekh te kho-rong kho-se-milj-i sirsir.*  
 pin-3SGOBJ all SUB 2SG:REAL-want 2SG-IRR-tie-3SGOBJ quickly  
 ‘Pin all of it which you want to tie quickly.’  
 (2012\_07\_12 obaksi01001 00:16:22.000-00:16:25.000 natural text)

Although it is easy to determine a co-referential relationship between the singular noun in the matrix clause and the object pro-index in the relative clause in (7.68), there are cases where a certain degree of ambiguity exists. This is illustrated in (7.69) where the subject of the relative clause, given that it is 3SG, is not overt, therefore triggering ambiguity as to whether the referent of the non-overt pro-index is an argument in the matrix clause or is information that ought to be able to be deduced from context.

- 7.69 *Ne-ve 'wolei Yvon khai Ø-s-bo-kuk-te bin*  
 1SG:REAL-say Oh Yvonne 3SG 3SG-IRR-NEG1-cook -NEG2 bean  
 ‘I said, “Oh Yvonne she did not cook some of the beans  
*sobonon khe te Ø-ti-takh-e.*  
 some DEM SUB 3SG:REAL-ASP-take-3SGOBJ  
 which she took”.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:03:59.000-00:04:04.000 natural text)

In fact, the object pro-index on the verb in the relative clause is co-referential with the object of the main clause realised by the noun phrase *bin* ‘bean’. Nese does not make any morphological distinction between singular and

plural categories in inanimate common nouns (cf. §4.5.4), and the object is invariably 3SG even though its co-referential noun phrase in the main clause may be modified by a numeral or quantifier specifying plurality. Plural animate nouns functioning as either subjects or objects in a main clause must have their corresponding co-referential entities in the relative clause marked for number. Although possessive suffixes are marked for number, they bear no import in distinguishing co-referentiality between a lexical noun phrase in the matrix clause and an object pro-index in the relative clause. Given that Nese does not permit a lexical noun phrase inside a relative clause to be co-referential with a lexical noun phrase in the matrix clause and possessive suffixes can only modify full lexical noun phrases, possessed full noun phrases co-referential with an argument in the matrix clause are non-existent.

On the other hand, there is evidence of a lexical noun phrase in the matrix clause being modified by a possessive classifier, as shown in (7.70). In such cases, the numerical value indicated on the possessive classifier does not have any relevance in terms of distinguishing whether an object pro-index in the relative clause is co-referential with the noun phrase it is modifying.

- 7.70    *Nemer-re*        *s-an*                                *te*        *rri-ti-ma*.  
           Man-PL            CLGEN-3SG:POSS            SUB        3PL:REAL-ASP-come  
           ‘His people who came.’  
           (2012\_06\_24 obgisa01001 00:00:43.000-00:00:47.000 natural text)

In (7.70), the head noun in the possessive noun phrase is plural, even though the general possessive classifier is marked for 3SG and the plural head noun *nemerre* is co-referential with the 3PL subject cross-index in the relative clause. In cases where number is not encoded in the lexical noun phrase functioning as an argument in the matrix clause, which is co-referential with an object pro-index in the relative clause, the presence of a possessive classifier does not bear any significance in determining whether an object pro-index is co-referential with the lexical noun phrase. This is illustrated in (7.71), where there is no number encoded in the head noun *nokhobu* in the matrix clause and the co-referential object pro-index in the relative clause is specified for the 3SG person and number. Although the object pro-index is singular, a plural reading is also possible. In such cases, the presence of the possessive classifier does not assist in adding any numerical information to the object pro-index, a factor that is pivotal in establishing a co-referential relationship.

- 7.71 *Nokhobu s-am te rri-si-nib-e.*  
 bamboo CLGEN-2SG:POSS SUB 1PL-IRR-cover-3SGOBJ  
 ‘Your bamboo(s) which we will cover.’  
 (2012\_07\_21 obaksi01001 00:25:03.000-00:25:10.000 natural text)

### 7.5.2.3 Restrictions on relativisation

There are no restrictions on what kinds of arguments in the main clause may be relativised since Nese permits subjects, objects and non-core arguments to undergo relativisation. However, there is a restriction on the type of nominal element in the matrix clause that may be relativised. In this regard, Nese does not allow independent pronouns bearing any syntactic function such as subject or object arguments in the matrix clause to undergo relativisation. Arguments in the form of lexical noun phrases are the only ones that may be relativised, consequently entering into a co-referential relationship with another argument in the subordinate clause. Furthermore, Nese does not place emphasis in using resumptive independent pronouns in relative clauses as co-referential arguments, contrasting with the predominant use of co-referential subject cross-indexes and object pro-indexes in relative clauses. Evidence from the data points to four different argument types in main clauses that may enter into co-referential relationships with their co-referencing arguments in relative clauses. These are presented in Table 7.4.

