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This paper presents a structural interpretation of topicalized and focused constituents in Maori in terms of the expanded CP domain put forward in Rizzi (1997). The analysis identifies the use of a Topic>Focus sequencing in which the initial ko topic marker is a realization of the Force head, whereas the initial nā/mā focus markers instantiate a Case function heading the focused XP in the SpecFocusP.

Based on earlier work of Cinque (1990) and on further evidence from Romance and Germanic languages, Rizzi (1997) has proposed an expansion of the CP domain to include the projections ordered as in (1) and shown in tree form in (2).

1. Force > Topic* > Focus > Topic* > Finiteness [Rizzi 1997]

2. ForceP
   └─┬─
      │   ┌─
      TopP*
  └─┬─
     Top FocusP
  └─┬─
     Focus TopP*
  └─┬─
     Top FiniteP
  └─┬─
     Finite IP

An instantiation of the Topic > Focus > Topic sequencing is seen in the Italian example in (3).

* My thanks to Karanina Utahu, a Tahoe speaker, for her assistance with the Maori data, to Ken Hale for giving me access to Hale (1970), and to Winifred Bauer and to Ray Harlow for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. I also wish to thank the organizers of AFLA-VI for both moral and funding assistance, as also the participants.
3. Credo [che a Gianni QUESTO domani gli dovremmo dire]  
I believe that to Gianni this tomorrow we should say  
'I believe that to Gianni, THIS, tomorrow we should say.' [Rizzi 1997: (37a)]

In (3) the focused QUESTO of the subordinate clause is both preceded and followed by a topic constituent, respectively, a Gianni and domani.

The Maori example in (5b) below contains two constituents that are commonly interpreted as topic and focus (Harlow 1986; Waite 1990; Bauer 1991, 1993, 1997). The relative placement of these constituents leads to the identification of their ordering as in (4).¹

4. Maori: Topic > Focus
5. a. I fihore a Pita i te hipi.
   T/A fleece PERS Pita ACC the sheep
   'Pita fleece the sheep.'

   b. Ko te hipi nā Pita i fihore.
   ko the sheep n(GEN) Pita T/A fleece
   'Pita fleece the sheep.' As for the sheep, it was Pita who fleeced (ii.).'

The example in (5a) has the unmarked VSO ordering. In (5b) the subject, a Pita, is preposed in what is called the Actor-Emphatic construction and is preceded by the object, appearing here as a topic: ko te hipi.

One of the problems in interpreting aspects of sentence structure in Maori is that of identifying the role played by various particle like elements. Thus, in (5b), for example, what is ko and what is nā?

In an analysis of data from Gungbe, a Kwa language, Aboh (1996) has identified two distinct particle elements as topic (TOP) and focus (FM) markers:

6. Kofi ya, gan kpa me we kpomon le ui-i dfo
   Kofi TOP prison in FM policemen the(PL) shut(PERF)-him LOC
   'As for Kofi, the policemen put him IN PRISON.' [Aboh 1996: (25a)]

Aboh proposes that the ya and we particles in Gungbe are located in the heads of the respective Topic and Focus projections, assuming a schema as in (2). In terms of the Minimalist approach of Chomsky (1995), the XP topic and focus constituents raise to check the features of the corresponding heads.

In Maori, the contrast between (5a) and (5b) indicates that the topic and focus constituents are preposed. If we assume that the raising of topic/focus constituents implements a checking relation with the features of the Topic/Focus heads, then the ko and nā particles should not be occupying the Topic/Focus head positions at PF.

¹ Maori examples cited from published sources are regularized to the modern spelling system using macrons for long vowels. Some glosses are also altered from the original citations for reasons of consistency. Non-standard abbreviations used in the glosses are: T/A, 'Tense/Aspect'; and PERS, 'personal (marker)'.  

---
In this paper, I will propose that ko is in the head of the Force projection immediately above the TopicP in (2) and that nā belongs as a Case head in the complex XP that raises to the SpecFocusP.

Section 1 takes up the analysis of ko topics, distinguishing them from other proposed constituents, also preceded by ko, and leading to two different structural interpretations for the two different uses of ko. In section 2, I show how the proposed nā constituents have syntactic focus characteristics, but that nā is associated with Case properties which indicate that it should be represented as the head of the focused XP constituent. Section 3 shows how the structural interpretation of the topic/focus divide can be exploited to account for the use of two distinct forms of negation.

