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ABBREVIATIONS

Linguistic abbreviations are used throughout the examples in this document. Some are even standard. Here they all are for reference:

Ø – Null Argument

1,2,3 – Numbers of persons (of pronouns)

Adjc - Adjunct

Adv – Adverb

AdvP – Adverbal Phrase

AGT – Agent

CAUS - Causative

CLFR - Classifier

COL – Collective

COMPL – Complementiser

CONF.Q – Confirmation Question Particle

Conj – Conjunction

ConjP – Conjunction Phrase

DAT – Dative

DEM.DIST – Distal Demonstrative

DEM.MED – Medial Demonstrative

DEM.PROX – Proximal Demonstrative

DO – Direct Object

DYN.INTR – Dynamic Intransitive Voice

DYN.PAS – Dynamic Passive Voice

HON - Honorific

IMP – Imperative

INCL - Inclusive

INS – Instrumental

INTENT – Intentionality

IO – Indirect Object

LOC – Location ; Locative

NEG – Negative

N - Noun

NP – Noun Phrase

O - Object

PartP – Particle Phrase

PEJ – Pejorative

PP – Person Plural

Prep - Preposition

PrepP – Prepositional Phrase

Prn - Pronoun

PS – Person Singular

Q – Question Particle

RECP – Reciprocal Voice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DYN.TR</strong></td>
<td>Dynamic Transitive Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ</strong></td>
<td>Equative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVT</strong></td>
<td>Eventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCL</strong></td>
<td>Exclamation ; Exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOC</strong></td>
<td>Focus Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FocP</strong></td>
<td>Focus Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FocQ</strong></td>
<td>Focus Question Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFL</strong></td>
<td>Reflexive Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REL</strong></td>
<td>Relativiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td>Sentence ; Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STV.PAS</strong></td>
<td>Stative Passive Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SVC</strong></td>
<td>Serial Verb Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VP</strong></td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. A Short History

Ötari was the original language of Mohai, prior to its incorporation into the Heitak Empire. It was a member of the Dahu language family. Ötari is no longer spoken but three other Dahu languages survive in an area to the west of Mohai.

The Ötari people had a peaceful matrilinial family-orientated society. They organised themselves into three to seven loosely-organised kingdoms (the number varied over time).

They had basic metal-working techniques and could produce spears, helmets, shields and swords. They were great sailors and built a variety of vessels. Naval warfare was almost unknown to the Ötari, but they set sail often to fish, to trade or to travel more quickly and safely than they could on land.

They called their homeland Dora Odace, meaning (The) Blessed Country in Ötari.

Dora Odace had a wetter climate than the lands to the south which made it attractive to the Roheitak. When invasion came, the Ötari proved no match for the warlike and organised Roheitak with their navy, cavalry and body armour.

A large Roheitak minority soon established itself as overlords and ran Dora Odace as a slave-labour, plantation economy, growing cereals and vegetables in much greater quantities than could be grown further south.

The invaders' Classical Leheitak language belonged to the Kelma language family. It co-existed with Ötari until the collapse of the Heitak Empire and persisted for a couple of hundred years afterwards.

In the early days of Empire, Ötari remained the sole language the natives used amongst themselves, but Classical Leheitak had greater prestige, as the language of the rulers. Gradually, it won more speakers and took over more public functions.
Imperial period Ōtari was subject to rapid change. It incorporated many Leheitak loanwords and a base-12 counting system in place of the traditional base-5. A local dialect of Leheitak developed too, adopting Ōtari words for local flora, fauna and cultural practices.

1.2. Lemohai and the Ōtari Revival

Gradually, a new language emerged. This new tongue took much of its grammar from Ōtari and most of its vocabulary from Leheitak. It was named Lemohai, the language of Mohai. After the empire collapsed, Lemohai was eventually adopted as the official language of an independent Mohai.

In present day Mohai, there is a revival of interest in learning Ōtari for the heritage value. Traditional poems and stories may be found in the language, plus a few new works. Learning Ōtari is particularly popular amongst members of Metal Age re-enactment societies. These meet at weekends to live the simple life in recreated Ōtari-style villages.

Ōtari was well-documented, mostly by Roheitak scholars rather than native speakers, but we have enough material to reconstruct a decent Ōtari sketch grammar with some confidence.

As far as knowledge permits, this grammar avoids changes made to Ōtari during the imperial era. It also avoids changes made by revivalist speakers to adapt Ōtari to modern life. The aim is to present a pre-imperial Ōtari, so readers can better see the nature of the Dahu languages.

1.3. Typology of Ōtari

Ōtari was a Subject-Verb-Object language. It had the nominative-accusative alignment type, so marked a similar range of sentence roles to English.

Unlike English though, it treated nouns in the genitive case like accusatives. This made Ōtari a Type 3 language in Milewski’s typology. English is Type 1.

It had zero-marking for grammatical inflections, but used agglutination for semantic derivations. Word order was strict and important. Ōtari was head-initial, putting heads before dependants in almost all phrases.
2. PHONOLOGY

Ôtari had 28 phonemes and 3 allophones. They are presented here using the *North Axoku Hyperspace Bureau transliteration table, no. 1-2-13*. Where necessary, pronunciations are clarified with the help of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA).

2.1. Vowels

The language had five oral and five nasal vowels. It is not thought that these varied significantly outside of diphthongs and triphthongs. They are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i, ĩ</td>
<td>u, ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Low</td>
<td>e/ɛ/, ĕ</td>
<td>o/ɔ/, ŵ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>a, ā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single vowels were always enunciated clearly. They were never swallowed up as unstressed vowels often are in English.

The nasal vowels were exact nasal counterparts of the oral ones. So they behaved like Portuguese nasal vowels as in the phrase *um bom vinho branco*.

They were not like the French vowels as in *un bon vin blanc*. These vowels are not the ones suggested by the spelling. An exception was nasal *e*, which is followed by a *[j] glide in Portuguese, but not in Ôtari. Nasal vowels are transcribed here with the accent the Portuguese call *til*.

2.2. Diphthongs

Vowels were classed as strong (*a, ā, e, ē, o, ŵ*) or weak (*i, ĩ, u, ū*). Any strong vowel-weak vowel combination was a valid diphthong in Ôtari, provided both were oral or both nasal. The strong vowel kept its full value.
and the weak vowel weakened towards /j/ or /w/.

Two weak vowels could also combine if both were oral or both nasal. In these cases, the first vowel weakened.

In nasal diphthongs, only the strong vowel carried the til, though both were nasalised.

- **Waika** – Yellow, etc.  
- **Akuo** – Behind  
- **Duã** - One; Thumb  
- **Āitu** - Long

Two strong vowels were not permitted next to each other.

### 2.3. Triphthongs

Any strong vowel between two weak vowels was a valid triphthong, provided the vowels were all oral or all nasal. Again, only the strong vowel took the til in nasal combinations, though all the vowels were nasalised.

- **Guai** – You (singular, low status)  
- **Aku’ai** – Crab

### 2.4. Vowel Sandhi and Allophony

Where vowels met at word boundaries, unstressed weak vowels diphthongised, as described above. A rising diphthong plus a weak vowel created a triphthong at word boundaries. As noted above oral-nasal pairings were not allowed (see 2.2-2.3).

- **Fātu esukai** = /'fātuɛ'sukai/ [diphthong across boundary]  
  *Fruit fresh*  
  *"Fresh fruit"*

- **Akuaira** = /'a'kuaires/ [triph at boundary - note stress]  
  *Island south*  
  *"South Island"*

The first of two strong vowels was lost on compounding.

---
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**Ciro, cat + Ekũ, wild = Cirekũ – Wild cat**

Where a falling diphthong preceded another vowel, its final vowel became y or w in compounds.

**Nomai, word + Atau, sharp = Nomayatau – Taboo or swear word**

### 2.5. Consonants

There were eighteen consonant phonemes, shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Coronal</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ny / ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+Voice</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Voice</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates</td>
<td>+Voice</td>
<td>j /dʒ/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Voice</td>
<td>c /tʃ/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>f /φ/</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>x /ʃ/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterals</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhotics</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glides</td>
<td>(w)</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\( P, T \) and \( K \) were unaspirated.
\( N, D \) and \( T \) were dental.
\( L \) was clear as in \textit{leaf}, not dark as in \textit{fall}.
\( R \) was normally a tap, like single \( r \) in Spanish \textit{pero}.

2.6. Consonant Sandhi and Allophony

Two strong vowels were separated by an unwritten glottal stop, \([ʔ]\) at word boundaries. \([ʔ]\) was also required between a rising diphthong and a strong vowel.

A stressed weak vowel did not weaken at word boundaries, but was preceded by \([ʔ]\), like a strong vowel.

Some linguists believe the glottal stop was not required after a triphthong or falling diphthong. We will never know for sure. Ancient sources are not clear and practice varies amongst contemporary revivalists.

\[ \text{Lowa esukai} = /'lowa \, ʔɛ'sukai/ \quad [+ \text{glottal}] \]
\( \text{Water fresh} \)
\( "\text{Fresh water}" \)

\[ \text{Yomai uleme} = /'jɔmaj \, u'ɛmɛ/ \quad [- \text{glottal}] \]
\( \text{Fish \quad rotten} \)
\( "\text{Rotten fish}" \)

An unwritten \( m \) or \( n \) appeared between two strong nasal vowels across word boundaries. They were probably not required where a nasal diphthong could be formed, though there is some dispute about the matter.

Contemporary revivalists favour \(/m/\) after the two high vowels \( i \) and \( u \), and \(/n/\) after the rest. Once again, what the historical Ōtari people did is unknown.

\[ \text{Iwā ăitu} = /'iwan \, ăitu/ \quad [+m] \]
\( \text{lit. River long - "Long river"} \)
BUT -

*Ijũ ĩpe = /ˈiːjũɨp/ \[nasal diphthong across boundary\]
lit. Cease doubt - "Cease to doubt"

*Akuãi iwã = /ˈakuãi ʔiwa/ \[2nd vowel not nasal, so add glottal stop\]
Crab river - "River crab"

*R became a trill when word initial. Again, it followed Spanish, as in *roja*.

2.7. Syllabification
The following were the only syllable patterns permitted in Őtari.

*(C)V ; (C)VV ; CVVV

2.8. Prosody
Stress always fell on the *penultimate syllable*. Few clues have been left to us about the intonation patterns of Őtari, as ancient Roheitak writers did not trouble themselves with such matters. However we do know that questions should be asked with a questioning intonation.

The language seems to be hospitable to other English intonation patterns and these are similar to the intonation patterns of Őtari’s partial descendant, Lemohai. Their use is therefore suggested, except as noted below.

��tari usually followed Spanish in having no clear breaks between words. Breaks occurred where the unwritten glottal stop was introduced between vowels (see 2.6, above).

Here are some examples of 工委 intonation patterns, annotated for three pitches: 1-low, 2-medium, 3-high. The forward slash: / represents another exception to the “no breaks between words” rule. It indicates an Indonesian-style pause, that fell between subject and predicate, except in rapid speech.
**Fai / cenye**

2 / 3 1

I eat

"I am eating"

**Ule xukà / yele iowà**

2 2 3 2 / 3 2 2 1

Man this drink water

"This man is drinking water"

### 2.9. Dialectal Variations

At this stage we only have texts go on and about half of these come from around Orisu, the modern capital. Texts are scarcest in remote mountain areas, the very places most likely to exhibit dialectal variation. It is often therefore difficult to distinguish personal, orthographic choices from regional ones.

However, we know that phonemic /ts/ was common throughout the north and that an extra vowel /i/ had some currency in the south, with both oral and nasal varieties. It may have had wider usage as an allophone of /i/, before velar, and perhaps palatal and post-alveolar, sounds.

### 2.10. Writing System

Ôtari was not written down until some hundred and fifty years before the Roheitak invasion. Even then, little was written in the language.

Most towns and a few villages eventually had their own chronicles. The practice began in the Orisu area and depended on the availability of a literate person, usually a priest. There were also royal records and a few collections of folk literature. Much has been lost down the years, but a decent-sized corpus still remains.

Ôtari scribes adapted the Classical Leheitak alphabet to their own language. Nasality on vowels was shown by a diacritic and most consonants had their own letter. Proper nouns were not capitalised in writing, as the alphabet did not contain capitals, though they are capitalised here in transliteration.
3. MORPHOLOGY

Ōtari words were divided into of three broad classes: **nouns, verbs** and **particles**. Class boundaries were more fluid than in European languages. Words frequently passed unaltered from one class to another. The change was signalled purely by word order.

Each broad class had a number of important sub-classes. There was no dedicated class for modifying words like adjectives and adverbs. Modification was viewed as a process. It was signalled by word order, so it is discussed under **Section 4, Phrases**.

Root words tended to have one or two syllables, though longer ones existed. They were overwhelmingly observational and tended to refer to the natural world, as the Ōtari were closer to nature and had less possessions than a modern society.

- **Jĩ** – House ; Hut
- **Bele** – Bone
- **Oyo** – Food
- **Uleme** – Rotten

Non-observational nouns either referred to social structures and practices, or they were of a religious or mythological nature. Abstract words in the modern sense were comparatively rare.

- **Kiẽda** – Story
- **Māja** – Traditional lore or knowledge
- **Maicu** – Idea ; Concept ; Thought

Compound words put the substantive element before the qualifier. Like substantive-first languages in our world, Ōtari only allowed compounds to consist of two elements. The meaning of some compounds was closely related to the meaning of their parts, though others were less literal.

- **Oxu** – Hall
- **Kuari** – Assemble ; Meet
- **Oxu-kuari** – Village meeting hall

There were no inflectional affixes only derivational ones. This is unlike most European languages, though like Indonesian, which has only one inflectional affix and a wealth of derivational ones. A change of word class sometimes required an affix, but was often signalled merely by word
3.1. Nouns

The class of nouns covered all entities. Defined formally, a noun was any word capable of acting as the subject of a clause. By this definition, pronouns are a sub-class of nouns. Other important sub-classes were common and proper nouns.

3.1.1. Common Nouns

Common nouns were not marked for number, gender, case or definiteness. Given this lack of inflection, a bare common noun was subject to some interpretation.

\textit{Fātu} – A fruit ; The fruit ; Several pieces of fruit ; Some fruit (considered as a mass) ; Fruit in general

Case was shown by prepositions and word order, number was shown by quantifiers. Gender was not a grammatical category. Definiteness was shown fitfully by word order, as shown in \textit{Section 5, Clauses}.

3.1.2. Noun Compounding and Affixation

Compound nouns were compounds with a root noun as their substantive element. The qualifier could be another noun, a particle or a verb.

\textit{Xoli} – Meal ; \textit{Euna} – Happy
\textit{Xoli-euna} – Feast (i.e. “Happy meal” !)

Common affixes used with nouns are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun Affixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ōtari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are some examples:

**Go- masũ**
AGT-hunt
"Hunter"

**Kua-doru**
LOC- holy
"Holy place"

**Pei- gemo**
COL-war
"Warband"

Note that *pei-* is no mere plural. The group must have some kind of unity, such as the common purpose of the warband in the last example. A noun could not add more than one word or affix. Affixation could change spelling.
**Go- masũ yomai**

AGT-hunt fish
"Fisher"

**Kua-doru Lebai Nosue**

LOC-holy Mother Tekuo
"Place sacred to Mother Tekuo"

**Pey-ule bosã** [+1 affix, +1 noun]

COL-man mountain
"Gang of men of/from the mountains"

Full reduplication of a noun indicated extensiveness. 

*Bokai* meant "copse", "wood" or "forest", but a *bokai-bokai* could only be a "large forest".

### 3.1.3. Personal Nouns

A full personal name consisted of five elements. First names tended to express or embody desirable qualities. Some were gender specific, some not. A boy's first name was followed by his father's first name and a girl's first name was followed by her mother's.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some Common Personal Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ōtari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Íme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuõi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namaito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukūde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third element was the preposition *mi*, “in”. Then came the name of the extended family, or *mofu*. This was the name of a founder figure, real or mythological. This element often resembled the kind of names shown above though sometimes it was in an older form of the language that no longer made sense.

Finally, there came a clan name. Mohai had around fifty clans, or *yetau*, during the Ōtari period. Most were named after a totem animal, though a few had totem plants. Many of these clans survive today. Most have Lemohaised their names, a few have not. One or two went by Lemohai names for a while then re-Ōtarised, as interest in the ancient tongue increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some Important Clan Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ōtari</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yetau Akuāi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yetau Bakū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yetau Kuaitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yetau Roxu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yetau Saiwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yetau Ŭci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fortunately, a person's full names was not usually necessary. Here are a couple of names to show how the system worked:

**Akule  Potā mi Saji        Baku**  
_Honour Jewel in  [? Mofu] Hawk [Clan]_

Known to history as **Queen Akule**, she ruled the Kingdom of **Eyola**, and was the last Ötari ruler to hold out against the advancing Roheitak.

**Odace  Namaito mi Kurā             Akuāi**  
_Blessed Wise        in  Peace [Mofu] Crab [Clan]_

Known through a popular cycle of folk tales as **Odace Namaito**, he appears as an itinerant judge, attached to an unnamed kingdom. His judgements showed Ötari people how to uphold custom law, but temper it with mercy, creativity and common sense. We cannot at this distance tell whether he was a real figure, based on a real figure, or purely legendary.

Note that his third name is feminine. This is the name of the alleged founder of his mofu. Ötari society was matrilinear, so most men had a feminine mofu name. The remainder had names whose meaning had been lost, as in the previous example.

### 3.1.4. Place Names

Place names usually described local features though quite a few were named after people or events associated with the location. Most consisted of two elements, but they could be longer.

**Ta- yoku**  
_Tai + yoku_  
_Field rock_  
"Field of Rocks"

**Jī- bosā**  
_Jī + bosā_  
_Hut mountain_  
"Huts in the Mountains"
**Iwān-ōtau**  [Iwā + ōtau]
River great
"Great River"

**Kua- kule**  [Kua + Akule]
Place Akule
"Place of Honour", or perhaps, "Place belonging to (a person called) Honour" (maybe even to Queen Akule herself)

**Teme coi, Yomai Xuāite!**
See IMP, fish leap!
"See, Fish Leap!"

The last example is a rather curious village name from the north. Like a number of similar names, it recalled some long forgotten incident.

### 3.1.5. Kinship Terms

Ōtari society was matrilinear and matrilocal. Kinship terminology reflected this in that its prime aim was to distinguish relatives in the paternal and maternal lines. The system also distinguished relative age in some close relationships.

The **Iroquois** of North Eastern USA have a patrilinear society but use similar terminology, though without age distinctions. The **Yanomamo** system is also similar.

- **Kamuai** - Father ; Father's Brother
- **Lebai** - Mother ; Mother's Sister
- **Wotai** - Brother ; Sister ; Parallel Cousin
  (i.e. Child of Father's Brother or Mother's Sister)
- **Asū** – Own Child ; Child of Your Same-Sex Sibling or Parallel Cousin
  (Not to be confused with **atei**, which means child in the sense of non-adult)
- **Kute** - An asū who has grown-up
- **Bāci** - Child of Your Opposite-Sex Sibling or Parallel Cousin
**Taga** - Mother’s Brother  
**Sopa** - Father’s Sister  
**Liē** - Cross Cousins  
   *(Children of Father's Sister or Mother's Brother)*  
**Yonu** - Child of Cross Cousin

Suffixes marked seniority within a generation.  
- **-ra** – Older  
- **-pu** - Younger  
**Wotai-ra** - Older brother/sister/parallel cousin  
**Kamuai-pu** - Father's younger brother

**Xome** - Husband  
**Moja** - Wife

These terms were combined with other terms to indicate in-laws.  