**Table 7.4: Co-referential arguments in matrix and relative clauses**

Co-referential arguments in relative clause	Arguments in matrix clause			
	Subject	Object of transitive verb	Object of PP	Predicate of non-verbal matrix clause
subject	✓ (7.29)		✓ (7.75) (7.81)	✓ (7.78)
object		✓ (7.74)	✓ (7.72)	
<i>rangan</i>		✓ (7.77)	✓ (7.77)	
subject of verbal preposition <i>belek</i>			✓ (7.81)	

As shown in Table 7.4, there is a symmetrical relationship between the co-referential properties of subject and object arguments in matrix clauses. Objects of transitive verbs in matrix clauses can only be co-referential with an object argument in the relative clause or the preposition *rangan*. In a similar manner, subjects in matrix clauses are restricted to enter into co-referential relationships only with subject arguments in relative clauses.

Objects of prepositional phrases functioning as non-core arguments in matrix clauses display more flexibility, in that they may be co-referential with either a subject, object, non-core *rangan* ‘in, into, at’ and subject of the verbal preposition *belek* ‘like’ of relative clauses. While a co-referential relationship may exist between objects of prepositional phrases in matrix clauses with either a subject, object or non-core argument in the relative clause, there are also cases where Nese does not require any argument in the relative clause to enter into a co-referential relationship with the object of a prepositional phrase in the matrix clause.

To begin with, the subject of an intransitive matrix clause may be co-referential with a zero marked 3SG subject of the relative clause, as illustrated in (7.72), where the 3SG irrealis subject pro-index is co-referential with the non-overt subject argument of the verb *vitai* ‘put’. The example also shows a co-referential relationship between the possessed lexical NP object argument of the prepositional phrase functioning as a non-core argument of the matrix intransitive clause with the object argument of the verb *vitai* ‘put’ in the relative clause.

- 7.72    *Ø-Se-ma*                      *khin*                      *noroblat*                      *s-an*                      *te*  
           3SG-IRR-come                PREP I                      paper                      CLGEN-3SG:POSS                SUB  
           ‘She will come for her paper which  
           *Ø-ti-vita-i*    *iekhe*.  
           3SG:REAL-ASP-put-3SGOBJ                DEM:LOC  
           she had left here.’  
           (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:16:23.000-00:16:26.000 natural text)

Furthermore, a subject pro-index in the main clause may be co-referential with another subject pro-index in the relative clause, as illustrated in (7.73). In (7.73), the 2SG irrealis subject pro-index in the matrix clause is co-referential with the 2SG subject pro-index marked for realis mood in the relative clause.

- 7.73    *Kho-se-kil-kil*    *norrian*                      *te*                      *kho-rong-o*.  
           2SG-IRR-REDUP-look for                food                      SUB                      2SG:REAL-want-3SGOBJ  
           ‘You will look for food that you want.’  
           (2014\_02\_18 naaksi01001 00:16:54.000-00:16:59.000 natural text)

In (7.74), the noun phrase occupying the object position in the transitive matrix clause is co-referential with the object argument in the relative clause. On the contrary, the subject argument in the matrix clause is not co-referential with the subject argument in the relative clause, contrasting with example (7.72) in which the subjects of both the matrix and relative clauses are co-referential.

7.74 *Rri-tekh* **norrurr** *te Amerika Ø-ti-vreng-i khe.*  
 1PLINCL:REAL-take clothes SUB America 3SG:REAL-ASP-throw-3SGOBJ DEM

‘We took the clothes which the Americans threw.’

(2012\_06\_19 obfaha01003 00:00:07.000-00:00:11.000 natural text)

A common argument in object position in the matrix clause need not necessarily be an object argument of a transitive verb as Nese also permits the object argument of prepositional phrases functioning as non-core arguments in matrix clauses to be co-referential with another argument in the relative clause. This is shown in (7.75), where the common argument in the matrix clause is the object of the prepositional phrase headed by the verbal preposition *min*, which is co-referenced by the resumptive 3SG independent pronoun *khai*, functioning as the subject of the intransitive verb *tokh*.

7.75 So tete min **norrian** te **khai** Ø-ti-tokh.  
 Thanks father PREP2 food SUB 3SG 3SG:REAL-ASP-stay

‘Thank you father for the food which is here.’