1.0. Ko-marked constituents

This section presents the evidence for at least two uses of the ko particle: section 1.1 describes the constructions in which ko precedes a topic and section 1.2 identifies uses of the ko particle in which the following constituent is not a topic. Section 1.3 presents the analysis of the two principal types of ko constructions to propose that the ko of the ko topic construction is a complementizer head, whereas the ko of focal/predicative constructions combines features of C° and I° heads.

1.1. Ko topics

The topic for Rizzi (1997: 285) is: "[...] a proposed element [...] normally expressing old information, somehow available and salient in previous discourse." This notion of topic matches with the interpretation that Bauer (1997: 654) applies to the ko topics of the present discussion: "[...] the entity which is presented by the speaker as 'What I am talking about'."

Ko topics in Maori, however, need to be distinguished from other constructions in which a constituent is preceded by a ko particle. This section of the paper identifies the principal characteristics of ko topics.

First, a ko topic is most readily the nominative argument of its clause. In (7a) the Ø-nominative subject of the transitive sentence is te piriwhiawa. Example (7b) shows that this nominative can be topicalized, in contrast to (7c) with a proposed ko marked object.

7. a. I kete piriwhiawa i te tamaiti.
    /A find the policeman ACC the child
    "The policeman found the child."

b. Ko te piriwhiawa i kete i te tamaiti.
    ko the policeman /A find ACC the child

c. *Ko te tamaiti i kete te piriwhiawa

The examples in (8) show the passive sentence corresponding to (7a). Once again, the nominative, in this case the Theme argument, can be topicalized.
8. a. I kite-a te tamaiti e te pirihimana.
   T/A find-PASS the child by the policeman
   "The child was found by the policeman." [Hohepa 1967: (42)]
b. Ko te tamaiti i kite-a e te pirihimana. [Hohepa 1967: (43)]
c. *Ko te pirihimana i kite-a te tamaiti.

The examples in (9) and (10) show two other constructions in which a nominative can be topicalized. In (9a) there is an Actor-Emphatic Agent preceding the verb. In this construction, the object of the verb shows up as a Ø-nominative. Such an object can then be topicalized, as in (9b).

9. a. Nā te pirihimana i kite te tamaiti.
   n(GEN) the policeman T/A find the child
   'It was the policeman that found the child.' [Hohepa 1967: (44)]
b. Ko te tamaiti nā te pirihimana i kite.

In (10a) the italicized nominative is interpreted as the Theme of the constituent which follows it.² This nominative, like other nominatives, can be raised to precede the verb when the clause begins with a negative or some other operator like constituent, as in (10b). Then, (10c) shows that this nominative constituent can be a ko topic as well.

10. a. Ka tae-a ngā kaitōrero te whakanui.
    T/A attain-PASS the(PL) speaker the increase
    'The (number of) speakers can be increased.'
b. E kore ngā kaitōrero ka tae-a te whakanui. [Waite 1989: (48b)]
    'The (number of) speakers will not be able to be increased.'
c. Ko ngā kaitōrero ka tae-a te whakanui.
    'It's the (number of) speakers that can be increased.' [Waite 1989: (48a)]

Both the passive and the Actor-Emphatic construction provide a means by which a Theme argument can be nominative. These two constructions therefore feed the ko topic realization because, when a Theme argument needs to check accusative Case, it cannot be a topic. Given the possible raising of a nominative argument in the range of constructions represented by the example in (10b), if the position filled by such a raised nominative is SpecIP, then these constructions would be implementing overt checking of nominative Case and would be the position on the chain linking directly with the ko topic position above.

A ko topic can also be formed from the object of a preposition or from a possessor internal to a subject (see Bauer 1997: 657-659). In such cases, according to Bauer (1997: 657), the topic most frequently is resumed by a pronoun. The example

² Waite (1989) argues that the nominative is raised out of the constituent, a type of clause, that follows it in the surface form.
in (11) shows a ko topic which is coreferential with both a possessive and the object of a preposition.

11. [...] ko te wahine puhi haere ake anō ana hoa noho i ko the woman virgin move up again her friend stay at a ia 3SG
    PERS 3SG
    `[...] as for the young high-ranking virgins, their constant companions also went with them.'