**Xome Wotai** – Husband of sister or parallel cousin

To distinguish children by gender add as separate word:  

**Asū roi** – Male asū  
**Asū kuei** – Female asū

To distinguish lineages add a separate word:  

**Liē lebai** – Cross cousin in the mother's lineage  
   *(Mother's Brother's child)*

The verb and preposition bietu means over, above or to be over/above. It may follow a kin term in a compound to distinguish generations:
Kamuai-bietu  
Father-over  
Grandfather  

Lebai-bietu  
Mother-over  
Grandmother  

3.1.6. Personal Pronouns  
The language had personal pronouns in singular and plural form, for each of three persons. Third person pronouns did not distinguish between humans and non-humans, nor by gender. There were two types of first person plural, one that included the addressee(s) and one that excluded them.

Each of these seven basic concepts was further divided by three levels of politeness: equative, honorific and pejorative. The use of these reflected the relative social status of the interlocutors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Ötari</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pej.</td>
<td>Eq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PS</td>
<td>Tau</td>
<td>Fai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PS</td>
<td>Guai</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PS</td>
<td>Rai</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PP</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wode</td>
<td>Ucĩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PP</td>
<td>Buā</td>
<td>Tai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PP</td>
<td>Xiǎ</td>
<td>Ata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pronouns were used much less than in English, as any that could be understood from context were dropped (See Section, Clauses below).
3.1.7. Indefinite Pronouns
A handful of general nouns doubled-up as indefinite pronouns. These were followed by a vague quantifier, then a third element, a numeral classifier (see 3.3.4 Numeral Classifiers, below). Here are some examples of indefinite pronouns. More are given in the Dictionary.

*Rā suo ja*
Thing all GENERAL.CLFR
"Everything"

*Salu duã koye*
Person one head.CLFR
"Somebody"

3.1.8. Reflexive and Reciprocal Pronouns
Ōtari had no need of these, as both reflexivity and reciprocity were marked by verbal voice.

3.1.9. Interrogative Pronouns
Interrogative pronouns fused the nouns/indefinite pronouns *salu* and *rā* with the question particle *mē*, to give *melu*, "who?" and *mā*, "what?". If the speaker was radically short of information, the all-purpose *marē*, "who/what?" was available.

3.1.10. Relative Pronouns
Unlike in English, the interrogative pronouns did not double-up as relative pronouns. As we shall see, the language has no need for relative pronouns (See 7.3 Relative Clauses).

3.1.11. Locative and Demonstrative Pronouns
Three locative words served as pronouns, and adverbs: *xuā*, "here"; *kuo*, "there"; *ro*, "yon". These combined with the affix -kā, of uncertain origin, to produce the three demonstratives: *xukā*, "this" or "these"; *kuokā*, "that" or "those"; *roikā*, "yon".
3.1.12. Possessive Pronouns
There was no single word for “mine”, “yours”, etc. Instead the word rā, “thing” or “something” had to be used, followed by a personal pronoun: rā fai, “mine”, etc., as juxtaposition was the only way to indicate possession. Pejorative and honorific forms could also be used. These referred to the status of the possessor, not the thing possessed: rā tau, approx. “little old me’s”, not *“some worthless thing of mine”.

3.1.13. Quantifiers
Quantifiers were vague expressions of number and mass. It seems odd to our eyes to rank them amongst the pronouns, but the language lacked a modifier class and they can be used pronominally in English, for example:

*Sawa polai*
Come many
"Many came"

Used as noun modifiers, they required the presence of a numeral classifier (see 3.3.4 Numeral Classifiers, below). Used as pronouns, they stood alone.

The main ones were:

*Suo* - All, both, every ;  *Wei* - Few
*Polai* - Many

There was no equivalent of English “some” in the plural sense. You had to choose between *polai* and *wei*. The dividing line depended on context. A hundred grains of rice would be a few, a hundred trees would be many, unless you were in a forest, when it too could be a few.

However, a partitive “some” was available: nyē, which also meant portion. Obē, “zero”, also did duty as “none” and as “no” in the quantitative sense.
3.1.14. Numbers

Numbers ranked amongst the pronouns for similar reasons. Like quantifiers, they had a pronominal usage though it was not their main one.

_Sawa seura_

_Come hundred_

"A hundred came"

The Ōtari originally counted in base 5, the number of fingers on one hand. Indeed the word for "one" also means "thumb", the word for "two" is also "finger", and the word for "five" is the same as "hand". (The words for "three" and "four" are of uncertain origin).

Under the Heitak Empire, the Ōtari switched to the base 12 system favoured by the Roheitak. Base 12 counting will be dealt with under Classical Leheitak and Lemohai, so I will confine my attention here to base 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Ōtari</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Obẽ</td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Duã</td>
<td>One ; Thumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aja</td>
<td>Two ; Finger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bake</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sinye</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1x5</td>
<td>Kã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(1x5)+1</td>
<td>Kã duã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2x5</td>
<td>Ajakã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardinals</td>
<td>Ordinals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>(2x5)+2</td>
<td>Ajakā aja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5x5</td>
<td>Nime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>(5x5)+2</td>
<td>Nime aja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>(2x(5x5)+(1x5)+3</td>
<td>Ajanime kā bake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5x(5x5)</td>
<td>Seura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordinal numbers were formed by preceding the cardinal numbers above with the word *po*, “rank”, or, “position”: *po duã*, “first”, etc. To translate last, combine *po* with the verb *kaya*, “finish”, or, “complete”: *po kaya*.

Fractions were formed in a similar way, with *nyē* “portion” (see also 3.1.13 Quantifiers above), or some in the partitative sense. *Nyē bake*, “a third”, etc.

Reduplication was used for emphatic numbers: *seura-seura*, “hundreds”, etc.

Approximate numbers took the preposition *bini*, “near”: *bini kã*, “about five”; “fiveish”.

As with quantifiers, all these number forms could stand alone as pronouns or be used as noun modifiers in conjunction with a classifier.

### 3.2. Verbs

The class of verbs referred to actions and states as in English, but also to qualities (which the Ōtari viewed as extended states). The class therefore included words we would call adjectives and manner adverbs. The verb class divided into two sub-classes: dynamic and stative verbs. Many stative verbs corresponded to our adjectives, but not all.
Sēgo – Run (dynamic)
Polu – Stand (stative)
Euna – Be happy (stative)

Defined formally, a verb was any word capable of standing alone as the predicate of a clause. They could also act as the attribute of a noun or of another verb.

Voice and transitivity were the main features of verbal morphology. They were both parts of a unified marking system, referred to here as voice. Each verb had an unmarked home voice based on the most typical case. A verb then took any additional voices that made semantic sense, marking them with a prefix. The home voice also served as the verbal noun and infinitive.

Jībe – Build (something) ; Builds ; Building ; To build (transitive)

In addition, the verb took derivational affixes to indicate intention and direction of action.

Verbs were not marked for tense, mood or aspect. Tense and aspect were shown, if at all, by adverbial particles. Mood was shown by separate verbs. (See Section 5.2.6, Serial Verbs below)

Teme – See ; Saw ; Has seen ; Was seeing (etc.)

3.2.1. Dynamic Verbs
A dynamic verb referred to an action. All root dynamic verbs had an agent-like subject and many took other arguments in addition. Most could also derive voices with non-agentive subjects.

3.2.2. Dynamic Intransitive Voice
This voice had a single subject noun phrase. Verbs of motion, thinking or feeling tended to fall into this class.
Dynamic verbs with additional arguments took *mo-* to make them intransitive. (*M-* before initial strong vowels - *a, e, o*). These derived intransitives often had a generic quality to them, suggesting habit or ability.

**Fai mo-teme**

1PS.EQ DYN.INTR-see

"I see" (things in general) ; "I am able to see"

**Sukũde mo-paya**

Lucky DYN.INTR.hit

"Lucky hits (out)" (in no particular direction) ;
"Lucky goes round hitting things"

### 3.2.3. Active Transitive Voice

Active transitive verbs were all dynamic. They had an agent-like subject and a patient-like object.

**Sukũde paya Runyo**

Lucky hit Eagle

"Lucky hit Eagle"

**Do jībe jī**

1PP.INCL.EQ build hut

"We built a hut"

**Tau teme go-imelu**

1PS.PEJ see AGT-medicine

"I see the medicine woman"
The first person pejorative is used in the last example, as the speaker is of low social status compared to the medicine woman. Her gender was not specified as herbal medicine was an occupation reserved for women.

Many verbs had the active transitive as their home voice. Active transitive verbs could be derived from active intransitives by use of a causative voice, see Section 3.2.9 Causative Voices below.

### 3.2.4. Active Ditransitive Voice

Active ditransitive verbs were also all dynamic. They had subject and object plus a third argument, usually an indirect object, but sometimes a locative, as in English.

Motu  olu  jĩ   xenya jo   asũ  kuei motu  
3PP.HON  give  hut  new    DAT  child  girl  3PP.HON
"They gave the new hut to their daughter"

Motu     kuri  yere  põi agu
3PP.HON  put  flower  on  table
"They put the flowers on the table"

Only a few verbs had this as their home voice. Other verbs could be made active ditransitive by preposition incorporation, see Section 3.2.15 Preposition Incoporation below.

Active transitives could be derived from ditransitives by the prefix se-, (s-before strong vowels).

Motu      se-kuri  yere
3PP.HON  put  flower
"They put down/placed the flowers"

Motu       s-olu   jĩ   xenya
3PP.HON  DYN.TR-give  hut  new
"They gave away the new hut"
Intransitives were derived, as above, by use of $m(o)$-. Again, this often had a habitual reading.

**Motu m-olu-olu**

3PP.HON DYN.INTR~give~give  
"They give loads of stuff away" ;  
"They are very generous"

Note the honorific pronoun, here. Successful and high status extended families (*mofu*) were expected to be generous, especially towards their own clan.

### 3.2.5. Dynamic Passive Voice

The language had two passive voices dynamic and stative. Both raised the object of a dynamic transitive verb to subject position. Thus, all passives were derived.

The dynamic passive was marked with the prefix $b(e)$-. Its subject was a patient that was currently undergoing the action. The agent was left implicit or added with the instrumental preposition $ga$.

**Sukúde be-payá (ga Runyo)**

Lucky DYN.PAS-hit (INS Eagle)  
"Lucky was getting hit (by Eagle)"

With ditransitive verbs, only the direct object could be raised this way. The indirect object had to be raised twice, in effect (see **Section 3.2.17 Multiple and Addional Verbal Affixes** below).

**Yere b-olu jo esá ga ule**

Flower DYN-PAS.give DAT woman INS man  
"The flower was being given to a/the woman by a/the man"
BUT NOT ...

*Esã b-olu yere ga ule
Woman DYN.PAS-give flower INS man
"The woman was being given a/the flower by a/the man"

3.2.6. Reflexive Voice
This had a single argument which was both agent and patient. It referred to entities acting upon themselves. It was marked by the prefix xu- (x- before another u). All reflexive verbs were derived from active transitives.

E xu-oxute
"3PS.EQ REFL-wash"
She washed herself

Ucí xu-teme
"1PP.EXCL.EQ REFL-see"
We saw ourselves

3.2.7. Reciprocal Voice
This voice also had a single agent/patient argument. It referred to entities acting upon each other and was shown by the prefix d(o)-. All reciprocal verbs were derived from active transitives.

Do d-otome
1PP.INCL.EQ RECP-meet
"We met each other"

Xiă do-kuore
3PP.PEJ RECP-watch
"They watched one another"

3.2.8. Eventive Voice
The eventive focussed on the action or state. The agents, and many of the patients, of eventive verbs were unknown or unimportant. A small number of verbs had this as their home voice, mostly verbs concerned with natural phenomena. Derived eventives added the prefix p(a)-.
Asue
Rain
"Rain fell";
"It rained"

Pa-mabai te deku
EVT-dance LOC village
"There was dancing in the village";
"Dancing took place in the village"

3.2.9. Causative Voices
The causative added an extra argument, as subject, to any of the voices above. Hence, it is better to speak of a family of causative voices, rather than a single causative voice. Nonetheless, all causatives shared the one prefix, kāi-/kāy-.

Added to an intransitive verb, the result was a transitive. The cause became the new subject and the old subject dropped to object position.

E kāi-soru rofa
3PS.EQ CAUS-die goat
"He killed a/the goat"

Added to a transitive verb, the new subject was a controller directing the agent. The agent dropped to object and was followed by the original patient object in a double-object construction.

Motu kāi-cenye asū motu sītaji rai
3PP.HON CAUS-eat child 3PP.HON vegetable 3PS.PEJ
"They made their child eat his vegetables"

It is not always clear how to read a string of four nouns, as in the second example, but context and intonation usually made things clear.

English causative constructions use two verbs to Ōtari's one. Ōtari reserved such constructions for indirect and delayed causation (see also
Section 5.2.6 Serial Verb Constructions and Section 7.5.1 Object Complements). It also needed a complementiser which English does not.

*Guai   ekatu nya        malai
2PS.PEJ cause 3PS.HON fall
"You caused him to fall"

Guai     ekatu jẽ        nya malai
2PS.PEJ cause COMPL 3PS.HON fall
"You caused him to fall"

3.2.10 Stative Verbs
A stative verb referred to a state. The stative sub-class included what English-speakers refer to as qualities. To the Òtari these were just long-standing states. There was no separate adjective or manner adverb classes.

This meant stative verbs served as main predicate items without the verb to be and as modifiers of nouns and verbs without alteration. (This latter usage is also dealt with in Section 5.2.2, Intransitive Clauses, below).

Ucĩ               polu  mesu
1PP.EXCL.EQ stand still
"We stood still"

Yere   aumĩ
Flower red
"The flower was red"

Esã       euna
Woman happy
"The woman is happy"
3.2.11. Absent Voices

Stative roots were inherently intransitive, so they had no need for voices to promote objects, so they lacked the following voices paradigm: active transitive, active ditransitive, passive, reflexive and reciprocal.

3.2.12. Deriving Dynamic Verbs from Statives

Dynamic intransitive verbs could be derived from stative root verbs by using the usual dynamic intransitive prefix $m(o)$-. These were "becoming" verbs (inchoative verbs), ones whose subject was a patient changing state. The cause of the change was not expressed.

\[
\text{Ixe mo-kōbi} \\
\text{Sky DYN.INTR-dark} \\
"The sky darkened"
\]

\[
\text{Fai m-euna} \\
1\text{PS.EQ DYN.INTR-happy} \\
"I became happy"
\]

Dynamic intransitives could be derived from stative verbs by means of the reflexive prefix $x(u)$-.

\[
\text{Ata xu-eiko} \\
3\text{PP.EQ REFL-sit} \\
"They sat down"
\]

3.2.13. Deriving Dynamic Causatives

The causative prefix, $kāi-/kāy$- could also be added to stative roots. This created an active transitive verb by demoting the stative subject to object and introducing a new subject argument.

\[
\text{Pey-alua kāi-kōbi ixe} \\
\text{COL.bird DYN.INTR-dark sky} \\
"The flock of birds darkened the sky"
\]
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Si kāy-euna fai
2PS.EQ CAUS-happy 1PS.EQ
"You make me happy!

3.2.14. Stative Passive Voice
As noted, the language had a dynamic passive (Section 3.2.5, above) whose subject was being acted on. The stative passive by contrast expressed the state of the subject after being acted upon. It was marked by o(t)-.

Aku o-dace
Island STV.PAS-bless
"The island is blessed" ;
"The blessed island"

Alua o-tobi ga go-masū
Bird STV.PAS-catch INS AGT-hunt
"The bird was caught by a/the hunter"

As with the Dynamic Passive, only direct objects could by raised with the stative passive. The indirect object had to be raised twice (see Section 3.2.17 Multiple & Additional Verbal Affixes, below).

3.2.15. Preposition and Adverb Incorporation
Any Ôtari preposition, and any locational or directional adverb could be incorporated into the verb. This happened in two situations.

3.2.15.1. Translating Phrasal Verbs
English has a lot of expressions in which a preposition regularly accompanies a verb. They are normally used with a prepositional argument, but can be used without.

He climbed up the tree
He climbed up

In the first example up is clearly a preposition. It heads the prepositional
phrase *up the tree*. In the second, it is variously described as an intransitive preposition (one without a referent), an adverb, or part of the phrasal verb to climb up. In Ōtari, such words were usually prefixed to the verb.

\[\text{E xuri mōba cotu} \]
\[3\text{PS.EQ climb up tree} \]
"He climbed up a/the tree"

**BUT:** \[E mōba-xuri \]
\[3\text{PS.EQ up-climb} \]
"He climbed up"

However, phrasal verbs should not be translated this way if they have a non-literal meaning. These expressions are best rendered into Ōtari by a serial verb construction.

Take the phrasal verb *to fall down*. Falling is always downwards, so the *down* merely adds emphasis. For emphasis, Ōtari added the verb *kaya*, to finish, to do completely.

\[\text{E malai kaya} \]
\[3\text{PS.EQ fall finish} \]
"He fell down"

(For more details on Serial Verbs, see Section 5.2.6, Serial Verb Constructions, below).

### 3.2.15.2. Applicative Voices

Applicatives were also formed by preposition incorporation. They promoted a prepositional object to direct object. The new applied object was seen as more topical than usual, but not as topical as a subject. Noun phrases after the applied object were likely to be new information.

\[\text{E mōba-xuri cotu ga kutā} \]
\[3\text{PS.EQ up-climb tree INS rope} \]
"He climbed up a/the tree with a/the rope"
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E ga-xuri kutã mõba cotu
3PS.EQ INS-climb rope up tree
"He climbed up a/the tree with a/the rope"

Where the sentence already had an object, a double object construction resulted. The applied object came before the natural object. This happens in English with our dative shift construction, as in the second sentence below. In Ōtari, this could also happen with instrumentals and locatives.

Ule olu yere aumĩ jo esã
3PS.EQ give flower red DAT woman
"The man gave a/the red flower to a/the woman"

Ule j-olu esã yere aumĩ
3PS.EQ DAT-give woman flower red
"The man gave the woman a red flower"

E kuri yere põi agu
3PS.EQ put flower on table
"She put a/the flower on the table"

E põi-kuri agu yere
3PS.EQ on-put table flower
"She put a/the flower on the table"

3.2.16. Intentionality and Performance
Verbs could also take prefixes to show intention and performance. As with voices, each verb had an implicit home intentionality and took prefixes to show the rest. Unlike with voices, home intentionality could be marked for emphasis.

The purposive marker was W(e)- and the non-purposive L(u)-. Yet(a)- showed that someone was pretending to do something.
Malai – Fall (implicitly accidental)
Lumalai – Fall (+emphasis on accidentalness)
Wemalai – Drop (+Purpose)
Yetamalai – Feint a fall (+Pretence)

A further three markers evaluated performance. Ajũ(w)- showed success, up(e)- failure, and ny(e)- an attempt.

Tobi – Catch (implies success)
Ajũtobi – Successfully catch
Upetobi – Fail to catch ; Mishandle
Nyetobi – Try to catch

3.2.17. Multiple and Additional Verbal Affixes
The verb often took several of the above affixes. When this happened, the order was:

Intent./Perf. - Voice – Prep. - Root Verb

A noun phrase could therefore be promoted from oblique or required third argument to subject, provided it was notionally promoted to object first, as in the first example.