(2012\_06\_12 obaksi01001 00:11:19.000-00:11:22.000 natural text)

Example (7.75) contrasts with example (7.72) in that there is a co-referential independent 3SG resumptive pronoun in the relative clause in (7.75), which is lacking in the relative clause in example (7.72). Nese restricts the use of co-referential independent pronouns in relative clauses to those occupying subject position in relative clauses. When an independent pronoun is present in such contexts, such as in (7.75), it is used as a marker of emphasis, bringing into focus the argument with which it is co-referential. There is no evidence to suggest that an independent pronoun in object position in a relative clause can be co-referential with a lexical noun phrase argument in the matrix clause.

Although, in conjoined independent clauses, it is obligatory for the *rangan* argument to be co-referential with an argument functioning as the object of a prepositional phrase in an antecedent clause, evidence suggests that clauses exhibiting a subordinate relationship do not require the presence of a prepositional phrase with the locative *rengen* as its head in the matrix clause. This is illustrated in (7.76), where the relative clause contains *rangan* bearing no co-referentiality with an argument functioning as the object of the locative preposition *rengen* in the matrix clause. *Rangan* is co-referential, however, with the noun phrase *tenge* ‘thing’.

- 7.76    *Tav'at*            *khai*            *Ø-sa-ma*            *Ø-se-var-i*  
           woman        3SG            3SG-IRR-come       3SG-IRR-say-3SGOBJ  
           ‘The woman will come and block
- Ø-se-verkhorr-o,*            *tenge te*        *Ø-ti-norvo*            *rangan.*  
           3SG-IRR-block-3SGOBJ    thing    SUB    3SG:REAL-ASP-depend    LOC  
           him from it, the thing on which he depends.’  
           (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:49:34.000-00:49:41.000 natural text)

In (7.76), the common argument in the matrix clause is *tenge* ‘thing’, which is functioning as the object of the verb *verkhorr* ‘block (verbally)’. The subject of the verb *norvo* is the non-overt 3SG, which is not represented in the matrix clause but is retrievable from context.

As in (7.76) where the common argument is a lexical noun phrase object in the matrix transitive clause, example (7.77) also has a lexical noun phrase functioning as the object of the transitive matrix clause. Given that the relative clause has an intransitive verb as its head, the co-referential form *rangan* is functioning as an adverbial adjunct in this clause.

- 7.77    *Khar*        *ru-tu-sul*                    *naine*        *nge*        [*te*        *nemerrte*  
           3PL        3PL:REAL-ASP-burn       house       DEM       SUB       man  
           ‘They burnt the house which the man
- Ø-ti-natur*                    *rangan.]*  
           3SG:REAL-ASP-sleep       LOC  
           was sleeping inside.’  
           (Fieldnotes, elicitation)



A noun phrase forming the predicate of a non-verbal matrix clause may also be subject to relativisation, as illustrated in (7.78).

- 7.78 *Khai iekhe khe nanus te Ø-ti-tokh khe.*  
 3SG DEM LOC DEM grass SUB 3SG:REAL-ASP DEM  
 ‘This one here is the grass which stays here.’  
 (2014\_02\_18 naaksi01001 00:05:26.000-00:05:30.000 natural text)

In (7.78), there is no overt subject index in the relative clause given that 3SG cross-indexes are not realised on the verb and the 3SG independent pronoun is an optional element. The non-overt 3SG subject cross-index in the relative clause is co-referential with the noun phrase in the non-verbal matrix clause *nanus* ‘grass’. Nese exhibits a tendency for co-referential relationships to be established between a lexical noun phrase or a cross-index or a pro-index, rather than an independent pronoun in a matrix clause and another argument in a subordinate clause. Therefore, the relative clause in (7.78) can never occupy the slot immediately after the subject of the non-verbal clause.

A lexical noun phrase functioning as the object of a prepositional phrase with the locative preposition *rengen* as its head is also susceptible to relativisation, assuming a co-referential relationship with an independent pronoun functioning as the subject of the relative clause, as illustrated in (7.79).

- 7.79 *Rri-vekhsein-i, naine khe, naleng rengen mande,*  
 3PL:REAL-clean-3SGOBJ house DEM maybe LOC Monday  
 They clean it, the house, maybe on Monday,  
*tusde, rengen wik te kbhai Ø-se-ma.*  
 Tuesday LOC week SUB 3SG 3SG-IRR-come  
 Tuesday, in the coming week.’  
 (2014\_02\_18 naaksi01001 00:05:31.000-00:05:42.000 natural text)

In (7.80), the common argument in the main clause is the object of a prepositional phrase functioning as a non-core argument and the common argument in the relative clause is functioning as the subject of the relative clause. Another example where the object NP of a prepositional phrase that functions as a temporal non-core argument is not co-referential with any argument in the relative clause is (7.80).