The example in (12) shows that the inclusion of a pronoun resuming a topic may apply to a subject topic as well as to a non-subject.3

12. Ko Te Rongarahaia, kāhore ia i kōna; [TMS 34,3]
    ko Te Rongarahaia NEG 3SG T/A there
    `Te Rongarahaia wasn't there at all.'

    These data provide interesting support for the interpretation that the proposed ko constituents are indeed topics in terms of Rizzi's schema because they match up the pattern that applies in Italian, in line with Rizzi's statement in (13).

13. A topic [in Italian] can involve a resumptive clitic within the comment. [Rizzi 1997: 289]

In the Italian example in (14), the pronoun gli resumes the topic a Gianni (just as him resumes to Gianni in the English), but there can be no pronoun resuming the focused constituent QUESTO.

14. A Gianni, QUESTO, gli dovete dire. to Gianni this to:him you:should say
    `To Gianni, THIS you should tell him.' [Rizzi 1997 (23); adapted]

    A topic referring to a subordinate clause argument may be preposed to the front of the main clause or to the front of the subordinate clause:

15. a. Ka whakapae au [e kore e mutu te pririti]. T/A predict 1SG T/A NEG T/A finish the bridge
    `I predict that the bridge will not be finished.'

    b. Ko te pririti ka whakapae [e kore e mutu]. [H&H: 6]
    c. Ka whakapae au [ko te pririti e kore e mutu].

    In sum, the characteristics of ko topics are as follows:

---

3 Text citations are abbreviated as follows: H&H = Hale (1970); IT = Jones & Biggs (1995); TMS = Orbell (1992); and Whwh = Biggs (1997).
16. Characteristics of *ko* topics:
   
   *Ko* topics
   a. occur in sentence-initial position
   b. occur most freely on nominatives
   c. may be resumed by a pronoun
   d. may relate to a position within a subordinate clause.

1.2. Non-topic *ko* marking

1.2.1. Focal *ko* constituents

Focal *ko* constituents also occur in sentence initial position. Bauer (1991) distinguishes focal *ko* constituents from topics by the following characteristics: (a) *ko* marked focal constituents bear strong (contrastive) stress; (b) the *ko* particle may not be omitted; and (c) the sense of a sentence with focal *ko* can alternatively be realized as an overt cleft construction. These characteristics are illustrated in (17a-c) below in which the focused constituents are in upper case.

17. a. *(Ko)* Rewi e whāngai ana i te kūao kau.
   ko Rewi T/A feed T/A ACC the young cow
   ‘Rewi is feeding the calf.’ ‘As for Rewi, he is feeding the calf.’
   b. *(Ko)* REWI e whāngai ana i te kūao kau.
   "It is Rewi who is feeding the calf."
   c. Ko REWI te mea e whāngai ana i te kūao kau.
   the thing
   [Bauer 1991: (3), (5), (20)]

1.2.2. Predicative *ko*

Predicative *ko* occurs in equational constructions in which the identifying part of the construction is specific, as in (18), contrasting with non-specific identification in (19) involving a particle *he*.

18. a. Ko Hemi tēnei tamaiti.
   ko Hemi this child
   ‘This boy is Hemi.’
   b. Ko tōku kānga tēnei whare.
   ko my home this house
   ‘This house is my home.’
   [Biggs 1969: 26]

19. a. He nui te whare.
   he big the house
   ‘The house is big.’
   [Bauer 1997 (2013)]

---

4 Waite (1994) treats *he* as a T/A marker in the 1st head.
b. He māhita a Hera. [Bauer 1997 (204)]
   he teacher PERS Hera
   ‘Hera is a teacher.’

The ko predicative constituent has main sentence stress and, as in the case of focal ko, the ko may not be omitted (Bauer 1991).