Cotu o-mōba-xuri  ga  e
Tree STV.PAS-up-climb INS 3PS.EQ
"The tree was climbed up by him"

Esã       j-ot-olu                yere  ga   ule
Woman DAT-STV.PAS-give flower INS man
"The woman was given a/the flower by a/the man"

Sukũde lu-o-paya        ga   Runyo
Lucky     ACDNT-PAS-hit INS Eagle
"Lucky was accidentally hit by Eagle"
**Upe-we-malai** – Fail to drop (+Fail, +Purpose)

### 3.2.18. Additional Notes on Verbal Affixes

Two other affixes were commonly used with verbs: **-cukā**, reversed an action, like English "un-", or "dis"-. **-kuō**, signified "ability to be X-ed". As an independent word it also translated our verb "can" and our adjective "easy".

- **Jībe** - build ; **Jībe-cukā** - dismantle.
- **Kuō jībe** - can build ; **Jībe-kuō** - buildable (build easily)

Verbs were formed from nouns by the addition of voice markers:

- **Aku** – Island

  **M-aku**
  DYN.INTR-island
  "Get cut off ; Become isolated"

  **Kāy-aku**
  CAUS-island
  "Isolate (sthg.)"

  **Ot-aku**
  STV.PAS-island
  "Cut off ; Isolated "

Two affixes familiar from their use with nouns were: **go-**, which derived an agentive noun and **ī-** which derived a patientive noun

- **Gomasū**
  AGT-hunt
  hunter
3.2.19. Reduplication of the Verb

The full reduplication of a verb signalled intensity. The root was repeated but not affixes. Elsewhere on this site, full reduplication remains hyphenated, even where glossing conventions are not involved.

**Runyo paya-paya Sukūde**

Eagle hit~hit Lucky

"Eagle hit Lucky hard"

**Sukūde be-payapaya ga Runyo**

Lucky DYN.PAS-hit~hit INS Eagle

"Lucky was getting hit hard by Eagle"

**Saga-saga**

Be.quick~be.quick

"Very quick" ; "Very quickly" ; "To be very quick"

**Yomai saga-saga**

Fish be.quick~be.quick

"Very quick fish" ; "The fish is very quick" ;

"Fish that is very quick"

Partial reduplication signalled a repeated action. This was achieved by repeating the first syllable only.

**Pa-paya** - Hit repeatedly

(despite appearances, no fruit is involved)

The two types of reduplication could also be combined. Again, affixes did not repeat.
3.3. Particles
The class of particles covered all the logical, grammatical terms in the language. Defined formally, a particle was any word that could not act as a subject, predicate or attribute.

The main sub-classes of particle were: adverbial particles, prepositions, conjunctions, quantifiers, classifiers and interjections, though other kinds existed. A number of particles could move between sub-classes without alteration. Few morphological processes applied to the class.

3.3.1. Adverbial Particles
Context-setting expressions of time, place and so on are classed as adverbs in English. This includes words like "yesterday", "here" and "also". They were regarded as types of particle in Õtari.

*Cani*, "also" served as adverbial and conjunction, whilst words like *wosa*, "already", *isi*, "for a long time" and *tabai*, "soon" were amongst the equivalents of aspect markers.

\[
E \quad \text{xale isi}
\]
\[
3PS.EQ \quad \text{sail} \quad \text{long.time}
\]

"He was sailing for a long time"

Because the language lacked verbal tense and aspect morphology, it had more time adverbials than English. For example, *saroye* meant "the day after tomorrow", and *elocu*, "the day before yesterday".

\[
\text{Elocu,} \quad \text{do} \quad \text{aunyo te gemai}
\]
\[
\text{Day.before.yesterday, 1PP.EQ.EXCL \quad dig} \quad \text{LOC garden}
\]

"The day before yesterday, we dug in the garden"
3.3.2. Prepositions

A preposition expressed the relationship between a noun phrase and the remainder of the clause. The language had fewer, and more general, ones than we have in English. Here are some of the more important Ōtari prepositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ōtari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo ; Jetu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuā ; Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yũ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of prepositions was extended by the addition of location words.

*Pōi lasu agu*

*On top table*

"On top of the table"

There were two words each for "*to*" and "*from*. *Jo* meant "*to*" when the destination took *te* or *pōi*. *Jetu* was used if it took *mi*. Similarly *kuā* was "*from*" when the starting point that took *te* or *pōi* and ali was "*from*" when the starting point took *mi*. *Yũ*, "*for*", also served as a
conjunction as did some other prepositions.

Notice the absence of a word for "of". In Ōtari, the genitive relationship was signalled merely by juxtaposition of two noun phrases.

As discussed above under Applicative Voices (3.2.15.2), all prepositions in Ōtari could be incorporated into the verb to raise their referent to direct object.

3.3.3. Conjunctions
This sub-class of words overlapped somewhat with the sub-classes of prepositions and adverbial particles.

In English, conjunctions link phrases or clauses and adverbs link sentences. These are often different words even though they express the same basic relationship. This was not the case in Ōtari.

Da and cani both meant "and" or "also" when used as a conjunctive adverb. Either could be used within a sentence, like our "and", or between sentences, like our "also".

Lai meant "but" or "yet" and "however" when used adverbially. Cai likewise, meant "or", "alternatively" and "on the other hand".

3.3.4. Classifiers
A classifier was required whenever a quantifier or number was used to modify a noun. It indicated chiefly that the head noun was to be viewed as countable rather than as a mass, but also that the quantifier or number was modifying the head and not acting as a pronoun in its own right. There were around forty classifiers in the language, though some were used only rarely.

Almost all classifiers also functioned as nouns. Like other nouns, classifiers were invariant. Some represented the whole of the head noun, others just a notable aspect of it. Here are some well-used ones to illustrate how the system worked. More are shown in the dictionary.
Classifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ōtari</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Classifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cepo ; Felĩ</td>
<td>Tail</td>
<td>Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koye</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Animals (without tails)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kua</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mada</td>
<td>Staff ; Pole</td>
<td>Long, straight objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nĩce</td>
<td>Stick</td>
<td>Short, straight objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roiku</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>Massive objects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some nouns always took the same classifier, others could take one of two or three. If none were semantically appropriate, or if the speaker could not remember the correct one, then the general classifier *ja* was used. Exceptionally, *ja* was never used as a noun.

The use of classifiers is illustrated below.

**Yomai bake cepo**

Fish three tail.CLFR

"Three fish"

**Nĩce mieji wei nĩce**

Stick short few stick.CLFR

"A few short sticks"

**Kabua suo poci roikã**

Boat all wagon.CLFR yon

"All yonder boats"
3.3.5. Interjections
An interjection was a stand-alone term that expressed an emotional state of the speaker. It had no grammatical connection with the rest of the clause. Many were simple onomatopoeic exclamations and some were of uncertain origin.

- Ä - all-purpose mild interjection: aha!, hey!, etc.
- Asu cai! - an expression of surprise of uncertain origin: whoa!, strewth!, etc.

In modern English the most taboo interjections concern sexual matters, though this has not always been the case. In eighteenth century English, religious themes predominated. This seems to have been the case in Ōtari.

The Ōtari swore by their nine main gods or by a wide range of local tutelary spirits. For more on Ōtari religion, see the Ōtari Culture Page.

3.3.6. Focus Particles
Ōtari marked focus with a small sub-class of focus particles plus a limited amount of movement. This site uses the term focus to mean a special status given to certain words or phrases that is not present in all sentences.

- Kō – for emphasis.
- Āi – for contrast and surprise.
- No – for exhaustive listing (like English “only”).

The focus particle came at the end of the phrase it referred to.

Kũ xale kama kō
2PS.HON sail good FOC
“You sail well”

Kubu fai āi
Spear 1PS.EQ FOC
“My spear” (as opposed to yours)
Runyo no  ācu masū jai  fai  
Runyo  FOC go  hunt  with 1PS.EQ  
"Only Runyo went hunting with me"

The word ce had several uses. It could be a copula, it meant “yes”, or it was used as the truth value focus particle. In this last usage, it confirmed the truth of the whole clause.

Sukūde masū ce  
Lucky  hunt  yes  
"Lucky did go hunting"

3.3.7. Polarity Particles
This small sub-class of particle was used to indicate the nature of a clause: question, command, exclamation or polite request.

Coi  – Imperative particle  
Ce kō!  - Exclamative particle  
Mē?  – Polar question particle  
Muāi?  – Confirmation question particle

Specific interrogative words, other than interrogative pronouns are also included in this sub-class: moli?, “when?”; mokai?, “where?”; menai?, “how?”; and kou?, “why?”

Ce as we have noted meant “yes”, but only when affirming the truth of what was asked. A contrastive “yes”, woi, was also available. (French has a similar distinction between “oui” and “si”).

There were two negative words: obē meaning “zero”, “no” or “none” which negated noun phrases, and sā which meant “not” and negated verbs, predicates and clauses.

3.3.8. Etiquette
A number of particles were concerned exclusively with etiquette. Their effect was enhanced by choosing pronouns of the appropriate level of politeness.
Orí was used for both “please” and “thank you”. Spanish usage of “gracias” can be similar. *Saira kū, “you're welcome”* (with honorific you) would be an appropriate response.

*Kaisu* similarly, meant both “hello” and “goodbye”, though it was only used informally. (See Italian usage of “ciao”). The formal greeting was *kurā jai kū, “peace with you”*. Ā *xiruti!* was another greeting, but reserved for hailing from a distance. It combined the all-purpose mild interjection ā, “hey, aha!” with the verb *xiruti, “to greet”*.

Finally, some terms of address were worthy of note: *lorī* was the main honorific, used for both men and women where we might say “sir” or “madam”. Exalted persons were addressed as *oso*. This would be used from monarchs down to village headmen, priests and medicine women.

*Nixai* had a similar meaning to *lorī*, but was reserved for members of one’s own clan. Within a *mofu* kinship terms were used as terms of address: kamuai, “father”, “uncle” ; lebai, “mother”, “aunt”. Departed ancestors were both fellow-clansmen and exalted persons. They were therefore addressed in prayer as *nixai oso*.

Informal terms of address included *xori*, for men, “mate” (from a male speaker), or “love” (from a female speaker), *lā* for women – “babe”, perhaps, or “love”, and *ecu* for children, “lad” or “lass”.

Ā *xiruti, xori!* - G’day mate!

*Kaisu, lā!* – Hi, babe!

*Kurā jai kū, lori!* – Good day to you, sir! ; Good day to you, madam!
4. PHRASES

This page looks at the preferred order of words used in Ōtari phrases. It starts with small units and builds upwards. Larger units are discussed respectively on the Ōtari Clauses and Ōtari Sentences pages.

Ōtari had a strong tendency to put heads before their dependents. With few exceptions, phrases based around nouns, verbs and particles conform to this rule. Word order was largely fixed, as it was bound up with meaning. Pragmatic strategies therefore, tended to rely on particles and verbal affixes.

4.1. Noun Phrases

A noun phrase (NP) was a phrase headed by a noun. Quantifiers and pronouns counted as nouns, so Quantifier and Pronoun phrases counted as NPs. They are discussed below in sub-sections 4.1.3 and 4.1.4 respectively.

The simplest kind of noun phrase consisted of a bare noun. This could be a root noun or a compound.

\[
\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{N}
\]

\[
\text{Yomai} - \text{Fish} \quad ; \quad \text{Oxukuari} - \text{Village meeting hall}
\]

\[
\text{Ata} - (3\text{rd Person Plural, Equative}) \text{They} \quad ; \quad \text{Polai} - \text{Many}
\]

4.1.1. Co-ordination of Noun Phrases

Another kind of Noun Phrase consisted of NPs added together as equals. The two noun phrases could simply be juxtaposed. The second defined, or elaborated on, the first. The two were said to be in apposition.

\[
\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP, NP}
\]

\[
\text{Akule, āce}
\]

\[
\text{Akule, queen}
\]

“\text{Akule, queen}”
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The small corpus of surviving Ōtari literature contains no instances of three or more noun phrases in apposition. However, it would be consistent with everything we know about the language if this were allowed. Modern revivalist practice therefore allows any number of noun phrases to stand in apposition to each other.

**NP -> NP, NP ...**

_Äkule, äce, gogã, gomisu_

Äkule  queen, warrior, AGT.be.brave

"Äkule, queen, warrior, heroine"

It was more common though to join NPs with a co-ordinating conjunction. Any number of NPs could be linked in this way. The conjunction appeared before the last one.

**NP -> NP ... Part NP**

_Sere da kubu - Shields and spears_

_Sere, tabo da kubu - Shields, clubs and spears_

### 4.1.2. Subordination of Noun Phrases

A noun phrase could also consist of a head NP followed by a subordinate one in genitive relation with the head. This relationship was also indicated by mere juxtaposition. Either of the juxtaposed NPs could themselves be built up from smaller units.

**NP -> NP ... (NP ... )**

_Kabua ule_

Boat  man

"The man's boat"

This construction could also indicate relationship to a place, whole-part relationships or the substance something was made from.
**Ule Eitago**
Man Heitak
"A/the man from Heitak" ; "A/the Roheitak male"

**Nedō jī**
Door house
"The door of the house"

**Jī potai**
Hut stone
"A/the stone hut"

The genitive construction also indicated kinship. If a pronoun was involved, it was marked for relative social status.

**Kamuai tau**
Father 1PS.PEJ
"My father"

Extra subordinate and co-ordinate NPs could be juxtaposed where appropriate. These could be related to each other or to the original NP. Context usually made clear what relations were involved.

**NP -> NP (NP (NP (NP)))**

**Kabua wotai gabā fai**
Boat sibling friend 1PS.EQ
"My friend's brother's boat"

**Kabua gabā wotai fai**
Boat friend sibling 1PS.EQ
"My brother's friend's boat"
NP -> NP, NP (NP), NP (NP)

Akule, āce wu, gomisu wu
Akule  queen 1PP.INCL.PEJ, AGT.be.brave 1PP.INCL.PEJ
“Akule, our queen, our heroine”

4.1.3. Quantifier Phrases
A quantifier phrase (QP) consisted of a quantifier followed by a classifier. (Classifiers were introduced in Section 3.3.4, Classifiers).

QP -> (Q Clfr)

Wei mada
Few staff.CLFR
"A few" (When said of long, straight objects)

QPs were always subordinate to NPs. They followed their head like any other NP subordinate.

NP -> NP (QP)

Kubu wei mada
Spear few staff.CLFR
"A few spears"

Kubu bake mada
Spear three staff.CLFR
"Three spears"

Nouns could take any appropriate classifier. Sometimes the choice reflected the perspective of the speaker.

Xepe sinye yere
Rose four flower.CLFR
"Four roses" (considered as flowers)
Xepe sinye lōba
Rose four plant.CLFR
"Four roses" (considered as plants)

At other times, choice reflected a change in the noun. (The second example below adds full reduplication to indicate a change in extent).

Būta duā kutā
Penis one rope.CLFR
"One penis" (flaccid)

Būta-būta duā mada
Penis-penis one staff.CLFR
"A massive erection"

Classifier choice could also distinguish between sub-classes of the basic noun.

Kabua duā poci
Boat one wagon.CLFR
"A boat"

Kabua duā bosā
Boat one mountain.CLFR
"A ship"

4.1.4. Pronoun Phrases
Pronouns replaced full NPs. Most constituted a type of NP all by themselves. This was true of personal and locative pronouns.

Kubu āitu bake mada
Spear be.long three staff.CLFR
"Three long spears"
Demonstrative pronouns could replace NPs or serve as subordinate NPs. Similarly English demonstratives served as both pronouns and adjectives.

*Kubu kuokā*

*Spear DEM.DIST*

"That spear" ; "Those spears"

These pronoun types all replaced something known, but indefinites and interrogatives introduced new items, so they needed a QP. Like a demonstrative, an interrogative could be head or subordinate NP. As a subordinate it took a QP if appropriate.

*Salu duā koye*

*Person one head.CLFR*

"Somebody"

*Melu? - Who?*

*Salu wei koye melu?*

*Person few head.CLFR who?*

*Which people?*

Honorific personal pronouns were used for all superiors, including: royalty, clan chieftains, village headmen, medicine women, Earth-lore keepers, older relatives and departed ancestors, addressed in prayer.
Optionally, they could also refer to older non-relatives and strangers. First person honorifics were used when addressing inferiors or to give oneself a sense of superiority over an adversary.

Equative forms were used between equals, such as: peasants who knew each other well or practitioners of the same craft, whether acquainted or not. They were also used between husband and wife. They carried connotations of informality and solidarity.

Pejorative forms referred to social inferiors. These included younger relatives, all children and slaves. First person pejoratives were used when the addressee merited an honorific.

\[ \text{Kurā jai kū, kamuai} \]
Peace with 2PS.HON father
"Peace with you, father"

\[ \text{Kurā jai guai, asū wā} \]
Peace with 2PS.PEJ child 1PS.HON
"Peace with you, child"

Honorifics and pejoratives could also be applied to non-humans. The application involved an assessment of their referent's value to humans, particularly to the speaker and listener.

\[ \text{Jī ojībe kama-kama} \]
Hut STV.PSV.build be.good~be.good
"A finely-built hut"

... becomes:

\[ \text{Nya - 3PS.HON} \]

\[ \text{Fātu uleme} \]
Fruit rotten
"Rotten fruit"
Pronouns were often dropped, when context made their referent clear (see Section 5, Clauses below).

4.1.5. Combining Types of Noun Phrase
When a noun took several kinds of subordinate NPs, the unmarked order was:

\[
\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP (QP Dem/Intrg NP)}
\]

\[
\text{Asū aja koye Sukūde}
\]

Child two head.CLFR Sukūde

"Lucky's two children"

This was used when counting members of a set. When a sub-set was being picked out from the main set, the QP moved, as it does in English.

\[
\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP (Dem/Intrg NP QP)}
\]

\[
\text{Kubu kuokā tai wei mada}
\]

Spear DEM.MED 2PP.EQ few staff.CLFR

"A few of those spears of yours"

4.1.6. Noun Phrases Modified by Verb Phrases
A noun phrase could also consist of a noun phrase followed by a subordinate verb phrase (VP). The internal structure of the VP is discussed below under Section 4.2. Verb Phrases. Here, we will just use the simplest kind, consisting of a single verb.

\[
\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP (VP)}
\]

\[
\text{Yomai ũte}
\]

Fish be.silver
"Silver Fish" (Stative)

**Esã saja**
Woman laugh
"Laughing woman" (Dynamic)

Personal pronouns could not take subordinate VPs, but demonstrative and indefinite pronouns could.

**Kuokã moba**
DEM.MED be.big
"That big thing" ; "That big person" ; "That big one"

**Rã moba**
Thing be.big
"Something big" ; "A big thing"

Where an NP took both a subordinate VP and a subordinate NP, the VP came first. Where the subordinate NP was itself modified by the VP, their order was reversed.

**NP -> NP (VP NP)**

**Cũbi petu esã**
Headdress be.beautiful woman
"A/the woman's beautiful headdress"

**NP -> NP (NP (VP))**

**Cũbi esã petu**
Headdress woman be.beautiful
"A/the beautiful woman's headdress"
4.1.7. Noun Phrases Modified by Particle Phrases

A noun phrase could also consist of a noun phrase followed by a subordinate particle phrase (PartP). The internal structures of the various kinds of particle phrase are discussed further under Section 4.3, Particle Phrases below. Here, we will use one simple and common kind of PartP was the preposition phrase. This consisted of a PrepP plus an NP.