- 7.80 *Kho-so-khuban*      *rengen*      ***navle***      *te*      *rri-les*      *nalang*  
 2SG-IRR-to garden      LOC      month      SUB      1PL:REAL-see      wind  
 ‘You’ll make a garden in the month in which we see the wind  
*Ø-sirsir.*  
 3SG:REAL-blow  
 blow.’  
 (2012\_08\_27 obnesp01003 00:07:38.000-00:07:47.000 natural text)

This differs from (7.77), in which a non-core prepositional common argument is realised in the relative clause by *rangan*. A possible explanation is that Nese does not allow the expression of temporal non-core arguments by means of a resumptive *rangan* in the relative clause; however, non-core arguments realised by prepositional phrases with a locative meaning may be co-referenced with *rangan* in the relative clause.

Lastly, the object of a locative prepositional phrase functioning as a non-core argument in the main clause may be subject to relativisation, bearing a co-referential relationship with the subject cross-index of the verbal preposition *belek* in the subordinate clause. This is illustrated in (7.81).

- 7.81 *Tejiblahk*      *ri-yat*      *rengen*      ***nuak***      *te*  
 children      3PL:REAL-sit      LOC      boat      SUB  
 ‘The children they sat on the boat which  
*Ø-belek*      *khe.*  
 3SG:REAL-like      DEM  
 is like this.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 01:05:16.000-01:05:20.000 natural text)

The common argument in (7.81) is the lexical noun phrase object of the prepositional phrase functioning as an adjunct of the main clause. This prepositional phrase has a locative function and unlike other examples, such as (7.77), it is not co-referential with a non-core *rangan* in the relative clause. On the contrary, it is co-referential with the subject of the relative clause.

### 7.5.3 Adverbial clauses

Nese employs the following subordinators, outlined in Table 7.5, to introduce adverbial clauses.

**Table 7.5: Subordinators and functions**

<i>neten te</i>	introduces an adverbial clause of reason ‘because’
<i>neren te</i>	introduces a temporal adverbial clause ‘when’
<i>neren</i>	‘during’, ‘at’
<i>belek te</i>	introduces a similitive adverbial clause ‘as if’

Adverbial clauses are a type of subordinate clause – that is, a clause that is embedded in a main clause and is grammatically dependent on that main clause. Adverbial clauses differ from complement and relative clauses in that complement clauses are arguments of a predicate and relative clauses are modifiers of a noun phrase that functions as an argument of a predicate. Adverbial clauses, on the other hand, are adjuncts of clauses contrasting with relative clauses that are modifiers of phrases. Following Dixon, adjuncts (which he labels as peripheral arguments) are associated with non-core arguments expressing notions such as instrument, accompaniment, recipient, beneficiary, time, place and manner (2010, p. 429). Nese adverbial clauses articulate concepts of time, manner, purpose and conditions under which an action occurs. Adjuncts that express temporal notions are associated with either simultaneous or sequential time frames. Manner clauses describe the way in which an action encoded in the verb in the matrix clause and that of a subordinate clause is carried out. On the other hand, purpose clauses provide the justification in a subordinate clause for an action expressed by the head verb in the matrix clause. Conditional adjuncts establish the condition under which an action occurs.

#### 7.5.3.1 Temporal clauses

Adverbial time clauses in Nese are introduced by the form *neren te* ‘when’ or simply *neren* ‘during, at’. The use of these markers of temporal clauses indicates a temporal relationship between the main clause and the subordinate clause, which can be either simultaneous, as in (7.82), or sequential, as in (7.83). In (7.83), the extraction of coconut milk takes place after the coconuts are collected and not simultaneously.

- 7.82 *Ø-se-viteikhorō nekrre min nause, nial*  
 3SG-IRR-block 1PL PREP2 rain sun  
 ‘It will shelter us from the rain, sun  
*neren te rri-si-natur laine.*  
 when SUB 1PLINCL-IRR-sleep house:LOC  
 when we will sleep in the house.’  
 (2012\_07\_12 obaksi01001 00:00:56.000-00:01:01.000 natural text)

- 7.83 *Tija rro-lol iekhetan khe neren te*  
 teacher 3PL:REAL-stay DEM:LOC DEM when SUB  
 ‘The teachers stay down here and when  
*rri-si-vis-vis rri-v’an rri-lavi nani*  
 3PL-IRR-REDUP-squeeze 3PL:REAL-go 3PL:REAL-pull coconut  
 coconut milk  
 they want to use coconut cream, they will go and take the coconut  
*atan khe.*  
 down DEM  
 down there.’  
 (2014\_02\_18 naaksi01001 00:08:22.000-00:08:28.000 natural text)

### 7.5.3.2 Manner clauses

Manner clauses are introduced by *belek te* ‘as if’, which expresses the manner in which the actions or events described in the main clause are carried out. In (7.84), the speaker is telling the addressee to do something in whatever manner he knows best. In (7.85), the speaker is saying that the way in which they filled the ship was as if they were blind.