1.2.3. Additive ko

A ko constituent is used to spell out the content of a DP, especially of a pronoun:

20. a. Kei te aha kōrūa ko Tame? [Bauer 1997 (3631b)]
    T/A do 2:DUAL ko Tame
    ‘What are you and Tame doing?’

b. Kei te noho a Tūrātou ko Hini, ko Pau.
    T/A sit PERS Tu3PL ko Hini ko Pau
    ‘Tu, Hine and Pau are sitting.’ [Bauer 1997 (3632a)]

1.2.4. Clause-internal ko

Ko marked subjects are sometimes found in a clause-internal position, as in:

21. a. Māramarama rava ake, kua whakaee-a ko te pā i Te Teko
    lightish INTENS up T/A attack-PASS ko the fort P Te Teko
    ‘At daylight he attacked the fort at Te Teko.’ [IT 20.5]

b. Kātahi ka whakanohi-ia ko ngā toa ki te toko waka ki
    then T/A sit-PASS ko the(PL) brave P the pole canoe P
    te ihu o ngā waka [IT 21.7]
    the bow GEN the(PL) canoe
    ‘Those adept at poling canoes were positioned in the canoe bows.’

The function of the ko constituents in these cases is not always clear. They do not appear to be amenable to the ‘topic’ interpretation and they may be assimilable to the predicative ko type and/or to the additive ko type.

1.2.5. Summary

The stress placement facts and the non-omissibility of the ko in both the focal and predicative ko constructions suggests that these two constructions could be manifestations of one and the same construction type. In section 1.3, I sketch out an interpretation of how these two apparently distinct non-topic functions may be conceived of as a single construction type. It is possible that the additive ko and/or the clause-internal ko may also be syntactically related to the focal/predicative ko construction (see also footnote 7), but I will not explore the details of the former constructions in the present paper.

5 Thanks to Winifred Bauer for contributing these examples.

6 Clark (1976: 46) considers these ko constructions to be of the predicative type, as also does Ray Harlow (personal communication).
1.3. Analysis

Why should *ko* occur as the marker of, on the one hand, a preposed topic and, on the other, a preposed focal constituent?

The fact that *ko* may be omitted before a topic is reminiscent of presence/absence effects observed with complementizers. In Rizzi’s Split CP shown in (2) above, the head of the projection above the higher TopP, Force, is the location of the complementizer (as indicated by the location of *che* ‘that’ in (3)). There are no other elements which are clear candidates for the complementizer role in Maori (although, see Bauer 1997: 98). I therefore propose that the *ko* of a *ko* topic construction occupies the head of Force and that the ‘topic’ part of (5b) is as shown in (22).

22. Topic *ko*

```
ForceP
   /
  /\          
 Force TopP  
  |  
 ko Spec    
  |  
   DP       
```

```
te hipi
```

We might suppose that the complementizer head may be overt when Force is merged above a Topic projection for PF.\(^7\)

In the case of uses of *ko* in focal/predicative types of constructions, since at least some of these constructions can alternatively (and sometimes preferably) be realized as overt clefts, my proposal for these is that the *ko* particle is a combination of *C* and *P* features. It is then, because of the presence of the *P* features, that such a *ko* is obligatorily realized. Although the precise nature of the cleft construction is not clear to me, the essential idea is that examples like (17b,c) would include the ForceP/IP component as shown in (23).

---

7. Richards (1999) presents an affixal/non-affixal account of varying manifestations of complementizers in Tagalog and English. The distribution of the alternative realizations that he describes may intersect with a main clause/subordinate clause distinction for topics in Maori.

8. An alternative interpretation is that *ko* is actually a Topic head raised to the Force head position. Such an interpretation, however, does not immediately account for the possibility of *ko*-omission. The solution adopted in the text would receive further support if it could be shown that *ko* may not be omitted before a preposed topic in a subordinate clause. It is interesting that, as Rizzi (1997) notes, it has been observed that, with an embedded topic in English, the inclusion of the complementizer is preferred (examples from Müller 1999):

(i) a. *I think ___ [to John] she gave a book*.  
   b. *"I think ___ [to John] she gave a book".*  

See also the further discussion in Müller (1999).
23. **Focus/Predicative ko**

![Diagram of Focus/Predicative ko]

2.0. **Focus**

2.1. **The Actor-Emphatic construction**

The examples (5b) and (9a) have included a *nā* particle before a preposed constituent in what is called the Actor-Emphatic construction. In this construction, the Actor-Emphatic constituent must be the Agent of an active clause, as is *te pirihi mana* in (24) below. The example (24a) shows the unmarked VSO clause pattern and in (24b) the Agent subject is preposed as an Actor-Emphatic. A further difference between (24a) and (24b) is that, whereas in (24a) the object *te tamaiti* has the *i* accusative marking, in (24b) it appears as a zero-nominative. In this respect, the Actor-Emphatic construction works like an ergative case marking system. As previously noted, the nominative object can raise to a pre-verbal position as in (24c) when the clause begins with fronted constituents of certain types.