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP (PartP)} \]

**Ule jai kubu**

*Man with spear*

"A/the man with a spear"

Where an NP took both a subordinate PartP and a subordinate VP, the VP came first. Where the PartP was itself modified by the VP, their order was reversed.

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP (VP PartP)} \]

**Ule seku jai kubu**

*Man be.tall with spear*

"A/the tall man with a spear"

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP (PartP (VP))} \]

**Ule jai xǎkua āitu**

*Man with hair be.long*

"A/the man with long hair"

Where an NP took both a subordinate PartP and a subordinate NP, the subordinate NP came first. Again, the order could be reversed where sense required.
Where a noun phrase took all three kinds of subordinate phrase, the normal order was VP, NP, PartP. As above, the order could be reversed where sense required.

4.1.8. Noun Phrases Modified by Clauses

As in English, a noun could be modified by an entire clause, a relative clause. This structure is discussed below in Section 7, Multi-Clause Sentences.

4.1.9. Modification of Co-ordinate Noun Phrases

A subordinate element following a list of co-ordinate noun phrases, was understood as referring to all the NPs.
Where only one NP was included in the scope of the modifying phrase, it came first, followed immediately by its subordinate.

\[
\text{NP} \to \text{NP (VP) Part NP}
\]

\textit{Ule sekü da esã}

\textit{Man be.tall and woman}

"A tall man and a woman"

Similarly, a list of subordinate elements were understood as referring to all the co-ordinate NPs.

\[
\text{NP} \to \text{NP Part NP (VP Part VP)}
\]

\textit{Ule da esã petu da mole}

\textit{Man and woman be.beautiful and be.clever}

"A/the clever, handsome man and a/the clever, beautiful woman"

Again, where only some of the subordinates applied to some of the NPs, they each followed their respective NPs. Any element that applied to both was then repeated.

\[
\text{NP} \to \text{NP (VP Prn) Part NP (VP Prn)}
\]

\textit{Ule mole kuokā da esã petu kuokā}

\textit{Man clever DEM.MED and woman beautiful DEM.MED}

"That clever man and that beautiful woman"

4.1.10. Noun Phrases Subordinate to Verb Phrases

Any of the kinds of noun phrase illustrated above could be subordinated within a verb phrase. For details, see below under \textbf{Verb Phrases Modified by Noun Phrases}, (Section 4.2.3).
4.1.11. Noun Phrases Subordinate to Particle Phrases

Any of the kinds of noun phrase illustrated above could be subordinated within a particle phrase. For details, see below under Prepositional Phrases, (4.3.2) and Conjunction Phrases (4.3.7).

4.2. Verb Phrases

A verb phrase (VP) was a phrase headed by a verb. The words English regards as adjectives and manner adverbs counted as verbs in Ôtari, so phrases based on them counted as VPs.

The simplest kind of verb phrase consisted of a single intransitive verb.

\[
\begin{align*}
Sēgo & \rightarrow \text{ Run ; Ran ; Running ; To run } \quad \text{(Dynamic)} \\
Polu & \rightarrow \text{ Stand ; Stood ; Standing ; To stand } \quad \text{(Stative)} \\
Euna & \rightarrow \text{ Be.happy ; Happy ; Happily } \quad \text{(Stative)}
\end{align*}
\]

4.2.1. Co-ordination of Verb Phrases

Another kind of Verb Phrase consisted of VPs added together as equals. Two or more verb phrases could simply be juxtaposed. The result was a serial verb construction (SVC). An SVC could only be used as main predicate item and even then certain conditions had to apply (see Section 5.2.6, Serial Verb Constructions). For now, here is a simple example.

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{ VP VP VP}
\]

\[
\text{Xuãi ācu momasū} \rightarrow \text{ Want go DYN.INTR.hunt}
\]

"Want to go hunting"

A more common way to co-ordinate verb phrases was to link them with a conjunction. Any number of VPs could be linked in this way. As with nouns, the conjunction appeared before the last element in the list (See Section 4.1.1, Co-ordination of Noun Phrases, above).

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{ VP ... Part VP}
\]

\[
\text{Sēgo da folu} \rightarrow \text{ Run and walk}
\]
Sêgo, folu da xuäite - Run, walk and jump

Co-ordinate dynamic verbs were usually arranged sequentially or in cause-effect order.

Saga      lai  petu
Be.quick but be.neat
"Quickly but neatly"

Stative verbs modifying nouns were in reverse order to English adjectives:

temporary state - purpose or evaluation - colour - shape -
age - size - quality

Petu           da   mole
Be.beautiful and be.clever
"Clever and beautiful" (evaluation - quality)

Xenya, atau      da   äitu
Be.new, be.sharp and be.long
"Long, sharp, new" (temp. state - temp. state - size)

4.2.2. Subordination of Verb Phrases
Another kind of verb phrase consisted of a VP followed by a subordinate VP which modified its head. Like co-ordination, subordination was indicated merely by juxtaposition. Any of the VPs involved could themselves be built up from smaller units. Word order in an incorporated VP followed the rules above.

VP -> VP ... (VP ... )

Telu  saga
Write be.quick
"Write quickly"
Subordinate verb phrases could modify the previous VP or the head verb. Context usually made clear which was intended. Co-ordinated elements could also be included.

**VP -> VP (VP (VP))**

*Kama cetume*
Be.good surprise
"Surprisingly good"

**Yesu waika nyaca**
Shine yellow bright
"Shine bright yellow"

**VP -> VP (VP Part VP)**

*Saja āitu da mogu*
Laugh be.long and be.strong
"Laugh long and heartily"

**Telu saga lai petu**
Write be.quick but be.neat
"Write quickly but neatly"

### 4.2.3. Verb Phrases Modified by Noun Phrases

A verb phrase headed by a transitive verb took a subordinate noun phrase as its object. The object NPs were generally placed after the verb complex, including any verbal modifiers. The main verb and its dependent VPs, NPs and PPs constituted the predicate.

**VP -> (VP (VP)) (NP)**

*Weku sacu nīce*
Throw be.far stick
"Throw a/the stick far"
VP -> VP (VP (VP (NP)))

Xuāi ācu masū yomai
Want go  hunt  fish
"Want to go fishing"

The object NP could be as long or complex as any of the types of NP illustrated above.

VP -> VP (NP (VP) (NP) (PartP (NP (VP))))

Teme wotai seku fai jai xākua āitu
See sister be.tall 1PS.EQ with hair be.long
"See my tall sister with the long hair"

We can now see the basis for the claim on the Ōtari page that Ōtari is a Type 3 language in the Milewski typology. For Milewski, Type 3 languages are those that treat the direct object of a sentence in the same way as the nominal attribute of a noun. Ōtari does this in that it places both directly after their referent and does not alter them morphologically. In this, it resembles Indonesian.

VP -> VP (NP)

Teme Akule
See  Honour
"See Honour"

NP -> NP (NP)

Potā  Akule
Jewel Honour
"Honour's jewel"
Occasionally, there would be two object NPs in a double object construction. (For details, see Section 5.2.5 Double Object Constructions, below and Section 3.2.15.2 Applicative Voices, above). Here, we will just note the phrase order.

\[ \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{VP (NP NP)} \]

\[ \text{Põi- kuri agu yere} \]
\[ \text{On- put table flower} \]
\[ \text{"Put a/the flower on the table"} \]

4.2.4. Verb Phrases Modified by Particle Phrases

Any of the above kinds of verb phrase could be followed by a particle phrase. The nature of particle phrases is discussed in the next section. Here, we will just look at some common types.

Verb phrases commonly included a subordinate particle phrase (PartP). These were optional elements, appearing after any of the required noun phrases.

\[ \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{VP (PartP (NP))} \]

\[ \text{Ata xale opa lowa kiro} \]
\[ 3PP.EQ sail through water be.rough \]
\[ \text{"They sailed through rough water"} \]

\[ \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{VP (NP) (PartP (NP))} \]

\[ \text{E kuta koro te gemai} \]
\[ 3PS.EQ plant seed LOC vegetable.garden \]
\[ \text{"She planted seeds in the vegetable garden"} \]

Independent PartPs were sometimes found in the same position. These were required third arguments of the verb.
VP -> VP (NP) PartP (NP)

E  kuri yere  põi agu
3PS.EQ put  flower on  table
"She put a/the flower on the table"

Some English adverbs counted as PartPs and normally appeared in PartP position.

Do  xale mogai
1PP.INCL.EQ sail  tomorrow
"We sail tomorrow"

E  tekuta  gemai  koro loreu
3PS.EQ LOC-plant vegetable.garden seed  yesterday
"She planted seeds in the garden yesterday"

Where adverbial and prepositional PartPs occur together, the PrepP phrase came first.

S → NP VP (PartP PartP)

Do  xale jo Eitago saroye
1PP.INCL.EQ sail  to Heitak  day.after.tomorrow
"We sail to Heitak the day after tomorrow"

E  kuta koro te  gemai loreu
3PS.EQ plant seed  LOC garden yesterday
"She planted seeds in the garden yesterday"

4.2.5. Verb Phrases Modified by Clauses
An entire clause could also be subordinated to a VP. Discussion of these are best left until after the clause has been introduced. See Section 7.5.1, Object Complements, below.
4.2.6. Modification of Co-ordinate Verb Phrases

The modification of co-ordinate verb phrases works in a similar way to the modification of co-ordinate noun phrases. A subordinate element followed a list of verbs and was understood as referring to them all.

Like NPs, VPs could be co-ordinated via an "... and ..." list. Unlike NPs, they could also form a serial verb construction (see Section 4.2.1. Coordination of Verb Phrases, above, and Section 5.2.6, Serial Verb Constructions 2.1. above). The subordinate element followed the co-ordinated ones.

\[
VP \rightarrow VP VP (VP)
\]

\[
Sēgo soju saga
Run   hide   be.quick
"Run and hide quickly"  (SVC)
\]

\[
VP \rightarrow VP (PartP (NP) VP (VP))
\]

\[
Sēgo jo deku   da   soju, saga
Run   to   village and hide   be.quick
"Quickly, run to the village and hide"  (List)
\]

Where only one of the co-ordinate VPs was included in the scope of the modifying phrase, it came first, followed immediately by its subordinate. In this case though, an SVC could not be formed. A list was required.

\[
VP \rightarrow VP (VP PartP VP)
\]

\[
Sēgo saga   da   soju
Run   be.quick and hide
"Run away quickly and hide"
\]

Similarly, a list of subordinate elements were understood as referring to all the co-ordinate VPs.
Where only some subordinates applied to some VPs, each followed their referents. Any element that applied to both was repeated.

```
VP -> VP (VP) PartP VP (NP)
```

```
Weku saga da paya teko rai
Throw be.quick and hit hard 3PS.PEJ
"Throw quickly and hit it hard"
```

4.2.7. Verb Phrases Subordinate to Noun Phrases

A subordinate verb phrase was normally the first element after a head noun phrase. It consisted of at least one verb.

```
NP -> NP (VP)
```

```
Kubu xenya
Spear be.new
"A/the new spear"
```

A VP subordinate to a noun could also consist of a set of co-ordinate verbs linked by appropriate conjunctions. They were arranged in reverse order to the equivalent English adjectives, i.e.:

```
purpose or evaluation - colour - shape - age - size - quality
```

The last verb was preceded by da, “and”. Other kinds of attributive could follow without taking da.
**Kubu xenya da āitu**  
Spear be.new and be.long  
"A/the long, new spear" (N age size)

**Kuei petu da mole**  
Girl be.beautiful and be.clever  
"A/the clever and beautiful girl" (N evaluation quality)

**Kubu xenya fai**  
Spear be.new 1PS.EQ  
"My new spear" (da not required as fai not a verb)

Occasionally, the last verb was preceded by *lai*, “but”. In these cases, sense dictated word order, not the rule above.

**Telu saga lai petu**  
Write be.quick but be.neat  
"Write quickly but neatly"

Subsequent verbs could modify the previous verb instead of the head noun. The absence of a conjunction indicated that this construction was being used. Verbs modifying other verbs formed a VP within an VP. Word order in this second VP followed the rule above.

**Bidu bekua waika**  
Leaf green yellow  
"A/the yellowy green leaf"

As noted, full reduplication of a verb indicated intensity (*Section 3.2.19, Reduplication of the Verb*).

**Yomai saga-saga**  
Fish be.quick-be.quick  
"A very quick fish"
The serial verb construction (introduced above in Section 4.2.1), was not available as a subordinate element. It could only be used as a main predicate item. For full details, see Section 5.2.6 Serial Verb Constructions, below.

4.2.8. Verb Phrases Subordinate to Particle Phrases
A verb phrase, incorporating any of the elements discussed earlier in this section (4.2), could be subordinated within a particle phrase. The phrase would be headed by a word corresponding to one of English's prepositions or conjunctions, or certain adverbs. The head particle was the first element in the phrase. It would be followed by at least one verb.

\[ \text{PartP} \rightarrow \text{Part (VP)} \]

\[ \text{Jai xākua āitu} \]
With hair be.long
"With long hair"

\[ \text{Ata xueiko te agu da cenyexoli moba} \]
3PP.EQ REFL-sit LOC table and eat meal be.big
"They sat down at a/the table and ate a big meal" (da + VP)

4.2.9. Comparison of Verb Phrases
English forms comparatives and superlatives with the affixes "-er" and "-est", or adverbs like "more" and "most". Ōtari, however, used the verbs: ma, "exceed", yeci, "disexceed" and āsu, "equal, resemble".

\[ \text{Yere xukā ma kuokā wa petu} \]
Flower DEM.PROX exceed DEM.MED concerning beautiful
"This flower is more beautiful than that one"

\[ \text{Yere xukā yeci suo wa petu} \]
Flower DEM.PROX disexceed all concerning beautiful
"This flower is the least attractive of all"
In the second example, *suo* functions as a pronoun not a quantifier, so does not need a classifier.

### 4.3. Particle Phrases

As we have seen, Ōtari classes a wide range of words as particles. Some sub-classes of particle were capable of acting as phrase heads, others were not.

#### 4.3.1. Adverbial Particle Phrases

Adverbial particles corresponded to English adverbs of time, direction and location. One or more adverbial particles constituted an Adverbial Phrase (AdvP), a type of PartP. An AdvP could have been part of a VP, but not part of an NP. It could not stand as a main predicate item. It was not a required sentence element.

Some adverbial particles modified the predicate. They normally followed the main verb and any NP or VP that modified it.

\[
\text{Prn VP} \rightarrow \text{Prn (V Prn (AdvP))}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Be} & \quad \text{gā-gā} & \text{xiā} & \text{wosa} \\
1\text{PP.INCL.HON} & \text{fight-fight} & 3\text{PP.PEJ} & \text{already} \\
& \text{"We fought them hard already"}
\end{align*}
\]

Predicate-modifying AdvPs could also come at the start of the clause. This shifted the emphasis to the verb, or its object NPP.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mogai}, & \quad \text{do} & \text{kuari xuā} \\
\text{Tomorrow, 1PP.INCL.EQ} & \text{meet} & \text{here} \\
& \text{"Tomorrow, we will meet here"}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Wosa,} & \quad \text{xiā} & \text{ācu jo deku} \\
\text{Already 3PP.PEJ} & \text{go} & \text{to village} \\
& \text{"They have already gone to the village"}
\end{align*}
\]
Notice also how these AdvPs did the work of tense, mood and aspect markers in other languages.

Other AdvPs modified the clause. These could come at the start or end of the clause.

S (AdvP)

Xiā nile kuā deku wosa, eluxe
3PP. PEJ leave from village already, however
"They have already left the village, however"

In English, some AdvPs give the speaker's opinion on the proposition expressed by the clause: “Unfortunately …”, etc. In these were handled by relative clauses (See Section 7.3, Relative Clauses, below).

In their clause-linking role, the sub-class of adverbial particles overlapped with the sub-class of conjunctions (see Section 4.3.7, Conjunction Phrases, below).

4.3.2. Prepositional Phrases

A prepositional phrase consisted of a head preposition followed by a noun phrase. The preposition could be simple or complex. A complex preposition was one extended by other prepositions or by locative and directional terms. This device made up for the lack of basic prepositions. The noun phrase was constructed as in Section 4.1 Noun Phrases, above.

PrepP -> (Prep NP) NP

Pōi lasu agu
On top table
"On top of a/the table"

A PrepP could be the attribute of a noun or of a verb. Within an NP, it was always optional. Within the verb phrase, it could be optional or required. See Sections 4.1.7 Noun Phrases Modified by Particle Phrases and
4.2.4 Verb Phrases Modified by Particle Phrases, both above.

A PrepP could even act as a main predicate item. Note the absence of a linking verb.

\[ S \rightarrow NP \ \text{PrepP} \]

\textbf{Yere põi lasu agu}  
\textit{Flower on top table}  
"The flower is on top of the table"

As in the languages of our world, the range of a preposition did not always correspond to its dictionary definition. Some set phrases just had to be learnt by heart.

\textbf{Põi lowa kiro}  
\textit{On water rough}  
"In rough water" ; "Through rough water"

\textbf{PrepP} \rightarrow (\text{Prep Prep}) \ \text{NP}

\textbf{Opa mi bokai}  
\textit{Across inside forest}  
"Through a/the forest"

4.3.3. Focus Phrases

In *Describing Morphosyntax*, Thomas Paine describes focus as a pragmatic status, not present in all sentences. This was certainly true of focus in Ōtari. The Ōtari marked focus with one of three particles (introduced in Section 3.3.6 Focus Particles, above)

Focus particles could take over as heads of any kind of phrase. They drew attention to the phrase in certain situations. English has two ways to do this. One is the cleft-construction, which moves an item to the front of the sentence. Alternatively, English keeps an item in situ, but adds intonation in speech or italics or underlining in writing.

\textit{It was Runyo that I saw}

\textit{I saw Runyo}
Ōtari kept the focussed phrase in situ, but placed a focus particle at its end. This was one of the few situations when the language put a phrase head at the end rather than the start of the phrase.

\[
\text{Prn V FocP V NP}
\]

\[
\text{Fai teme Runyo kō}
\]

\[
1PS.EQ \text{ see Runyo FOC}
\]

"It was Runyo that I saw" ; "I saw Runyo"

When a phrase is nested within a phrase (and perhaps within another), it can be difficult finding the correct spot to place the focus particle. This proves problematic for a number of modern revivalists trying to learn the language.

\[
\text{NP → N FocP Prn}
\]

\[
\text{Kubu xenya kō fai}
\]

\[
\text{Spear be.new FOC 1PS.EQ}
\]

"My new spear"

To emphasise the spear’s newness, the focus particle follows the attributive VP \text{xenya}. To place it after \text{fai} would be to emphasise my ownership of the spear.

Where three entities were mentioned in the same sentence, Ōtari offered the option of raising a prepositional argument to applied object, thus putting the natural object into focus by placing it at then end of the sentence (See \text{Sections 3.2.15 Preposition & Adverb Incorporation}, above and \text{5.2.5 Double Object Constructions}, below). Both constructions could be used together:

\[
\text{Sukūde binifolu iwā, cani Akule ā!}
\]

\[
\text{Sukūde by.walk river, with Akule FOC}
\]

"Sukūde was walking by the river with Akule, of all people!"
Here the speaker is implying that the presumed liaison is somehow scandalous. The focus particle has changed because ko marks emphasis, but ai marks contrast or surprise.