- 7.84 *Ale khunokh kho-so-kot-o belek te kho-rongvuson-i.*  
 CONJ 2SG 2SG-IRR-do-3SGOBJ as.if SUB 2SG:REAL-know  
 -3SGOBJ  
 ‘Okay you’ll do it like you want to.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:04:14.000-00:04:17.000 natural text)

7.85 *Seve rri-narralon, nenete-ni khe khar ri-si-nas*  
 COND 1PL:REAL-drown child-2PL:POSS DEM 3PL 3PL-IRR-die

'If we drown, all your children will die

*latas neten te nuak velvele je be*  
 sea:LOC PURP2 SUB boat small very CONJ

in the sea because the boat is too small but

*kirr-sungun-i belek te nam'ata-mi Ø-ti-vonvon.*  
 2PL:REAL-fill-3SGOBJ as.if SUB eye-2PL:POSS 3SG:REAL-ASP-blind  
 you fill it up as if you are blind.'

(2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 01:04:06.000-01:04:22.000 natural text)

With manner clauses, the main clause always precedes the manner clause.

### 7.5.3.3 Purpose and reason clauses

Nese employs *neten te* 'because' to express a reason or purpose for the occurrence of the action or event expressed by the verb in the main clause. The form is a juxtaposition of the preposition *neten* (cf. §6.6.2) with the subordinator *te*. Thompson, Longacre and Hwang (2007, p. 250) state that it is common for languages to use similar morphological means to express both purpose and reason clauses. This is because both give reasons why certain actions or events happen. Reason clauses, however, describe a motivating event that may be realised at the time of the main clause event while purpose clauses refer to a motivating event that must be unrealised at the time of the main clause event (Thompson, Longacre & Hwang, 2007, p. 250).

This difference is drawn via distinctions in mood in the subordinate clause whereby subordinate clauses are marked for realis mood when expressing reasoning notions contrary to being marked for irrealis mood when conveying a purposive denotation. Example (7.86) has its subordinate clause marked for realis, which means that the action in the subordinate clause has already happened and has brought about the condition expressed by the main clause.

- 7.86 *Khai Ø-ve tenge khorkhor sakhal khe*  
 3SG 3SG:REAL-be thing hard one DEM  
 ‘That’s one difficult thing
- neten te nale Ø-ti-rov di.*  
 PURP2 SUB language 3SG:REAL-ASP-finish already  
 because the language is already finished (no longer spoken).’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:07:12.000-00:07:16.000 natural text)

Since the event in the subordinate clause has already happened, the subordinate clause can be referred to as a reason clause. In (7.87) however, the mood of the main clause is realis and that of the subordinate clause is irrealis. The irrealis mood, being compatible with events which are set in the future tense, means that the event in the subordinate clause has not yet occurred at the time when the event described in the main clause occurred. Therefore, the subordinate clause in (7.87) is a purpose clause because the event described in the subordinate clause is still unrealised at the time when the people were going home.

- 7.87 *Rro-mul v'an neten te je-luljokhor nenet-in*  
 3PL:REAL-return DIR PURP2 SUB 1SG:IRR-enclose child-3SG:POSS  
 ‘We went back so that I could put the chickens
- nato.*  
 fowl  
 chickens in.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:33:29.000-00:33:33.000 natural text)

In situations where both the main and subordinate clauses are marked for irrealis mood, a purposive and reason reading may be deduced as shown in (7.88). In this example, the events in both the main and subordinate clause have not happened yet. The reason reading encodes the reason why the action expressed in the main clause will occur and the purpose for the realisation of the event described in the main clause.

- 7.88 *Khai Ø-se-nakis neten te nemerrte rri-si-ma.*  
 3SG 3SG:IRR-good PURP2 SUB people 3PL:IRR-come  
 ‘It will be good because the people will come/.’ ‘It will be good for the people to come.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

However, when the subordinate clause is marked for realis, a purposive reading is not possible as shown in (7.89) where the only reading which may be deduced from this example is based on reason.