24. a. I kite te pirihi mana i te tamaiti.
   T/A find the policeman ACC the child
   ‘The policeman found the child.’

   b. Nā te pirihi mana i kite te tamaiti.
   n(GEN) the policeman T/A find the child [Hohepa 1967: (44)]

   c. Nā te pirihi mana te tamaiti i kite.

Although (25), the passive variant of (24), contains an Agent, this passive Agent cannot appear as an Actor-Emphatic, as shown by (25b). Nor can the nominative Theme, as shown by (25c).

25. a. I kite-a te tamaiti e te pirihi mana.
   T/A find-PASS the child by the policeman
   ‘The child was found by the policeman.’ [Hohepa 1967: (42)]
b. *Nā te tamaiti i kite-a e te pirihimana.
c. *Nā te pirihimana i kite-a te tamaiti.

In fact there are two forms of the particles occurring in the Actor-Emphatic construction. These are dependent on tense. The examples with nā, as in (24), are past tense and occur with the i T/A marker preceding the verb. In (26b) the Actor-Emphatic marker is mā and, in this case, the T/A marker preceding the verb is e and the interpretation is future or prospective.

26. a. Ka kite te pirihimana i te tamaiti.
        T/A find the policeman ACC the child
        ‘The policeman will find the child.’
b. Mā te pirihimana e kite te tamaiti.
        m(GEN) the policeman T/A find the child

As we have seen before in (5b) and (9b), the Actor-Emphatic constituent may be preceded by a topic. The form corresponding to (26b) with a topicalized nominative theme is:

27. Kote tamaiti mā te pirihimana e kite.
        ko the child m(GEN) the policeman T/A find
        ‘As for the child, it is the policeman who will find it.’

As shown in the examples in (28) an Actor-Emphatic constituent may occur in the preposed position within a subordinate clause.

28. a. Katahi ka whakarite-a [mā Rua-pū-tahanga e whai atu],
        then T/A decide-PASS m(GEN) Rua-pū-tahanga T/A follow away
        ‘Then it was decided that Rua-pu-tahanga would follow.’  [Whwh 7.2]
b. Nā te aha koutou i mōhio ai [nā te taniwha
        n(GEN) the how 2PL T/A know PTCL m(GEN) the taniwha
        tō koutou hou i patu]?’  [Whwh 14.5]
        the(GEN) 2PL friend T/A kill
        ‘How do you know that your friend was killed by the monster?’

2.2. Focus and the Actor-Emphatic

This section will show that the Actor-emphatic construction has a number of characteristics which lead us to the conclusion that the Actor-Emphatic constituent should be housed in the SpecFocusP of Rizzi’s Split CP projection shown in (2).

In the analysis of Rizzi (1997), a preposed wh-question is in the SpecFocusP. Unlike the TopicP projection, the FocusP is not iterable. The fact that an Actor-Emphatic may not cooccur with a preposed wh-question therefore lends support to the interpretation that, within the terms of Rizzi’s framework, the Actor-Emphatic constituent is in the SpecFocusP:
29. a. *Inawhea nā Pita i ēhore (ai) te hipi?
   when n(GEN) Pita T/A fleece PTCL the sheep
   ‘When did Pita fleece the sheep?’
   b. *Nā Pita inawhea i ēhore (ai) te hipi?
30. *Ko wai nā Hone i pupuhi?
   ko who n(GEN) Hone T/A shoot
   ‘Who did Hone shoot?’