4.3.4. Particle Phrases Discussed Elsewhere

Classifiers did not form phrases of their own. They were always part of number phrases (See Section 3.3.4 Classifiers, above).

Interjections, by definition, stood apart from the rest of their sentence. They were only ever related to other interjections. (See Section 3.3.5, Interjections, above)

Etiquette particles and polarity particles were clause-level operators. They are therefore discussed elsewhere (See, Sections 3.3.8 Etiquette Particles and 3.3.7 Polarity Particles, above and Section 5 below, from 5.4 Negation onwards).

4.3.5. Co-ordination of Particle Phrases

As with other sentence elements, two PartPs could simply be listed or linked with a conjunction. Any number of PartPs could be linked in this way. The conjunction appeared before the last element in the list. It could be either da or cani. Both translated English “and” or “also”.

When listing items, a single conjunction was the norm, placed before the last item on the list. Occasionally a conjunction was omitted.

\[
\text{PartP} \rightarrow \text{PartP PartP}
\]

\[
\text{Jo Sukũde, jo Runyo}
\]

\[
\text{DAT Sukũde DAT Runyo}
\]

"To Sukũde, to Runyo"

\[
\text{PartP} \rightarrow (\text{PartP}) \text{ Part } (\text{PartP})
\]

\[
\text{Jo Sukũde da jo Runyo}
\]

\[
\text{DAT Sukũde and DAT Runyo}
\]

"To Sukũde and to Runyo"
4.3.6. Particle Phrases Modified by Particle Phrases

As with other subordinate constructions, two particle phrases were simply placed next to each to indicate that the second one modified the first.

\[
\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP (NP (PartP (PartP)))}
\]

\[\text{Wotai fai} \quad \text{jai} \quad \text{xâkua jai} \quad \text{mixu}\]

Sister 1PS.EQ with hair with plaits
"My sister with the plaited hair"

4.3.7. Conjunction Phrases

These were introduced above in Section 3.3.3 Conjunctions, where it was noted that English, conjunctions link phrases or clauses, whilst adverbs with the same basic meaning link sentences. This was not the case in Ōtari. The conjunction patterns for NPs, VPs and PartPs have already been noted above (Sections 4.1.1, 4.2.1 and 4.3.5, respectively).

Ōtari followed English in using the same words and structures regardless of what kind of items are being conjoined.

\[\text{Sere da kubu} - \text{Shields and spears} \quad \text{(NP Conj NP)}\]
\[\text{Cenye da yele} - \text{Eating and drinking} \quad \text{(VP Conj VP)}\]
\[\text{Jo Sukũde da jo Runyo} - \text{To Sukũde and to Runyo} \quad \text{(PartP Conj PartP)}\]

The commonest conjunctions were \text{da} and \text{cani}. Both translated English "and" or "also". Like all conjunctions, they normally appeared between their referents.

When listing items however, a single conjunction was the norm. \text{Da} could be repeated in lists, but \text{cani} could not.

\[\text{Sere, tabo da kubu} - \text{Shields, clubs and spears}\]
\[\text{Sere da tabo da kubu} - \text{Shields and clubs and spears}\]
\[\text{*Sere cani tabo cani kubu} - \text{Shields and clubs and spears}\]
The extra syllable in *cani* made it the more emphatic alternative. So in listing, *cani* had the sense of “*and whatsmore*”, “*and even*” or “*and also*”. When nesting conjunctions, cani was the higher level operator.

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{VP VP Part VP}
\]

*Cenyе, yеle cani mабai* - *Eating, drinking and even dancing*

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow (\text{VP Part VP}) \text{ Part (VP Part VP)}
\]

*Folu da gă, cani cenyе da paru* -
*Walking and fighting plus eating and sleeping*

The pattern extended to the conjunction of subjects and predicates.

\[
\text{S} \rightarrow (\text{NP Conj NP}) \text{ V PrepP}
\]

*Sukũde da  Akule folu  bini iѡă*
*Sukũde and Akule walk by  river*
"*Sukũde and Akule were walking by a/the river*"

\[
\text{S} \rightarrow \text{NP (VP Conj VP)}
\]

*Sukũde folu bini iѡă  cani masũ yomai*
*Sukũde walk by  river and hunt  fish*
"*Sukũde walked by the river and did some fishing*"

Whole clauses were joined in much the same manner and could be considered to be ConjPs when linked in a single sentence. Unlike in English, the structure was the same when referring back to a previous sentence.
S -> (NP V Part P. NP Conj V NP)

**Sukũde folu bini iwã. Akule da binifolu iwã**
Sukũde walk by river. Akule and by.walk river
"Sukũde was walking by the river. Akule went walking by the river, too"

Here, *bini iwã* is new information, so it stays in focus position. By the second clause, location is established, so *iwã* is raised to applied object by preposition incorporation, putting the focus on *da*. Note also how *da* is the second word in the second clause, like its equivalents in Yoruba and other languages of our world.

Again, juxtaposition was often enough to imply conjunction (a common device in Vietnamese). However, this is rare in the Ōtari corpus, perhaps because juxtaposition was already used marked possession.

Like English, Ōtari had a specialist conjunction for marking a contrast or exception. English uses both "but" and "yet" for this, but Ōtari just used *lai*. *Lai* also translated the English adverb "however". Like *da* in the example above, *lai* is the second word of the second clause.

**S S**

**Sukũde kuoti cõbe. Runyo lai jõbe jõ**
Sukũde cut wood. Runyo, however, build hut
*Sukũde cut wood, but Runyo built a hut*

Other conjunctions used as conjunctive adverbs were also placed second in the second clause.

Negation of *da* or *cani* was accomplished in the English manner by simply following them with *sā*, "not". Modern revivalists believe that the negation applies to all following elements not just the next one. This reading is consistent with other usages, but we cannot be sure.
Nya gomasū ōtau da mogu da sā nyamo
3PS.HON hunter great and not be.afraid and be.strong
“He is a great hunter, strong and unafraid”

If the above read … da sā mogu … the negation would be taken to apply to both mogu and nyamo not mogu alone. This would render the sentence more equivocal, and bring into question the use of a honorific pronoun.
5. CLAUSES

Otari had a strong tendency to put heads before dependents in clauses, as it had in phrases. Word order was still fairly fixed at the clause level because it was bound up with meaning. Pragmatic strategies as noted, tended to rely on particles and changing the voice of the verb.

An Otari clause normally consisted of a subject followed by a predicate. The subject consisted of a noun phrase, as described in Section 4.1 Noun Phrases, above. The predicate took one of several forms.

5.1. Clauses With Nominal Predicates

Perhaps the simplest declarative clauses were those that linked a noun subject with a noun predicate. In English, these clauses take the copular verb "to be". Otari lacked a verb "to be". The two NPs were sometimes only separated by the pause and intonation change: /, that comes between subject and predicate, as noted above in Section 2.8 Prosody.

5.1.1. Possessive Clauses

Otari also lacked the verbs "to have" and "to belong". Possessive sentences all involved the dative preposition jo. The difference between English "have" and "belong" sentences was expressed by word order.

\[
\text{Jo fai kabua = Jo fai / kabua} \quad \text{DAT 1PS.EQ boat}
\]

"I have a boat"

\[
\text{Kabua jo fai = Kabua / jo fai} \quad \text{Boat DAT 1PS.EQ}
\]

"The boat belongs to me"

5.1.2. Locative Constructions

Locative constructions were also built around a preposition. Normally, this would be the all-purpose locative te, but for a literal case of "being inside something", mi was preferred (see Section 3.3.2 Prepositions, above).
5.1.3. Existential Constructions

The Ōtari existential construction was simply a reversal of the locative construction. This parallels the way the two kinds of possessive sentences worked in 5.1.1. As we shall see below, other Ōtari presentative devices worked in the same way.

\[ Te \text{ gemai } \text{ ciro} = \text{Te gemai / ciro} \]

LOC vegetable.patch cat
"There is a cat in the vegetable garden" ;
"A cat is in the vegetable garden"

Mere existence was indicated with the verb te, "to exist". This carried no reference to location, though its similarity to the locative preposition te strongly suggests that there was some kind of historical link between the two words.

\[ Tē \text{ ciro} \]
Exist cat
"There was a cat" ;
"There are such things as cats"

5.1.4. Statements of Identity

A statement of identity asserts that "X is Y" where X and Y are both noun phrases. Statements of identity in Ōtari took ce as their copula. Ce was an equative particle, a kind of spoken equals sign. It was not a verb, as it took no verbal affixes and could not function as a noun modifier. As we shall see later, it also served as the word for "yes".

\[ Nya\text{ ce kamuai tau} \]
3PS.HON = father 1PS.PEJ
"He is my father"
5.1.5. Proper Inclusion

A statement of proper inclusion asserts that "X is a member of class Y". Again, X and Y must both be noun phrases. In Ōtari, statements of proper inclusion took the same form as statements of identity. Context was relied on to differentiate between the two.

*Sukūde ce gomasū kama*

*Sukūde = AGT.hunt good
"Sukūde is a good hunter"

5.1.6. Equative Clauses With Copular Verbs

Any of the above sentence patterns could be repeated using a verb of perception as a copula.

*Te gemai oteme ciro*

*LOC vegetable.patch STV.PAS-see cat
"It seems there is a cat in the vegetable garden"

Parallel "becoming" clauses could also be constructed using an appropriate verb plus the dynamic passive affix *be-*.

*Potã benaka tabai moja Seku*

*Jewel DYN.PAS-make soon wife High
"Jewel will soon become High’s wife"

Parallel "ceasing" clauses could also be constructed using an appropriate verb plus *kaya*, "to finish" or *ijũ*, "to cease without completing".

*Potã da Seku ijũ jaita tabai*

*Jewel and High cease be.alone soon
"Soon, Jewel and High will no longer be alone"

*Ijũ* is preferred to *kaya* here because it refers to *jaita* which is a stative verb, and you cannot complete a state, you can only leave it.
5.2. Clauses With Verbal Predicates

In Section 3.2 Verbs, we noted that Otari verbs each had a home voice based on the most typical situation. We also noted that they took prefixes to mark voice and incorporated prepositions to produce applicatives.

**Cenye** – To eat (something)  (active transitive)

**Mocenye** – To eat  (active intransitive)

Each voice or applicative form had to be accompanied by the required number of arguments. This is in contrast to English where some verbs are ambitransitive and can vary their number of arguments without special marking.

*Your dog is eating something*

*Your dog is eating*

As we shall see though in Section 6.1, Topicality, one of the arguments of the Otari verb could be null (omitted, but understood from previous clauses). It could not, however, be deleted (not present at all).

**Kǔdu kǔ cenye rā duà ja**

Dog 2PS.HON eat thing one GENERAL.CLFR

"Your dog is eating something"

**Kǔdu kǔ cenye Ø**

Dog 2PS.HON eat Ø

"Your dog is eating”  (something previously mentioned)

**Kǔdu kǔ cenye**

*Dog 2PS.HON eat*

* "Your dog is eating”

**Kǔdu kǔ mocenye**

Dog 2PS.HON DYN.INTR-eat

"Your dog is eating"
5.2.1. Atransitive Clauses

Verbs in the eventive voice were presented without a subject. In reality of course, the acts or states they described all had causes or agents, but they were unknown or considered unimportant. The eventive verb therefore often appeared alone.

Asue te bosā
Rain LOC mountain
"Rain fell in the mountains" ;
"It was raining (up) in the mountains"

Pamabai te deku
EVT-dance LOC village
"There was dancing in the village" ;
"Dancing took place in the village"

It was also possible to place the locative NP first to introduce and contextualise the verb.

Te bosā asue
LOC mountain rain
"In the mountains, rain fell"

5.2.2. Intransitive Clauses

Intransitive clauses normally consisted of a subject noun phrase and a predicate verb phrase, in that order. The verb could be dynamic or stative and was in one of the intransitive voices (dynamic intransitive, dynamic passive, reflexive, reciprocal, stative and stative passive).

Here are a few simple examples. Notice how the stative verb in the second example formed a normal intransitive clause in Ōtari. whereas in English we use a copula and adjective to say the same thing.
S > NP VP

_Ule sěgo_
Man run
"The man is running"

_Esā  euna_
Woman happy
"The woman is happy"

_Alua otobi_
Bird _STV.PAS-catch_
"The bird was caught"

Both the noun phrase and the verb phrase could be more complex as outlined above in Sections 1 and 2 respectively of the Ōtari Phrases page.

_Sukūde da  Runyo doteme_
Sukūde and Runyo _RECP-see_
"Sukūde and Runyo saw each other"

_Asū  Runyo xale mogai_
Child Runyo _sail  tomorrow_
"Runyo's son will sail tomorrow"

_Iwā  ŏtau  suye saga_
River _be.great flow  be.fast_
"The great river flows quickly"

In clauses like the last example, it was not always clear which verbs modified the subject and which were predicates. As Ōtari was overwhelmingly a spoken language, intonation patterns were often enough to mark the subject-predicate boundary. (3=high pitch, 2 = medium, 1 = low / =pause)
In other cases, a following demonstrative or quantifier phrase served to boundary-mark the subject NP.

**Iwã õtau xukã suye saga**  
River be.great PROX.DEM flow be.fast  
"This great river flows quickly"

There was also the option to insert a pronoun immediately after the subject NP. Note here the use of an honorific pronoun. A river was important to neighbouring people and its spirit had to be shown due reverence.

**Iwã õtau, nya suye saga**  
River be.great, 3PS.HON flow be.fast  
"The great river, it flows quickly"

Where the NP did not include a subordinate verb, a pronoun was sometimes inserted anyway to establish attitude or social status.

**Sukũde, rai gãtu**  
Sukũde, 3PS.PEJ stupid  
"That Sukũde, he's stupid"

In writing, this device had potential for confusion with the genitive construction. In speech though the two pronouns fell on different sides of the subject-predicate pause and had different intonations. (/ = pause ; 1 = low tone, 3 = high).

**Wotai, / rai moxu-moxu**  
3 2 / 3 2 1 2 1  
Brother, 3PS.PEJ be.lazy~lazy  
"That brother (of mine), he's so lazy"
Like the nominal predicates (discussed in Section 5.1 above), an intransitive verbal predicate could preceed its subject NP. This construction served a presentative function. It introduced a new, indefinite noun phrase.

**S > VP NP**

**Sêgo ule**
Run man
"A man is running" ; "There is a man running"

**Xume saga  mi iwã, yomai bake cepo**
Swim be.quick in river, fish three tail.CLFR
ūte da moba-moba
be.silver and be.big~big
"Three very big silver fish are swimming quickly in the river"

Definite NPs, those referring to entities already "on stage" did not trigger reversal. Nor did NPs whose reference was obvious from context, like the great river above. There would only be one great river in a district.

Classes-of-one such as personal names, or nouns like *ixe*, "the sky" were seen as inherently definite. The referents of first and second person pronouns were also obvious, hence definite. None of these triggered intransitive inversion.

**Ixe bekua**
Sky be.blue/green
"The sky is blue"
*Bekua ixe*

Generic nouns (those referring to a whole class of entities) were also held to be inherently definite. They too did not require inversion.

**Bidu bekua**  
Leaf be.blue/green  
“Leaves are green”

**?Bekua bidu**

*Bekua bidu* is disallowed where *bidu* has generic meaning, but not when it refers to a specific leaf or leaves.

Naturally, a verb that was used to modify an indefinite noun did not take part in an inversion, it stayed by its referent.

**Saja esā euna**  
Laugh woman be.happy  
"A happy woman laughed"

Equally, a verb that modified another verb followed its referent when inversion took place.

**Xume saga yomai**  
Swim be.fast fish  
"A fish swims fast"

With a serial verb (**Section 4.2.1** above and **5.2.6** below), only the first verb inverted. This first verb had to be intransitive, the others could have any transitivity.

**Sawa salu polai koye moteme**  
Come people many head.CLFR DYN.INTR.see  
"Many came to see“
As modern linguists have discovered, performing an inversion and seeing what moves and what does not, is a good way to test what is going on in ambiguous Ótari texts.

So far we have just looked at verbs in the active voices. Verbs in any of the other voices could also precede their subjects where appropriate.

5.2.3. Transitive Clauses

Transitive clauses consisted of a subject noun phrase, a verb phrase and an object noun phrase, always in that order. The verb was dynamic and was usually in the active transitive voice, though some were in a causative voice.

\[ S > NP \ VP \ NP \]

\[ \text{Fai teme si} \]
\[ 1PS.EQ \ see \quad 2PS.EQ \]
\"I see you\"

\[ \text{Ule tobi alua} \]
\[ \text{Man catch bird} \]
\"The man caught a/the bird\"

Notice in the last example that the subject is given as definite, but it is not certain whether the object is definite or indefinite. The subject of an Ótari transitive verb had to be definite (i.e. introduced previously). Along with the reversal of intransitive clauses with new subjects, this shows that Ótari was sensitive to definiteness in some contexts, even though it did not formally mark definite and indefinite.

In English, there is no definite subject restriction on transitives, but 90% have definite subjects anyway because entities are brought onto stage with intransitives before they start interacting with other entities. The remaining 10% of cases call for creative translation if they are to be turned into good Ótari. Take the English clause:
Two men love that woman

Here the subject is indefinite, so translation will require two clauses. We might, for example, try an existential clause plus a transitive:

*Tē ule aja koye.*  
Exist man two head.CLFR.  
Aта suo koye moji esā āsu  
3PP.EQ all head.CLFR love woman be.same  
"There were (these) two men. Both loved the same woman"

Or if recounting a tale:

*Nyomā po duā, ala ule aja koye.*  
Time rank one, live man two head.CLFR.  
Aта suo koye moji esā āsu  
3PP.EQ all head.CLFR love woman be.same  
"Once there lived two men. Both loved the same woman"

A single stative passive clause would suffice provided we had already introduced the woman into the tale. The men then become an oblique argument and indefinite obliques were allowed:

*Esā omoji ga ule aja koye*  
Woman STV.PAS-love INS man two head.CLFR  
"The woman was loved by two men"

### 5.2.4. Indirect Object Clauses

The least marked kind of ditransitive clauses consisted of a subject NP, a verb phrase, a direct object NP and an indirect object PrepP, always in that order. The verb was dynamic and was in the active ditransitive voice.

The subject of a ditransitive verb, like the subject of a transitive verb, had to be definite. The verb had to be in the active ditransitive voice. A few verbs had this as their home voice, such as *olu*, “to give”.
5.2.5. Double Object Constructions

Ötari had two kinds of double object constructions. Both have been introduced in Sections 3.2.4 Active Ditransitive Voice and 3.2.9 Causative Voices.

The causative prefix kāi-/kāy- turned a transitive root into a ditransitive. The controller of the event became the new subject and had to be definite. The immediate agent became an new direct object, equal in status to the original object (neither was indirect). However, this new, demoted object always preceded the original one.

BEFORE ...

Asū motu  cenyə  sɨtaji  rai
Child 3PP.HON eat  vegetable 3PS.PEJ
"Their child ate his vegetables"

AFTER ...

Motu  kāicenye  asū  motu  sɨtaji  rai
3PP.HON CAUS-eat  child 3PP.HON vegetable 3PS.PEJ
"They made their child eat his vegetables"

In the second type, an indirect object was raised to applied object of equal status with the direct object. This was done by incorporating the dative preposition jo into the verb. The applied object always came first.