- 7.89 *Khai Ø-se-nakis neten te nemerrte rri-ma.*  
 3SG 3SG-IRR-good PURP2 SUB people 3PL:REAL-come  
 ‘It will be good because the people came.’  
 \*It will be good in order that the people came.  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

It is therefore clear that when both clauses are marked for realis mood, the subordinate clause is a reason clause. A combination involving a main clause marked for irrealis mood and a subordinate clause marked for realis mood may also have a reason connotation. On the other hand, a strictly purposive reading may be deduced when a main clause is marked for realis mood and a subordinate clause is marked for irrealis mood. It is only when both clauses are marked for irrealis mood that a reason as well as a purposive reading may be deduced. In these cases, semantic factors as well as contextual information may be relied upon to assist in determining the intended connotation.

### 7.5.4 Conditional clauses

Following Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007, p.257), the different parts of conditional clauses are the ‘if’ clause and the ‘then’ clause. The ‘if’ clause is the clause which names the condition and the ‘then’ clause refers to the main clause. In Nese the ‘if’ clause is introduced by the conditional marker *seve* ‘if’ and it always precedes the main clause as shown in (7.90). Nese employs several strategies to mark the beginning of the ‘then’ clause. There are cases where the ‘then’ clause is indicated by a pause or a change in intonation. In other cases, the ‘then’ clause is introduced by the coordinators *ale* ‘and’ as shown in (7.91).

- 7.90 *Seve na-ma, j-be-vervis-te khin-i.*  
 COND 1SG:REAL-come 1SG:IRR:NEG1-reveal-NEG2 PREP1-3SGOBJ  
 ‘If/when I come, I won’t tell him.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:32:54.000-00:32:57.000 natural text)

- 7.91 *Lana seve Ø-se-ma ale bir-sakhsakh kele.*  
 Lana COND 3SG-IRR-come CONJ 1PL EXCL:REAL-work again  
 ‘Lana, if she comes, then we will work again.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:08:57.000-00:09:03.000 natural text)

In (7.91) the conditional *seve* follows the subject of the ‘if’ clause. The subject of the ‘if’ clause normally follows the conditional *seve* as illustrated in (7.92) where the subject is realised by the 1SG subject cross-index. However in (7.91) the subject is topicalised.

- 7.92 *Seve khunokh kho-rong te kho-ba-num-u ba-lemje*  
 COND 2SG 2SG:REAL-want SUB 2SG-POT-drink- 3SGOBJ POT-a.lot  
 ‘If you want to drink lots of it,  
*ale kho-vol-i vol-i v’an.*  
 CONJ 2SG:REAL-buy-3SGOBJ buy-3SGOBJ go  
 then you go buying it.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:48:36.000-00:48:40.000 natural text)

Thompson, Longacre & Hwang (2007, p.258) divide conditional constructions into two different categories: reality conditionals and unreality conditionals, with the distinction being based on semantic grounds. Reality conditionals are conditional constructions that refer to real, present, habitual, generic or past situations. Unreality conditionals are further subdivided into two groups: imaginative and predictive conditionals. The subcategory of imaginative conditionals is further subdivided into hypothetical conditionals and counterfactuals. The former refers to situations which might happen while constructions in the latter subcategory refer to situations which did not or could not happen. As in reason and purposive clauses, Nese relies on mood marking on the verb of the main clause to determine whether a construction is a reality or unreality conditional. Constructions in which the mood of the verb in the main clause is realis are reality conditionals, given that they are situations that have happened, are happening or are habitual. A reality conditional construction may be comprised of an ‘if’ clause marked for realis mood and a subordinate clause marked for irrealis mood as shown in (7.93) or it can be made up of both clauses marked for realis mood, as shown in (7.94).



In (7.93) the realis mood marking in the ‘if’ clause encodes a habitual meaning. The action expressed by the verb in the ‘then’ clause, whose realisation is dependent on the occurrence of the activity in the main clause, is marked for irrealis mood. This means that it is expected that when kava is prepared for ceremonial purposes, it will be drunk by that person.

- 7.93 *Khai num-u rengen seremoni khin tenge sakhal,*  
 3SG drink-3SGOBJ LOC ceremony PREP1 thing one  
 ‘He drinks it during a ceremony that is done for something
- ri-si-bat-e ale seve re-bet nanalokh,*  
 3PL-IRR-make-3SGOBJ CONJ COND 3PL:REAL-make kava  
 that they do and if/when kava is made,
- khai Ø-se-num-u*  
 3SG 3SG-IRR-drink-3SGOBJ  
 he is going to drink it.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:50:02.000-00:50:11.000 natural text)

This habitual connotation is also evident in the ‘if’ clause in (7.94) where the head verb is marked for the realis mood. The ‘if’ clause is made up of a complement clause while the ‘then’ clause is composed of an equational clause where the head verb is the copula *ve* marked for realis mood.