BEFORE ...

Ule olu yere  aumĩ jo  esã
Man give flower red  DAT woman
"The man gives a/the woman a/the red flower"
AFTER ...

**Ule jolu esã yere aumî**

*Man DAT-give woman flower red*

"The man gives a/the woman a/the red flower"

This construction was used when the ultimate recipient of an action was more topical than whatever was directly acted on.

### 5.2.6. Serial Verb Constructions

The framework used here to describe Serial Verb Constructions is that used by Alexandra Aikhenvald in her 2006 essay: *[Serial verb constructions in typological perspective]*. Aikhenvald's definition of the SVC is broad, simple and powerful.

Unlike some writers, she does not distinguish SVCs from compound verbs. This approach suits the description of Ōtari where two separate categories would have no meaning. Any Ōtari verb can be a main predicate item and all lack the tense, aspect and mood (TAM) inflection that might distinguish a main verb from a subordinate. Aikhenvald writes:

"A serial verb construction (SVC) is a sequence of verbs which act together as a single predicate, without any overt marker of coordination, subordination or syntactic dependency of any other sort. Serial verb constructions describe what is conceptualized as a single event.

*They are monoclausal; their intonation properties are the same as those of a monoverbal clause, and they have just one tense, aspect, and polarity value. SVCs may also share core and other arguments. Each component of an SVC must be able to occur on its own. Within an SVC, the individual verbs may have the same, or different, transitivity values*.

Ōtari used a wide range of serial verb constructions, though not all possible types. Unlike many languages in our world, Ōtari had little need for SVCs to add NPs to the clause. As we have seen, it did that with prepositions, verbal voice and applicative marking (see **3.2 Verbs**, above).

However, the lack of TAM affixes meant that TAM concepts had to be expressed by SVCs. English often uses auxiliary-main verb combinations in such cases. The auxiliaries are the heads of the English construction and carry the grammatical information for both verbs. As noted, this could not happen in Ōtari.
"All the men have finished eating now"

The language also failed to distinguish between finite and infinitive verbs. So its equivalents of English finite-infinitive constructions turned out as SVCs.

"The children want to see"

SVCs were often required where English has a single verb. For example Ôtari had no verb "to bring".

"The men of our clan bring goat-meat to the feast"

The verb order in SVCs was iconic, sequential or causal. These often amounted to the same thing.

"The man caught some food and walked home"

Most SVCs contained only two verbs. Three-verb SVCs were also possible, though they were rare.

"The children want to come and see"
As noted in above (5.2.2 Intransitive Clauses), when the subject was indefinite, and the first verb of the SVC was intransitive, then the subject and the first verb changed places. I am not aware of this happening in any languages of our world.

\[\text{Sawa salu polai koye moteme} \]
\[\text{Come people many head.CLFR DYN.INTR.see} \]
\[\text{“Many came to see”}\]

The verbs in an Ōtari SVC had to share a subject. If they were all transitive, they had to share an object. The joint object came between the two verbs, as it does in Yoruba.

\[\text{Do kuta koro kãyemau} \]
\[\text{1PS.EQ.INCL plant seed CAUS-grow} \]
\[\text{“We plant seeds and make them grow”}\]

Where only the first verb was transitive, the object appeared after it, as above. Where only a later verb was transitive, the object followed that verb instead.

\[\text{Atei xuãi sawa teme kũ} \]
\[\text{Child want come see 2PS.HON} \]
\[\text{“The children want to come and see you”}\]

Where two verbs had different objects, each object appeared after its own verb, as in the earlier example:

\[\text{Ule yetau ucĩ durã kău rofu sawa jo xolieuna} \]
\[\text{Man clan 1PP.EQ.EXCL take meat goat come DAT meal.happy} \]
\[\text{“The men of our clan bring goat-meat to the feast”}\]
If the verbs had different subjects, an SVC was not possible. You would either use two co-ordinate clauses or an indirect causative clause with object complement (see: *Sections 3.2.9 Causative Voices*, and *7.5.1 Object Complement Clauses*).

*Guai ekatu nya malai*

2PS.PEJ cause 3PS.HON fall
"You caused him to fall"

*Guai ekatu jë nya malai*

2PS.PEJ cause COMPL 3PS.HON fall
"You caused him to fall"

A common English sentence pattern is:

**S-V-O Complement Phrase**

They painted the boat black

Such sentences translate into Ōtari as SVCs.

*Ata yexu kabua kāimoloru*

3PP.EQ paint boat CAUS.DYN-INTR.black
"They painted the boat black"

### 5.3. Placement of Non-Core Material

The constructions above are all ways of handling core clausal material (the verb and its required arguments). Optional, non-core elements came before or after all the core material.

Location and direction in time and space were generally placed at the end of the clause, when they were non-core material.

*Do peita xale mogai*

1PP.INCL.EQ start sail tomorrow
"We set sail tomorrow"
Non-core material could also appear at the start of the clause in a presentative construction, presenting the whole of the core. In this example, the core clause is a place-locative (as above in 5.1.6 Equative Clauses with Copular Verbs) and the non-core phrase is a time-locative.

Saroye, do te Tayoku
Day.after.tomorrow, 1PP.INCL.EQ LOC Tayoku
"The day after tomorrow, we will be in Tayoku"

Likewise, non-core locative and directional material usually came after the whole of an SVC, though it could occasionally precede, sometimes even dragging a verb with it. This is very uncanonical SVC behaviour, but is occasionally found in late written Ōtari. The final example with a focus particle would be the more usual approach.

Ucĩ sēgo ácu siepã jetu jĩ
1PP.EQ.EXCL run go be.straight DAT hut
"We are running straight home" ;
"We are running straight into (our) hut"

OR ...

Siepã jetu jĩ, učī sēgo ácu
Be.straight DAT hut, 1PP.EQ.EXCL run go
"Straight into our hut is where we ran"

OR ...

Ucĩ sēgo ácu siepã jetu jĩ kō
1PP.EQ.EXCL run go be.straight DAT hut FOC
"We are running straight home"

Instruments also came at the end of the core clause. They could precede or follow non-core locative and directional material. Both orders were common. Whichever NP the speaker most wished to put into focus came last, as in English.
Ata  ācu ga  saiku jo  Tayoku
3PP.EQ go  INS foot  DAT Tayoku
"They travelled on foot to Tayoku"

Ata  ācu jo  Tayoku ga  saiku
3PP.EQ go  DAT Tayoku  INS foot
"They travelled to Tayoku on foot "

A focus particle could be added to the last NP for greater emphasis. There was also the option to move the instrument to the front if it was more topical than the core clause.

Ga  saiku, ata  ācu jo  Tayoku
INS foot  3PP.EQ go  DAT Tayoku
"On foot, they travelled to Tayoku"

In the passive voices, the agent of the verb could be omitted or introduced by the instrumental preposition ga. If included, it normally followed the core, though again there was the option to front it.

Si  oteme  ga  Runyo
2PS.EQ STV.PSV.see INS Runyo
"You were seen by Runyo"

Ga  ule, yere  aumī  otolu  jo  esā
INS man flower red  DYN.PAS.give DAT woman
"By a/the man, the red flower is being given to a/the woman"
As noted in Section 3.2.15.2 Applicative Voices, non-core NPs can be raised to applied object status by incorporating their preposition into the verb. Once this is done though, their position becomes as fixed as that of other core NPs.

5.4. Negation

Ôtari had two negative words, one for use with noun phrases and one for use with verb phrases. There were also special negative pronouns.

NPs were negated with obē, the word for “zero”. This followed the NP to which it referred. Naturally, it took a classifier.

\[
\text{Te cotu roikā, alua loru obē felī} \\
\text{LOC tree DEM.DIST, bird black zero tail.CLFR} \\
\text{"There are no black birds in yonder tree"}
\]

VPs were negated with sā, the word for “not”. This preceded its VP referent.

\[
\text{Fai sā mosoku} \\
\text{1PS.EQ not DYN.INTR.know} \\
\text{"I do not know"}
\]

If the referent was an SVC, sā still preceded.

\[
\text{Do sā peita xale mogai} \\
\text{1PP.INCL.EQ not start sail tomorrow} \\
\text{"We will not set sail tomorrow"}
\]

Both negators presented issues of negative scope. The last example could be read as either:

\[
\text{We will not set sail tomorrow, we will do something else}
\]
OR …

*We will not set sail tomorrow, but on another day*

In English we often use intonation to indicate the precise element being negated. In Ótari, the last example was given the former reading. For the latter reading, *să* was moved and *no*, the focus particle for exhaustive listing, was added.

```
Do peita xale, să mogai no
1PP.INCL.EQ start sail not tomorrow FOC
"We will set sail, but/only not tomorrow"
```

Also, the birds tree example could be read as either:

```
There are no black birds in yonder tree
```

OR …

```
There are birds in yonder tree, but not black ones
```

Again, the first reading is assumed unless *no* is employed.

```
Te cotu roikã alua, loru no obẽ felĩ
LOC tree DEM.DIST bird, black FOC zero tail.CLFR
"There are birds in yonder tree, but/only no black ones"
```

The two negative pronouns were: *salũbẽ*, "*nobody*", (*salu* + *obẽ*) and *răbẽ*, "*nothing*" (*ră* + *obẽ*). Their Standard English equivalents take a positive verb, but Ótari used a negative verb, like some kinds of colloquial English, Cockney for example or African-American.
5.5. Questions and Answers

Answers are declarative statements, much like those above. However, they have their quirks, so best treated here, alongside questions.

5.5.1. Polar Questions

Polar questions questioned the applicability of a predicate to their subject. Unlike in standard English, they kept the same word order as the declarative clause from which they derived. The only difference was that a question particle, usually *mẽ*, was placed at the end.

The particle was offset by a comma in writing or a slight pause in speech. Some kinds of colloquial English have a similar construction, using huh? As in English, a questioning intonation was employed.

Possessive, locative and existential constructions (5.1.1 to 5.1.3 above) were the easiest clauses to question.

Q: Kabua xukã jo kũ, mẽ?

3 2 2 1 / 3 2 3

"Does this boat belong to you (, sir)?" ;
"This is your boat, huh (, sir)?"

The answer involved either *ce*, for "yes" or *sã* for "no". We have already met *ce* as an equative particle (Section 5.1.4, Statements of Identity above) and *sã* for negating a verbal predicate. In answers it was also used to deny nominal predicates and here it translated both "no" and "not".

A: Ce, kabua kuokã jo wã

Yes, boat DEM.MED DAT 1PS.HON

"Yes that boat belongs to me"
A: Să, kabua kuokā sā jo wā
   No, boat DEM.MED not DAT 1PS.HON
   "No that boat belongs to me"

Statements of identity and proper inclusion required the use of ce as an equative particle (5.1.4 to 5.1.5 above). In a positive reply, the equative particle ce was therefore used twice: once as an equative and once to mean “yes (that is the case)’’.

Q: Xukā ce kubu, mē?
   DEM.PROX = spear, Q?
   "Is this a spear?" ;
   "This is a spear, huh?"

A: Ce, kuokā ce kubu
   Yes, DEM.MED = spear
   "Yes, that is a spear"

A: Sā, kuokā sā ce kubu
   No, DEM.MED not = spear
   "No, that is not a spear"

A simple subject NP with a simple verbal predicate was also easy to question.

Kũdu mocenye, mē?
   Dog DYN.INTR-eat Q?
   "Is the dog eating?"

A simple noun-verb-noun transitive clause was just as easy to question.

Q: Kū teme yomai, mē?
   2PS.HON see fish, Q?
   "Did you see the fish?"

A: Ce, wā teme yomai
   Yes, 1PS.HON see fish
   "Yes, I saw the fish"
A ditransitive question (and its answer) was similarly formed. One simply added extra NPs and PrepPs to the end of the clause. Ambiguity was possible though, between VPs that were subordinate to the subject NP and VPs that were main predicate items.

In some cases a subject noun phrase was boundary-marked by a demonstrative, number or possessive phrase. Verbs subordinate to the subject noun came before the boundary-marker and verbal predicates came after.

**Kubu atau xukā xenya mē?**  
*Spear sharp DEM.PROX new Q?*  
"Is this sharp spear new?"

However, a boundary marker was not always present. As with statements, there was the option to insert a pronoun recapitulating the subject, or one could just rely on context and intonation.

**Kubu atau xenya mē?**  
*Spear sharp new Q?*  
"Is the sharp spear new?"

**Kubu atau, e xenya mē?**  
*Spear sharp 3PS.EQ new Q?*  
"The sharp spear, is it new?"

The focus particles could also be used in questions. Their use corresponded to various intonation changes in English. At the end of a clause, they merged with the question particle. So, for example kō plus mē became kuē. Kō was used in the reply.

**Q: Kubu xukā atau kuē?**  
*Spear DEM.PROX sharp FOC.Q?*  
"Is this spear really sharp?"
A: Ce, kubu kuokã atau kõ
   Yes, spear DEM.MED sharp FOC
   "Yes, that spear really is sharp"

As in English, shorter answers may also be provided to any of the questions shown above.

Ce – Yes
Sã – No

Ce, kõ! - Yes, FOC! ; "Yes, indeed! ; Definitely! ; Yay!" (etc.)
Sã , kõ! - No, FOC! ; "No, certainly not! ; No way!" (etc.)

Teme – Yes, I saw it
Sã teme – No I did not see it

5.5.2. Confirmation Questions

Confirmation questions in English work like a normal polar question worked in Ōtari. They consist of a normal clause followed by a question expression.

This flower is beautiful, isn't it?

Ōtari also took this approach. However, it changed the question expression to muãi. Like mẽ, coould contract with the emphatic focus particle kõ. In this case the result was kuãi.

Q: Yere xukã petu, muãi?
   Flower DEM.PROX beautiful, CONF.Q?
   "This flower is beautiful, isn't it?"

A: Ce, yere xukã petu
   Yes, flower DEM.PROX beautiful
   "Yes, this flower is beautiful"
Q: Yere xukā petu, kuãi?

Flower DEM.PROX beautiful, yes FOC.CONF.Q?

"This flower certainly is beautiful, isn't it?"

A: Ce, yere xukā petu, kõ

Yes, flower DEM.PROX beautiful, FOC

"Yes, this flower certainly is beautiful"

Again, shorter response patterns were available:

Ce, muãi? – Yes, it is, isn't it? [etc.]
Ce, kõ! – Indeed, it is! Isn’t it just? [etc.]

To deny the expection of the questioner, the negative marker can be employed sã. However, if the questioner had a negative expection, it was contradicted by woi, a “contrastive yes” word, that functioned like French “si”.

Q: Yere xukā sã petu-petu, muãi?

Flower DEM.PROX NEG beautiful~beautiful, CONF.Q?

"This flower doesn't look very nice, does it?"

A: Woi, petu-petu

Yes, beautiful~beautiful

"Yes, it does look nice"

A: Woi - “Yes, it does, actually”

A: Woi, kõ! - Of course it does!

Like ce, woi could also be used as a copula with nominal predicates. It took this role when answering a statement perceived as incorrect.
Xukã sã ce yere
DEM.PROX NEG = flower
"This is not a flower"

A: Xukã woi yere
DEM.PROX = flower
"This is a flower"

A: Xukã woi yere, kõ!
DEM.PROX = flower FOC
"Of course, it's a flower"

5.5.3. Exclamatory Questions
Exclamatory questions ("Surely not?", etc.) are best kept until Section 5.6 below, which introduces the concept of exclamation.

5.5.4. Questions with Question Words
When questioning a particular item in a clause, it was replaced by a question word. In English, this question word would be moved to the front of the sentence, but in Õtari, it remained in situ.

Q: Xukã ce mā?
DEM.PROX = what?
"What is this?"

A: Xukã ce fātu
DEM.PROX = fruit
"This is a fruit"

Q: Kubu fai mokai?
Spear 1PS.EQ where?
"Where is my spear?"
A: Kubu si xuã
   Spear 2PS.EQ here
   "Your spear is here"

Q: Melu teyo yere aumĩ?
   Who pick flower red
   "Who picked the red flower?"

A: Fai teyo e
   1PS.EQ pick 3PS.EQ
   "I picked it"

Q: Ule teyo mā yolu esā?
   Man pick what FOR.give woman
   "What did the man pick to give to the woman?"

A: E teyo yere aumĩ
   3PS.EQ pick flower red
   "He picked a red flower"

5.6. Exclamations
Another expression that required a particle at the end of the sentence was the exclamation. This took the exclamative phrase: ce, kô!, encountered above (5.5.1) with the meaning of "yes, indeed". This also functioned like a spelt-out exclamation mark.

Xukā ce yere petu, ce kô!
   DEM.PROX = flower beautiful, EXCL!
   "What a beautiful flower!"

Without ce, the kô would be read as referring only to the last word or phrase. As noted when it introduced (5.1.4 Statemens of Identity) ce can function like an equals sign. Used thus, it equates all before it with all after, so with exclamations it is saying: whole clause = focus.
Exclamatory questions express disbelief or incredulity. Some exclamatory questions combined the exclamatory strategy above with the polar question particle *muẽ*, to produce the tag *ce kuẽ*.

\[
E \quad petu, \quad ce kuẽ?! \\
3PS.EQ beautiful = FOC.Q?! \\
"Isn't it beautiful!?"
\]

Others combined *ãi*, the focus particle expressing surprise or contrast with one of the question words.

\[
Si \quad teme māi!? \\
2PS.EQ see what.FOC \\
"You saw wha-at!?"
\]

### 5.7. Commands and Exhortations

These followed a single structure, the imperative. The imperative particle *coi* was placed at the end of the sentence. The only difference was that a command took a second person pronoun or none, whilst an exhortation took a first person pronoun.

\[
Si \quad yūteyo fai aumĩ, coi \\
2PS.EQ FOR.pick 1PS.EQ flower IMP \\
"Pick me a flower"
\]

\[
Do \quad ācu teyo aumĩ, coi \\
1PP.INCL.EQ go pick flower, IMP \\
"We must go pick some flowers"
\]

### 5.8. Requests and Suggestions

Looked at one way, a request is a toned-down command, and a suggestion a toned-down exhortation. In Õtari therefore, they followed a similar structure to their counterparts in 2.3, softened by the use of *orĩ*, "please".
**Yũteyo fai aumĩ, coi orĩ**
FOR. pick 1PS.EQ flower, IMP please
"Pick me a flower, please"

**Do ācu teyo aumĩ, coi orĩ**
1PP.INCL.EQ go pick flower, IMP please
"Let's go pick some flowers"

### 5.9. Performatives

A performative clause does not merely report facts, but creates them. Such as these familiar clauses:

\[ I \text{ name this ship} \]
\[ I \text{ pronounce you man and wife} \]

As these English examples suggest, performatives tend to be uttered by authority figures. In Ōtari society these would include village head-men, medicine women and the female heads of mofu. Ōtari performatives had no special marking, they took the imperative.

**Do jĩbe deku xenya xuā, coi**
1PP.INCL.EQ build village new here, IMP
"We will build the new village here"

### 5.10. Politeness

We have already met one of the most effective and widespread politeness strategies in Ōtari. This was the use of the honorific series of pronouns (See **Section 3.1.6 Personal Pronouns**, above). Other common polite expressions included:

**Saira** – Welcome to

**Saira kū** – You are welcome

**Orĩ** – Please; OR, Thank you
An expression of politeness used as part of a full clause generally followed or preceded the rest of the clause. As in the examples under 5.8 just above.

5.11. Rudeness

We have also already encountered the main Ōtari rudeness strategy, namely the use of the pejorative series of pronouns (See Section 3.1.6 Personal Pronouns, above). Many instances of their use were socially acceptable, such as their use with familiars and minors. However, usages deemed inappropriate were considered offensive.

The use of unsoftened commands to social superiors was also deemed offensive.

References to the lower half of the body were considered rude in some contexts as was discussion of bodily excretions, particularly vomiting, which implied a rejection of something.
6. PRAGMATICS

Pragmatics studies the relationship between meaning and context. It covers a wide range of spoken language, such as filler words, turn-taking and the links between words and body language. At this distance in time we are unable to study such phenomena with respect to Ōtari. This section is therefore confined discussion of topicality and focus, which can be observed in surviving written sources.

6.1. Topicality

A topic in the linguistic sense is older, more salient information. The most topical noun phrases in Ōtari were subjects, followed by direct objects, datives, required locatives and finally obliques.

6.1.1. Topicality and Valence Adjustment

As we have seen, noun phrases could be moved up this hierarchy, but only if the move was accompanied by a change of verbal voice or the incorporation of a preposition into the verb. This process was the main indication of topicality in.

For example, the two passive voices allowed a patient to move up to subject and the incorporation of a dative preposition allowed the indirect object to move up to applied object.

Ōtari

*Sukũde bepaya ga Runyo*

Lucky DYN.PAS-hit INS Eagle
"Lucky was getting hit by Eagle"

*Ule jolu esā yere aumĩ*

3PS.EQ DAT-give woman flower red
"The man gave the woman a red flower"

Movement could occur down the hierarchy, too. A causative voice introduced a new subject and moved the old subject down to object position.

*Peyalua kāikōbi ixe*

COL.bird DYN.INTR-dark sky
"The flock of birds darkened the sky"
6.1.2. Topicality and Transitivity

As noted in Section 5.2.3 Transitive Clauses, the subject of a transitive or ditransitive verb had to be definite.

\[ \text{Ule tobi alua} \]
\[ \text{Man catch bird} \]
\[ "The man caught a/the bird" \]

The subject of an intransitive verb could be definite or indefinite, but intransitive verbs (plus their dependents) followed definite subjects and preceded indefinite ones.

\[ \text{Ule sēgo} \]
\[ \text{Man run} \]
\[ "The man is running" \]

\[ \text{Sēgo ule} \]
\[ \text{Run man} \]
\[ "A man is running" ; "There is a man running" \]

A definite NP is more topical than an indefinite, hence there was a relationship, between subjecthood, transitivity and topicality in Õtari.

6.1.3. Topicality and Pronoun Dropping

Topical noun phrases were often repeated as pronouns in subsequent phrases or clauses. These pronouns could also be dropped wherever sense allowed. This happened most often to the subjects of clauses, but objects could be dropped too.

\[ \text{Ule teyo yere aumī. Olu jo esā} \]
\[ \text{Man pick flower red. Ø give Ø DAT woman} \]
\[ "The man picked a red flower. He gave it to the woman" \]
A prepositional object that was becoming important was usually moved up to object position first before it was dropped. Thus the pronoun-dropping system interacted with the valence adjustment system.

*Roi wemoteme jo cotu.*  
Boy INTENT.DYN-INTR.see DAT tree.  
"The boy looked at the tree."

*E mõbaxuri e. Mieiko.*  
3PS.EQ up-climb 3PS.EQ. Ø in.sit Ø  
"He climbed up it. He sat in it"

Pronouns were used for clarity and emphasis. This was particularly true of third person pronouns, which always replaced an earlier noun phrase. First and second person pronouns were needed for first mentions, but then dropped most of the time.

*E xuãi teme e*  
3PS.EQ want see 3PS.EQ  
"He wants to see it"  
(i.e.: “He”, not someone else)

*Ucí ācu jo iwã. Xuãi masũ yomai*  
1PP.EXCL.EQ go DAT river. Ø want hunt fish  
"We are going to the river. We want to go fishing"

Pronouns and nouns were often retained when their referents changed their role from one clause to the next. This was done to avoid ambiguity. There were however no hard and fast rules.

*Ucí teme gomasũ jaiko bini iwã.*  
1PP.EXCL.EQ see hunter while Ø by river  
"We saw the hunters when we were by the river"

*Ata sēgo masũ cada. (Rai) omasũ*  
3PP.EQ run catch animal. Ø/3PS.PEJ STV.PAS.catch  
"They were running to catch an animal. It got caught"
In sentences like the one above, *rai* was usually droppable as that is clearly what was being hunted and the verb is marked to show that a former object has moved up to subject. It might be best left in though if talking about a large animal that was capable of catching the hunters.

Pronouns were also retained where they were required to signal relative social standing.

**Bede** ãcu jo iwã, kuolĩ. Xuãi masũ yomai.  1PP.EXCL.HON go DAT river, then. Ø want hunt fish.
"We were going to the river, then. We wanted to catch some fish"

**Xiã** lai, kãyijũ **bede**  3PP.PEJ but, CAUS.cease 1PP.EXCL.HON
"They however, stopped us."

Here the final **bede** could be dropped as "we" are the discourse topic. The retention of this honorific however, emphasises that we are better people than those who stopped us which suggests in turn that we were within our rights and our opponents overstepped the mark.

In extended discourse, nouns and pronouns were often retained purely to remind the listener who or what was being discussed.

**Roi wemoteme** jo cotu.  Boy INTENT.DYN-INTR.see DAT tree.
"The boy looked at the tree"

**E** mõbaxuri e. **Mieiko.**  3PS.EQ up-climb  3PS.EQ. Ø in.sit Ø
"He climbed up it. He sat in it"

**Cotu seku-seku. Kuõ moteme** sacu  Tree high-high. Ø can DYN-INTR.see far.
"The tree was very tall. He could see a long way"
Notice that *roi* can be safely omitted in the last sentence even though the tree became the subject of the sentence before. This is because *"the boy"* is the discourse topic, that which the whole text is about. Also of course, boys can see and trees cannot.

*Cotu* however is repeated, even though it has already reduced to a pronoun and then a gap. This is because the tree has changed its role from indirect object of the first clause, to direct object of the second and third, then to subject of the fourth.

As omission was used for topical, known information, it was not used to indicate an unknown participant. An unknown participant was introduced with an indefinite pronoun. Once established, it could then be omitted in later sentences, like any other noun.

A generic object: *"stuff / things in general"* took the intransitive voice of a transitive verb.

```
Salu su koye moteme
Person all head.CLFR DYN.INTR.see
"People see things"
```

### 6.2. Focus

Focus was defined in **Section 4.3.3 Focus Phrases** in the terms favoured in Describing Morphosyntax, by Thomas Paine. For Paine focus is a pragmatic status, not present in all sentences.

In Ōtari, focus could be marked by one of two strategies: by movement or by focus particles, (introduced in Section 3.3.6 Focus Particles). It could also be marked with both. All the devices presented below follow one of these approaches and have been introduced previously. They are repeated here so that the treatment of focus in Ōtari may be viewed in the round.

### 6.2.1 Focus by Movement

Focus within the clause was normally achieved by movement, though translations of the English cleft were not. Focus within the phrase required the use of focus particles.
When focus was indicated by movement in Õtari, it was essentially presentative in nature. Old information was placed at the start of the clause and new information at the end. The old information served to present and contextualise the new.

Here is a reminder of the various kinds of focus by movement in Õtari. It is a moot point whether some of these moves serve to put one NP into focus or the other into a topical position.

6.2.2. Focus by Movement with Nominal Predicates

The normal possessive clause had the structure:

```
Jo NP1 NP2
```

```
Jo fai kabua
DAT 1PS.EQ boat
"I have a boat"
```

To put the possessor into focus, this was reversed:

```
NP2 jo NP1
```

```
Kabua jo fai
Boat DAT 1PS.EQ
"The boat belongs to me"
```

(See Section 5.1.1 Possessive Clauses)

The locative clause had a definite subject and the form:

```
NP1 te NP2
```

```
Ciro te gemai
Cat LOC vegetable patch
"The cat is in the vegetable patch"
```
The existential clause reversed this structure and had an indefinite subject:

\[
\text{Te NP2 NP1}
\]

\[
\text{Te gemai ciro}
\]

LOC vegetable patch cat

"There is a cat in the vegetable garden"

(See 5.1.2 Locative Constructions and 5.1.3 Existential Constructions, above)

6.2.3 Focus by Movement with Verbal Predicates

Atransitive clauses could switch from verb initial to verb final, when the action of the verb was in focus.

\[
\text{VP te NP}
\]

\[
\text{Asue te bosã}
\]

Rain LOC mountain

"Rain fell in the mountains"

\[
\text{Te NP VP}
\]

\[
\text{Te bosã asue}
\]

LOC mountain rain

"In the mountains, rain fell"

(See Section 5.2.1, Atransitive Clauses, above)

As in most languages, new (indefinite) NPs were generally brought on stage with the use of intransitive verbs. Like the Romance languages in our world, Ōtari placed these indefinite subjects after the verb, to put them into focus.
In the ditransitive clause, an indirect object could be raised to a second direct object via a double object construction. This was achieved by incorporating the preposition *jo* into the verb and would be done if the IO is more topical than the DO, or to put the DO into focus.

In a like manner the rest of the valence adjustment system implicitly put some arguments into focus at the same time as it made others more topical. This process is dealt with at length in Sections 3.2 and 5.2. It will not be further considered here, as it does not rely on movement alone.
6.2.4 Focus with Adjuncts

Adjuncts, or non-required phrases, generally carried new information and so were placed at the end of a neutral clause.

S V O Adjc

Goimelu pasũ yefa te gemai nya
AGT.medicine gather herb LOC vegetable.garden 3PS.HON
"The medicine woman was gathering herbs in her garden"

When they were placed between subject and verb, more emphasis was put on the verb.

S Adjc V O

Goimelu, te gemai nya, pasũ yefa
AGT.medicine LOC vegetable.garden 3PS.HON gather herb
"The medicine woman was in her garden, gathering herbs"

When moved to the start of the sentence, the adjunct acted as a presentative, setting the scene before the subject was introduced and began to act.

Adjc S V O

Te gemai nya, goimelu pasũ yefa
LOC vegetable.garden 3PS.HON AGT.medicine woman gather herb
"In her garden, the medicine woman was gathering herbs"

Initial position was also used when the adjunct was valid for several consecutive clauses.
6.2.5. Focus with Focus Particles

As noted in Section 3.3.6, there were three focus particles kõ, the general emphatic particle, āi for surprise or contrast and no for exhaustive listing. These handled focus within the phrase and translated the English cleft.

Word order within the phrase was fixed according to structural considerations and so not available as a focussing device.

\[
\text{Kubu xenya atau kõ} \\
\text{Spear be.new sharp FOC} \\
\text{"Sharp new spear"}
\]

\[
\text{Kubu xenya kõ atau} \\
\text{Spear be.new FOC sharp} \\
\text{"Sharp new spear"}
\]

When a phrase is nested within a phrase, it can be difficult finding the correct spot to place the focus particle. This proves problematic for a number of modern revivalists trying to learn the language. The above example shows the general principle: place the particle at the end of the phrase to which it applies.

The English cleft picks out an NP for special attention. Our clefts often move core arguments, but core arguments had to remain in situ in Ōtari. Spoken English often keeps them in situ too, but uses intonation to distinguish them instead of a particle.

\[
\text{Fai teme Runyo kõ xumaxi bokai} \\
\text{1PS.EQ see Runyo FOC exit forest} \\
\text{"It was Runyo I saw coming out of the forest" ;} \\
\text{"I saw Runyo coming out of the forest"}
\]

6.2.6. Focus with Movement and Particles

When Ōtari raised a prepositional argument to applied object, it also put the natural object into focus position by placing it at then end of the sentence.
This device may be used along with a particle. The particle shows that the focus on the object was not merely a side-effect of raising the prepositional argument. The particle also adds emphasis.

**Sukũde binifolu iwã, cani Akule āi!**

*Sukũde by.walk river, with Akule FOC

"Sukũde was walking by the river with Akule, of all people!"

Here the speaker is implying that the presumed liaison is somehow scandalous. They raise the prepositional phrase *bini iwã* to form *binifolu iwã* in order to set the scene, then deliver their astonishing news. The focus particle is *āi* to show contrast or surprise.

### 6.2.7. Focus or Reduplication?

Focus should be distinguished from reduplication which marks intensity (of verbs) and extent (of nouns). The boundary between the two concepts is not always clear. Where appropriate reduplication and focus particles can, of course, be used together.

**Kubu kuokã  atau-atau kõ!**

*Spear DEM.MED be.sharp   FOC

"That spear is really sharp!"
7. MULTI-CLAUSE SENTENCES

This section looks at the order of words in Ōtari sentences with two or more clauses. Single clause sentences were dealt with above in Section 5 Clauses and Section 6, Pragmatics. Sentence types are introduced in approximate order of complexity, starting with those most loosely linked, where the component clauses are most easily distinguished.

Multi-clause sentences were used less in Ōtari than in English. Many concepts which require complex sentences in English could be neatly expressed with a Serial Verb Construction (SVC) in Ōtari. For details see Section 5.2.6. Serial Verb Constructions, above.

However, all the verbs in an Ōtari SVC had to have the same subject, a restriction not found in Terran languages like Yoruba.

Gomasũ teme kubu wã durã
Hunter see spear 1PS-HON take
"The hunter saw my spear and he took it"

In Ōtari, a multi-clause sentence had to be constructed whenever the subject changed.

Gomasũ durã kubu wã, wã da teme rai
Hunter see spear 1PS-EQ, 1PS-HON and see 3PS.PEJ
"The hunter took my spear and I saw him"

Note also the use of honorific and pejorative pronouns in these two examples, to show that the speaker considers himself superior to that thief of a hunter. The position of da is explained immediately below in 7.1.

7.1. Co-ordination of Clauses

As in English, two (or more) independent clauses could be joined by a conjunction. Neither was required to complete the other and separate sentences were always an alternative. Co-ordination merely presented the clauses as conceptually linked in some way. Here are some types of co-ordination found in ancient Ōtari.
7.1.1. Conjunction

Two clauses in a relation of conjunction are either both true or both false. The two clauses are joined in English by words and phrases such as: *and, also, plus, in addition, additionally, as well as* and many others. Such words were translated by just two Ōtari words: *da* and *cani*. The corpus of surviving Ōtari texts also features the occasional use of the verb *seka, “to add”* as a conjunctive particle.

As indicated above, *da* and *cani* were used to join two noun phrases (Section 4.1.1), two verb phrases (4.2.1), two particle phrases (4.3.5) or two predicates (4.3.8).

They could also link two clauses to form a multi-clause sentence with the conjunction coming after the subject of the second clause. English can do this with *“also”* but not with *“and”*. Ōtari requires it with both *da* and *cani*. (see again Section 4.3.8)

\[ S \rightarrow (NP \ V \ Part \ P) \ (NP \ Conj \ V \ NP) \]

*Sukũde folu bini iwã, Akule da binifolu iwã*

*Sukũde walk by river, Akule and by.walk river*

"Sukũde was walking by the river. Akule went walking by the river, too"

Any number of additional clauses could be linked in this way. The conjunctive particle took the same position in each. The only exception was when the subject of the next clause was omitted. Then *da* or *cani* came first in the next clause.

*Sukũde folu bini iwã da masũ yomai*

*Sukũde walk by river, Ø and hunt fish*

"Sukũde went walking by the river and fishing"

In English, pronouns are commonly dropped as above in the second of two conjoined clauses. This happened much less in Ōtari, because where the subject stayed the same, an SVC was preferred to two conjoined clauses. The example above uses two clauses though because the two events are not presented as a tightly-bound sequence.
As noted the verb *seka*, “add” seems to have served as a conjunction on occasion. It appears to have been simply a stylistic alternative to *da* and *cani* but was only used to link clauses. Evidence in the corpus is scant, but this is how contemporary Ōtari revivalists use it.

*Sukūde folu bini iwã, Akule seka binifolu kuo*

*Sukūde* walk by *river, Akule* add by *walk there*

"Sukūde was walking by the river. Akule went walking there, too"

As in English, the above sentence could be shortened even further. It was permissible to have the two subjects share a predicate.

*Sukūde da Akule folu bini iwã*

*Sukūde* and *Akule* walk by *river*

"Sukūde and Akule were walking by the river"

However, that would replace the entire second predicate, so the following construction was not possible.

*Sukūde folu bini iwã, Akule [do] da*

*Sukūde* walk by *river, Akule* do also

"Sukūde was walking by the river. Akule was too"

7.1.2. Disjunction

When two clauses in a relation of inclusive disjunction, one or both must be true. When they are in a relation of exclusive disjunction, one must be true and the other false.

In most languages of our world, these two senses are not distinguished. English “or” has both meanings and so did Ōtari *cai*. It translated a range of English expressions, such as “or”, “alternatively” and “on the other hand”.

Like the conjunctive particles, *da* and *cani, cai* was used to join two noun phrases (Section 4.1.1), two verb phrases (4.2.1), two particle phrases (4.3.5) or two predicates (4.3.8). It was used in a like manner, too. When joining two clauses for example, it was the second element in the second
clause. It could also be repeated for emphasis, with the sense of English “either ... or ...”

Sukũde cai folu bini iwã, e cai binifolu sailu
Sukũde or walk by river, 3PS.EQ or by.walk lake
"Sukũde is either walking by the river, or walking by the lake"

Its negation sãcai had the sense of “neither”, “nor” or if repeated, “neither ... nor ...”

Sukũde sãcai folu bini iwã, e sãcai binifolu sailu
Sukũde nor walk by river, 3PS.EQ nor by.walk lake
"Sukũde is neither walking by the river, nor walking by the lake"

7.2. Comparison of Clauses

In Section 4.2.9 Comparison of Verb Phrases, we noted that Ĭtari compared predicates with an exceeds construction.

Subject 1 exceeds Subject 2 concerning Predicate

Yere xukã ma kuokã wa petu
Flower DEM.PROX exceed DEM.DIST concerning beautiful
"This flower is more beautiful than that one"

An extended version of this approach is used for the comparison of whole clauses. The first two examples below fit neatly into this framework. The only difference is that the predicate now consists of a dynamic verb + object instead of a lone stative verb. The comparison is enhanced by the use of honorific and pejorative pronouns.

Fai ma rai wa moji kũ
1PS.EQ exceed 3PS.PEJ concerning love 2PS.HON
"I love you more than he does"
The next two cases require a passive verb in order to fit them into the framework used above. They are thus very different to their English counterparts.

"I love you more than I love him"

"I love you more than I love anyone else"

Note that the second and fourth examples contain honorific pronouns without a corresponding pejorative. The contrasted element is the indefinite pronominal phrase *salu suo koye*. Like all indefinites it lacked a pejorative form.

7.3. Relative Clauses

A relative clause modified a noun. Its head noun could take any role in the main clause. Like all modifying elements in Òtari, the relative clause followed its referrent.

The relative clause was headed by the relativiser *bai*, which translated English “*that*”. *Bai* also translated English relative pronouns like “*who*” and “*which*”. Òtari lacked relative pronouns.