- 7.94 *Nekrre rri-sakhsakh min sisen buro, seve khina*  
 1PL 1PL:REAL-work PREP2 season GENMOD COND 1SG  
 ‘We only work in seasons, if I
- ne-les te nalang khai Ø-ti-sirrsirr, nev’enu khai*  
 1SG:REAL-see SUB wind 3SG ASP-blow place 3SG  
 see the wind is blowing, the place is
- Ø-ti-narang ne-rongvuson-i khai Ø-ve*  
 3SG:REAL-ASP-be.dry 1SG:REAL-know-3SGOBJ 3SG 3SG:REAL-be  
 is hot, then I know that
- nevre nokhobonian.*  
 month gardening  
 it’s the gardening month.’  
 (2012\_08\_27 obnesp01003 00:03:27.000-00:03:41.000 natural text)

As shown in (7.95), an ‘if’ clause may be composed of a complement clause containing a verb in the main clause marked for realis mood while the complement is marked for the potential mood. The ‘then’ part of the clause is marked for realis mood. A habitual connotation may also be deduced from the realis marking expressed on the main verb in the ‘if’ clause.

- 7.95 *Seve kirr-rong te kirr-be-les-ia kirr-ma.*  
 COND 2PL:REAL-want SUB 2PL:REAL-POT-see-1SGOBJ 2PL:REAL-come  
 ‘If you people want to see me, then come.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 01:05:59.000-01:06:03.000 natural text)

Unreality conditionals in Nese are indicated by the conditional clause being marked for the irrealis mood as shown in (7.96). In (7.96) both clauses are specified in the irrealis mood and as long as the event described in the main clause eventuates, then the event described in the subordinate clause will occur.

- 7.96 *Seve natas Ø-se-tamat kani kurr-su-mul,*  
 COND sea 3SG-IRR-peace 2PL 2PL-IRR-return  
 ‘If the sea is calm, you (PL) will return  
  
*nuak tu khai Ø-vala.*  
 Boat too 3SG 3SG:REAL-run  
 and the boat will also run.’  
 (2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 01:01:09.000-01:01:16.000 natural text)

Counterfactuals in Nese do not follow the pattern prescribed for unreality conditionals where the first clause takes irrealis marking as shown in (7.97) where the first clause is specified for the perfective aspect.

- 7.97 *Seve bas Ø-ti-ma je-v'an iekhe.*  
 COND bus 3SG:REAL-ASP-come 1SG:IRR-go DEM:LOC  
 ‘If the bus had come I would have gone by now.’  
 (Fieldnotes, elicitation)

### 7.5.5 Negative conditionals

In Nese, negative conditionals are signalled by the conditional marker *seve* and the negative verb *sikha* which means ‘if not’. The subordinate clause introduced by *seve sikha* expresses the event or action which would have happened if the event in the main clause did not take place. Examples from the current available data on Nese indicate that the ‘then’ clause in Nese can only be either in irrealis mood (7.98 and 7.99) or marked with the dehortative marker *khota* (7.100 and 7.101).

- 7.98    *khina*                      *ne-ve*                      *kani*    *kirr-v'an*                      *lanus*  
           1SG                              1SG:REAL-say              2PL    2PL:REAL-go              bush:LOC  
           ‘I said, “you guys go to the bush”,
- ne-ve*                      ***seve***    ***sikha***    *khar*    *re-se-v'an*                      *re-se-jnejne*  
           1SG:REAL-say              COND    NEG    3PL    3PL-IRR-go                      3PL-REAL-fish  
           I said, “if not they will go fishing
- dokh*                      *latas*.  
           first                              sea:LOC  
           first in the sea”.’
- (204\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:17:41.000-00:17:48.000 natural text)

In (7.98) the main clause is in fact the first clause with realis marked *v'an* as the head verb and the ‘if not’ clause being headed by two verbs in serial formation, both of which are marked for irrealis mood. The event described by the main clause occurred in real life, although the actions described by the ‘then’ clause are hypothetical situations which are presented as an option had the event in the main clause not occurred.

Example (7.99) presents a similar condition. The main clause has the transitive verb *viteikhor* ‘block’ with realis mood marking while the ‘if not’ clause is composed of the intransitive stative verb *nenelkhare* ‘cold’ marked marked for the irrealis mood. The main clause expresses an action that happened in the real world, and the speaker is stating, in the ‘if not’ clause, a possible consequence if the action in the main clause had not happened.

- 7.99 *Ne-viteikhor-o*                      *kele*    *neten*    **seve**    **sikha**    *Ø-se-nenelkhare.*  
 1SG:REAL-block-3SGOBJ    again    PURP2    COND    NEG    3SG-IRR-be.cold  
 ‘I closed it again because if not it’s going to get cold.