Unlike English “*that*, *bai* was not used as a demonstrative (See Section 3.1.11, Locative and Demonstrative Pronouns, above) or as a complementiser (See Section 7.5, Complement Clauses, below). It was
only used to link descriptive clauses to their referent. In the case of relative clauses the referent was a noun.

The patterns of the relative clause are shown below, running down the accessibility hierarchy. The subject and object of the relative clause, were replaced by gap:

\[
S \ [\text{Rel V O}] \ V
\]

\[
Ule \ sawa \ bai \ jibe \ ji \ xenya
\]

Man come \ REL \ Ø build hut new

"Here comes the man who built the new hut"

\[
S \ V \ [\text{Rel S V Part}]
\]

\[
Ule \ sawa \ bai \ fai \ teme \ loreu
\]

Man come \ REL \ 1PS.EQ see Ø yesterday

"Here comes the man who I saw yesterday"

Indirect objects and obliques must first be raised to direct object by incorporating their preposition into the verb. Then they can be gapped, like any other direct object. In the first example below, an indirect object is raised which would have created a double object construction, but for the fact that the first object is now gapped.

\[
S \ V \ [\text{Rel S V O}]
\]

\[
Ule \ sawa \ bai \ ucĩ \ jolu \ kubu
\]

Man come \ REL \ 1PS.EXCL.EQ DAT.give Ø spear

"Here comes the man to whom we gave the spear"
The genitive and comparative were not gapped, but instead were replaced in the relative clause by a pronoun. This is called a resumptive pronoun, as it repeats an element in the same sentence.

7.4. Adverbial Clauses
As in any language, a wide range of adverbial clauses were licensed. These were not required sentence elements but added extra clarifying information.

Adverbial clauses in were much less common in Ōtari than in English as serial verbs were used in preference wherever possible (Section 5.2.6, Serial Verb Constructions). They were used where the subject did not change and a link word was not required between the verbs. Examples of both SVCs and multi-clause sentences are given below.
7.4.1. Locative Clauses
These clause locate the action of the main clause in time or space.

7.4.1.1. Temporal Locative Clauses
Temporal clauses in Õtari often take *jaiko* which can describe any simultaneous actions or states. Thus, it translated our “as”, “during”, “while” and “whilst”. It also translated English “when” in the sense of “simultaneous with”. As noted in Sections 3.1.9-3.1.10, interrogative pronouns could not double up as correlatives like they do in English.

\[ \text{Do meuna jaiko asue} \]
\[ 1PP.EQ.INC DYN.INTR-happy when rain \]
\[ "We will be(come) happy when the rains come" \]

Note how the causative, becoming form of *euna* is used (Section 3.2.12 Deriving Dynamic Verbs from Statives). The subject of *asue* is unexpressed as the verb has the eventive as its home voice. (3.2.8). A more literal translation of the sentence might be something like “We will get made happy when it rains”.

There was also the option to use a prepositional phrase to express temporal location, followed by a relative clause. As this results in a longer sentence, the *jaiko* construction was generally preferred.

\[ \text{Do meuna te nyomã bai asue} \]
\[ 1PP.EQ.INC DYN.INTR-happy LOC time REL rain \]
\[ "We will be(come) happy when the rains come" \]

The order of the two clauses could be reversed without altering the meaning.

\[ \text{Te nyomã bai asue, do meuna} \]
\[ LOC time REL rain, 1PP.EQ.INC DYN.INTR-happy \]
\[ "When the rains come, we will be(come) happy" \]
SVCs had a default sequential or causal reading, though some expressed simultaneity, provided the subject of both clauses was the same.

**Runyo sawa sēgo**
Eagle come run
“Eagle came running”

Events may also be described as **rawa, “before”; sīde, “after”; or yedi, “until”** something else.

**Ule aunyo te gemai rawa esā kuta koro**
Man dig LOC garden before woman plant seed
"The men dug the garden before the women planted the seeds"

Clauses in this group may also be replaced by SVCs where the subject does not change between clauses.

**Ata taunyo gemai kuta koro**
3PP.EQ LOC.dig garden plant seed
"They dug the garden then planted seeds"

### 7.4.1.2. Spatial Locative Clauses
In English, words and phrases like “where”, “wherever”, “anywhere” and “everywhere” introduce spatial clauses that colocate the action of main clause at the same place as the action or state of the subordinate clause.

Spatial clauses in Õtari were often relative clauses that followed a prepositional locative phrase. As noted in the last section, interrogative pronouns such as **mokai, “where”** could not double up as correlatives like they do in English.

**Tau otome xãu te kua bai goimelu yūji**
1PS.PEJ meet 2PP.HON LOC place REL AGT.medicine dwell
"I will meet you where the medicine woman lives"
Note that the use of medicinal herbs was an occupation reserved for women, so the word *esā, “woman”* is redundant.

### 7.4.2. Manner Clauses

Manner clauses compare the action or state expressed in the main clause to that expressed in the subordinate clause. In English the manner clause is introduced by words or phrases such as: “*like*, “*as*”, “*how*” or “*in the way that*”.

Once again in Ōtari interrogative pronouns such as “*how*” could not double up as correlatives, like they do in English. There was also no word for “*like/as*”. The translation followed the pattern of our “*in the way that*” sentences.

*Guai ceni kubu coi te japasa bai wā jīka*

2PS.PEJ hold spear IMP in manner REL 1PS.HON DAT.show Ø

"Hold the spear how I showed you"

Note the use of honorific pronouns to express my superiority whilst I am in the teaching role. Note also how *guai* may be dropped in the second clause, but only if we also incorporate the dative preposition *jo* into the verb *ĩka*. A preposition cannot stand alone without a referrent.

### 7.4.3. Purpose Clauses

Purpose clauses outline the goal that motivates the action of the main clause. In English, they are introduced by words and phrases such as: “*in order to*”, “*so that*”, “*in order that*”.

In Ōtari, purpose clauses were divided into two types: those where the intention was realised and those where it may or may not have been realised. Where the intention was realised, the purpose clause was introduced by the word *yū*. We have already met *yū*, as a preposition meaning “*for*”. It may also be used as a conjunction with the meaning “*so (that)*”.

*Do kuri taji yū yomai mixume*

1PS.INCL.EQ place net for fish in.swim Ø

"We set the nets so that the fish will swim into them"
Many purposive statements in Ōtari were serial verb constructions as the initial action and intended result had the same subject. These also fell into realised and possibly realised classes. Where the actor's purpose is realised there is no purposive word, just a list of actions.

\begin{verbatim}
Ucî  ācu jo  yowa iwã  masũ yomai
1PP.EXCL.EQ go  DAT mouth river hunt  fish
"We went to the river mouth to catch fish"
\end{verbatim}

Where the actor's purpose is not realised, the verb \textit{jenya}, "to intend to do" came between the initial action and the result. The result was expressed as a complement clause (see \textit{Section 7.5.1} below, \textbf{Object Complement Clauses}).

\textbf{7.4.4. Reason Clauses}

Reason clauses describe the spur that gives rise to the action of the main clause. If a purpose clause describes the "pull" factors motivating an act, a reason clause describes the "push" factors behind it.

English reason clauses are introduced by words and phrases such as: "because", "since", "as" and "given (that)". In Ōtari, reason clauses were introduced by \textit{ĩjo}, "because".

\begin{verbatim}
Rai peita cenye Ŭjo  xupata  gatai
3PS.PEZ begin  eat  because be.healthy again
"He began to eat because he was well again"
\end{verbatim}

The pejorative pronoun is used here with sympathetic intent. It means "\textit{poor him}!"

\textbf{7.4.5. Sequence Clauses}

Sequence clauses tell us what happened after the action or state described in the main clause. English sequence clauses are introduced by words and phrases such as: "then" and "next". In Ōtari sequence clauses, both were translated by \textit{wato}. 
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Sequentaility and causality were the default readings of the Ōtari serial verb construction, so sequential SVCs abounded where the subject of both clauses was the same.

An SVC was by no means obligatory in such a situation. It was permissible to add *wato*, to emphasis the sequentiality, though this option was only excercised occasionally.

7.4.6. Result Clauses

Result clauses describe the consequence of the act or state described in the main clause. In English, result clauses are introduced with two-stage constructions like: "*so/such ... (with the result) that ...*"

In Ōtari this use of "*that*" is translated as *bai*. As noted in Section 7.3, Relative Clauses, the Ōtari used *bai* to link a descriptive clause to its referent. The referent could be a noun as in Section 3, or a verb as here.

The two-stage structure of the result clause meant it could not be replaced by an SVC, even when the main and result clauses had the same subject.
7.4.7. Circumstantial Clauses

Circumstantial clauses describe the means by which the action of the main clause was accomplished. English circumstantial clauses are commonly introduced with the instrumental preposition “by” which serves here as a conjunction.

*We tricked the men from the next village by hiding in the woods*

In Ōtari clauses like this became SVCs as the subject remained the same the main clause. The instrumental verb came first.

*Be soju mi cawa iga ule suo koye deku sāka*

1PP.HON.EXCL hide in wood trick man all head.CLFR village next

"We tricked the men from the next village by hiding in the woods"

A circumstantial clause with a change of subject was seen as essentially the same as a reason/causal clause, as per Section 7.4.4 above.

7.4.8. Conditional Clauses

A conditional clause comes before or after its main clause and tells us the circumstances that will ensure that the action of the main clause happens. The basic conditional structure in English is:

*If X, then Y*

*Y, if X*

English has a number of variants on this basic form, using tense and mood to convey different degrees of likelihood.

Ōtari also had a basic conditional structure plus variants, but as it lacked grammatical tense and mood structures, it relied on particles to convey degrees of likelihood. The basic conditional sentence had either of these forms:
O X kiău Y
Y o X

O translated English "if" and kiău was a special implicational "then" which could also translate as "therefore". The basic conditional structure was used for factual conditional statements. It covered both general, law-like conditionals and specific instances.

O asue kiău sītaji peīta emau
If Ø rain then vegetable begin grow
"If it rains, then vegetables start to grow"

The above was an example of a law-like conditional. To give a more specific reference we can add some time particles. We might even replace kiău with kuolĩ, "then/at that time" or wato, "then", "next" or "subsequently".

O asue tabai kuolĩ sītaji do peīta emau
If Ø rain soon, then vegetable 1PS.INC.EQ begin grow
"If the rains come soon, our vegetables will start to grow"

If an initial condition was not guaranteed to give rise to the action of the main clause, then maboye, "perhaps/maybe" was inserted.

O asue tabai, wato maboye sītaji do emau
If Ø rain soon, then perhaps vegetable 1PS.INC.EQ grow
öku
anyway
"If the rains come soon, our vegetables may still grow"

Where only one condition could possibly suffice, Ōtari had a couple of strategies. It could replace o with nyece bai, "provided that", or add the exhaustive listing focus particle to the consequential clause.
All forms of conditional required their connectives, hence they could not be replaced by SVCs.

7.4.8.1. Hypothetical Conditional Clauses
A hypothetical conditional statement deals with a situation that is not factual, but possible. The Ōtari hypothetical conditional was introduced by the "positing" verb *ofure*, "to allow, assume, permit*. This appeared in the eventive voice, to mark an unexpressed indefinite subject. The use of the connective *jē* will be explain below in Section 7.5 Complement Clauses.

"If I lived in Mohai I would speak Ōtari" ("Assuming that I lived ... ")

7.4.8.2. Counterfactual Conditional Clauses
A counterfactual conditional deals with a situation that is neither factual, nor possible. In English it is distinguished by its sequence of tenses.

"If you had been at the feast, you would have enjoyed it"
The Ōtari counterfactual conditional relies instead on a "positing" verb, such as *dakoi*, "to believe" or *cegu*, "to imagine or fantasise". This appeared in the eventive voice, to mark an unexpressed indefinite subject. The use of the connective *jĕ* will be explain below in *Section 7.5*.

**Supposing A, then B**

\[
O \text{ pacegu } jĕ \quad si \quad te \quad xolieuna \quad kīău \quad teji \quad e \\
\text{If imagine COMPL} \quad 2PS.EQ \quad \text{LOC happy.meal then} \quad Õ \quad \text{enjoy it} \\
\text{"If you had been at the feast you would have enjoyed it"}
\]

### 7.4.8.3. Negative Conditional Clauses

The negative conditional is a restrictive clause. It states what is required to bring something to pass. In Ōtari, it was introduced by *nixu*, which translates English "*unless*".

\[
\text{Nixu} \quad \text{asue tabai, sītaji} \quad \text{do} \quad \text{sā emau} \\
\text{Unless} \quad Õ \quad \text{rain} \quad \text{soon}, \quad \text{vegetable} \quad 1PP.EQ.INC \quad \text{not grow} \\
\text{"Unless it rains soon, our vegetables will not grow"}
\]

### 7.4.9. Concessive Clauses

A concessive clause describes a situation that is adverse, but does not prevent the action of the main clause. In English, these clauses are introduced by words and phrases like "*even though*", "*although*", "*though*", "*while*" and "*allowing*".

Ōtari concessives took a similar approach. They were introduced by words and phrases such as *noku*, "*despite, even if, even though*", and *ofure*, "*to allow, assume or permit*".

\[
\text{Noku} \quad \text{bai olau oxu, do} \quad \text{sā masū yomai olī} \\
\text{Despite that sea} \quad \text{calm,} \quad 1PP.INC.EQ \quad \text{no hunt} \quad \text{fish} \quad \text{today} \\
\text{"Even though the sea is calm, we will not fish today"}
\]
Ofure jë seya kiãu do masũ yomai ōku
Assume COMPL Ø wind then 1PP.INC.EQ hunt fish all the same
"Even if it is windy, we will still go fishing" ("Even if (it) winds ... ")

7.4.10. Substitutive Clauses
The substitutive clause describes an action that replaced the expected action of the main clause. Ōtari linked the two clauses with feitu, "instead of".

Be jai rakã, do naka suoka
1PP.EXCL.HON with neighbour, 1PP.INC.EQ create peace
feitu dogã
instead RECIP.fight
"We and our neighbours made peace instead of fighting each other"

Note that we award ourselves honorific in relation to our warlike neighbours. Their lowly status and our high status combine in an equative resumptive pronoun: do. The above example could have been rendered as a serial verb construction, simply by replacing feitu with sã, “not”.

7.4.11. Additive Clauses
An additive clause, obviously, adds something to something else. It is more emphatic than other additive devices and carries a sense of “and moreover”. Ōtari linked main and additive clauses with paseka bai which translates English “adding that”. In both languages the additive clause could come before or after the main clause.

Paseka bai wu jolu okome oyo,
EVT.add REL 1PP.INC.PEJ DAT.give guest food,
josaju motu kua yũ paru coi
DAT.find 3PP.HON place for sleep IMP
"As well as feeding the guests we must find them somewhere to sleep"
Notice here how both clauses are double objects constructions with indirect objects raised to applied object positions. Notice also that one imperative particle governs both clauses.

The presence of two objects in each clause meant that the above example could not be turned into a serial verb construction. However many additive clauses converted easily into SVCs.

\[
\text{Do \ saju ranya folu jo \ Tayolu}
\]
\[
1PP.INC.EQ \ find \ trail \ walk \ DAT \ Tayolu
\]
"We found the trail and walked to Tayolu"

7.4.12. Absolutive Clauses

English absolutive clauses consist of little more than a verb standing in apposition to the main clause. These constructions were best translated into Òtari with a sequential construction plus a temporal locative. (Temporal locatives were already introduced in Section 4.1.1 above).

\[
\text{Síde bai alaxo okome nile \ deku}
\]
After REL pack guest leave village
"Having packed, the guests left the village"

7.5. Complement Clauses

Whereas a relative clause modifies an argument of the verb, a complement clause is itself an argument of the verb. These were not as common in Òtari as in English. In Òtari, when the subjects of two verbs is identical, a serial verb is used, where English has a complement clause.

\[
\text{S-V-[S-V-V]}
\]

\[
I \ know \ I \ must \ go
\]
I know [I must go]

Here the clause "I must go" is the object of the main verb know. This is rendered into Òtari by a serial verb construction.
S-V-V-O

**Fai soku luwa kuā**

1PS.EQ know must go

"I know I must go"

Where an intention to act was definitely realised, a serial verb construction was required.

**E sawa ji cenye rā duā ja**

1PS.EQ go hut eat thing one GENERAL.CLFR

"He went home to eat something" ( ... and did)

However, Ōtari did require a complement clause, where the subjects of two verbs differed. Unlike in English and most other European languages, the Ōtari complement clause was headed by a different word to the relative clause. The relativiser was of course *bai*, but the complementiser was *jē*.

7.5.1. Object Complement Clauses

The object complement clause was a whole clause that served as the object to the verb of the main clause. In Ōtari, it had to have a different subject to the main clause.

**S-V-[S-V-V]**

*I know you must go*

"I know [you must go]"

**S-V-[S-V-V]**

**Tau soku jē kū luwa kuā**

1PS.PEJ know COMPL 2PS.HON must go

"I know you must go"
As discussed above, if the subject of both clauses was the same, a serial verb was normally required. However, if the subject remained the same and the complement clause used the copula ce, then jĕ was required. This apparent exception probably arose because ce was a particle and not a verb.

\[\text{Fai soku jĕ ce kamuai asū si} \]
\[1\text{PS.EQ know COMP } \varnothing = \text{father child } 2\text{PS.EQ}\]
"I know I am the father of your child"

Where an intention to act may not have been realised, the verb jenyä, "to intend to do" was required, along with jĕ.

\[\text{E sawa jĩ jenyä jĕ cenyä rā duā ja} \]
\[1\text{PS.EQ go hut intend COMP } \varnothing = \text{eat thing one GENERAL.CLFR}\]
"He went home (in order) to eat something"

( ... and may or may not have done so)

Indirect causation was often expressed by means of an object complement instead of a causative voice. A serial verb construction was not possible as the two verbs had different subjects.

\[\text{*Guai ekatu nya malai} \]
\[2\text{PS.PEJ cause 3PS.HON fall}\]
"You caused him to fall"

\[\text{Guai ekatu jĕ nya malai} \]
\[2\text{PS.PEJ cause COMPL 3PS.HON fall}\]
"You caused him to fall"

### 7.5.2. Subject Complement Clauses

The subject complement clause was a whole clause that served as subject to the verb in the main clause. In these situations, English has two options. One was to place the subject clause in normal subject position, the other was to move it to the end of the sentence and put a "dummy" pronoun in subject position.
S-V-[S-V-V]

That you must go saddens us
"[That you must go] saddens us"

S-V-O Compl [S-V-V]

It saddens us that you must go
"It saddens us [that you must go]"

Őtari could only use the first of these approaches as the language lacked dummy pronouns. Naturally, the subject of these two clauses in Őtari could only be different, so SVCs were not an option.

[Compl S-V-AdvP] V O

Jẽ kũ luwa kuã kãipõ wode
COMP 2PS.HON must go CAUS.sad 1PP.PEJ.EXCL
"That you must go saddens us" ; "It saddens us that you must go"

English often introduces clauses with an adverb giving the speaker's opinion, such as "unfortunately" or "naturally". In Őtari, these were replaced by a subject complement clause. This worked like English "It is unfortunate that ...". As noted though, Őtari lacked both dummy pronouns and the verb "to be".

[Compl S-V-O-AdvP] V

Jẽ motu nile deku wosa mejoku
COMPL 3PP.HON leave village already be.unfortunate
"Unfortunately, they have already left the village"
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