*Rru-rongo*                      *tenge*    *te*            *khai*    *Ø-ti-khavkhav.*  
 1PLINC:REAL-want            thing    SUB            3SG    3SG:REAL-ASP-be.hot  
 We want that which is hot.’  
 (2012\_06\_12 obaksi01001 00:06:53.000-00:06:58.000 natural text)

Examples (7.100) and (7.101) differ from examples (7.98) and (7.99) in that the subordinate clause is not marked for irrealis mood but takes the prohibitive mood marker which occupies the slot prior to the head verb in the clause.

- 7.100 *Kanan*    *bir-se-woj*                      *norrulnasasakh*    *khe*            *buro,*            *kanan*  
 1PLEXCL    1PLEXCL-IRR-eat    rice                      DEM            GENMOD            1PLEXCL  
 ‘We will eat this rice only, us

*min*            *vinelekh,*                      *neten*            *te*            *khina*    *no-rong-o*  
 PREP2            daughter-in-law    PURP2            SUB            1SG            1SG:REAL-WANT-3SGOBJ

and my daughter in law, because I don’t want

*sikha*            *de-woj*                      *nebetnekhev*            *khe,*            **seve**    **sikha**    *khota*  
 NEG            1SG:IRR-eat                      bread                      DEM            COND    NEG            PROHIB  
 to eat this bread, if not

*s-bo-won-te*                      *khe.*  
 1IRR-NEG I-full-NEG I                      EMP  
 we won’t be full.’

(2014\_01\_19 naanhy01001 00:02:34.000-00:02:43.000 natural text)

In (7.100) the intransitive head verb *won* in the subordinate clause is negated and the main clause is the initial clause with the transitive verb *woj* ‘eat’ as its head verb. The immediately following clause with the negated complement taking verb *rong* ‘want’ as the head verb forms a reason clause in a subordinate relationship with the main clause. Thus the negated conditional clause introduced by *seve sikha* presents a hypothetical situation which would arise if the action in the main clause has not

occurred. While example (7.100) presents a case where a conditional clause is subordinate to a main clause containing another subordinate clause, example (7.101) presents a case where two independent clauses with the transitive head verb *takh* ‘take’ and the intransitive head verb *v’an* ‘go’ respectively precede the negative conditional clause introduced by *seve sikha*. The action encoded by the verb in the subordinate clause is a hypothetical situation whose occurrence is likely if the propositions contained in both preceding clauses did not occur.

- 7.101 *Ne-ve wolei vinelekh kho-takh khar*  
 1SG:REAL-say Oh daughter in law 2SG:REAL-take 3PL  
 ‘I said, “Oh my daughter-in-law take them
- kirr-v’an maro jin nem-en olfala jekh-ok*  
 2PL:REAL-go up CLGEN house-3SG:POSS old uncle-1SG:POSS  
 you guys go up to the old man’s house, my uncle
- maro. Seve sikha khota nemere*  
 up COND NEG PROHIB people  
 up there. If not people will not
- bet tengeterr khe.*  
 make thing DEM  
 be able to do these things.’
- (2014\_01\_2019 naanhy01001 00:36:58.000-00:37:11.000 natural text)

### 7.5.6 Concessive clauses

Nese uses the adverbial general modifier *buro* ‘just’ and the adversative *be* ‘but’ to form concessive clauses which mean ‘X is still/just ...but still X did...’ The adverbial general modifier *buro* and adversative *be* occur at the end of the main clause and signal that although the event in the main clause happened, the event in the subordinate clause still occurred. Main clauses always have realis mood marking and subordinate clauses also take realis marking. This is illustrated in (7.102) and (7.103).

- 7.102 *Khai Ø-ti-roj                      buro        be        khai Ø-v'an*  
          3SG       3SG:REAL-ASP-sick       GENMOD       ADVS       3SG       3SG:REAL-go

'Although she was sick she went to the

*lanus*

bush:LOC

garden.'

(Fieldnotes, elicitation)

- 7.103 *Khai Ø-ti-sikha                      nav'at       buro        be        rong-o           yas.*  
          3SG       3SG:REAL-ASP-NEG       money       GENMOD       ADVS       want-3SGOBJ       go

'Although she did not have any money, she still went.'

(Fieldnotes, elicitation)

This text is taken from *A Grammar of Nese*, by Lana Grelyn Takau,  
published 2023 by ANU Press, The Australian National University,  
Canberra, Australia.

[doi.org/10.22459/GN.2023.07](https://doi.org/10.22459/GN.2023.07)