Another construction which bears a resemblance to the Actor-Emphatic has features involving variable binding of an oblique: the nā/mā particle may also appear before a preposed constituent which has a Cause role in its clause. This construction also preserves the tense characteristics that apply in the Actor-Emphatic construction. However, it differs from the Actor-Emphatic in that it requires the presence of a particle ai following the verb:

31. a. Nā te mahi rātou i hoki ai ki Pōneke
   nā the work 3PL T/A return ai P Wellington
   ‘They returned to Wellington because of the work.’ [Bauer 1997: (3342)]
   b. nāku anā i kite-a mai ai au ki konei.
   nā(1SG) again T/A see-PASS further ai 1SG P here
   ‘I alone am responsible for my being found here.’
   [Bauer (1997 (3339); PP2 45)]

The particle ai in Maori clearly resembles Niuean ai in its uses. The essentials of the conclusions of Massam and Roberge (1997) with respect to the role of ai in Niuean are valid also for Maori. They say:

32. In Niuean ai is an operator-bound clitic. [Massam & Roberge 1997]

The comparability of the constructions in the two languages can be seen in the following relative clause examples:

33. *Niuean
   Ti alai [e hala na fā hifo ai a ia]
   then block ABS path NFT go down ai ABS she
   ‘and blocked the passage by which she usually went down’
   [Massam 1998: (23)]

34. *Maori
   He a ra kino [tua ara i haere ai],
   T/A path bad that path T/A move ai
   ‘The track [she] was going along was a bad one.’

The Maori examples in (35) show the use of the particle ai in sentences with initial wh-question constituents.
35. a. *He aha koe i tāhū ai i taku kōtūro?*
   *PTCL what 2SG T/A steal ai ACC my daughter*
   ‘Why did you steal my daughter?’  [Bauer 1997 (2527); PP3 19]

   b. *A whea a Hata haere mai ai?*  [Bauer 1993: (46)]
   *at(FUT) when PERS Hata move near ai*
   ‘When will Hata come?’

The presence of *ai* in the Cause use of *nā/mā* preposed constituents indicates therefore that these constituents have the role of Operators over their clause. In Rizzi’s schema of the expanded CP domain the Focus projection is, as we have seen, the site for preposed *wh*-questions and it is inherently quantificational:

36. Focus is quantificational and Topic is not.  [Rizzi 1997]

The Actor-Emphatic construction itself provides the form of the sentence when an Agent is the focus of a *wh*-question, providing that the tense of the clause is compatible. Thus, when the clause is past or future, the Actor-Emphatic construction is used, as in (37a) and (37b) below. With other tense interpretations the subject appears at the beginning of the clause preceded by *ko*, as in (37c).

37. a. *Nā wai i here atu te kūri?*
   *n(GEN) who T/A tie away the dog*
   ‘Who tied up the dog?’

   b. *Mā wai e here atu te kūri?*
   *m(GEN) who T/A tie away the dog*
   ‘Who will tie up the dog?’

   c. *Ko wai kei te here atu i ngā kūri?*
   *ko who T/A tie away ACC the(PL) dog*
   ‘Who is tying up the dogs?’
   [Bauer 1997: (2850a,b,c)]

Similar effects obtain when the Agent subject is contrastively stressed. In (38a) the Actor-Emphatic construction is used since the clause is in the past tense. In (38b), with a present continuous interpretation, the stressed subject is preposed and preceded by *ko*.

38. a. *Nā POU i here atute kūri.*  [Bauer 1997: (4333)]
   ‘It was POU who tied up the dog’.

   b. *Ko POU kei te here atu i te kūri.*  [Bauer 1997: (4332)]
   ‘It is POU who is tying up the dog.’

In summary, *nā/mā* constructions include a constituent which has the characteristic properties of constituents that are preposed to the SpecFocusP in terms of the structure in (2). We have also observed, however, that, at least in the Actor-Emphatic construction, the use of this construction has Case implications for the internal content of the clause. Another fact about these constructions is that the
nā/mā particles mark a tense distinction which matches with the tense of the clause. If we take the Case role as the central clue, then a plausible interpretation of the structure is that the nā/mā particle is the complex head of a K(ase)P constituent which is attracted to the SpecFocusP position to check the features on the Focus° head:

39. **Focus nā/mā**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ForceP} \\
\quad \downarrow \text{Force} \\
\quad \quad \downarrow \text{FocusP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \downarrow \text{Spec} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \text{Focus} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{FiniteP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{KP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \text{i here atu te kuri} \\
nā Pou
\end{array}
\]

It is interesting that Maori gives evidence of two constructions in which a constituent is focused: the nā type represented in (39) and the focus ko type represented in (23), the two types apparently giving rise to similar interpretations (as seen in (37) and (38)). This makes it difficult to distinguish between what Kiss (1998) identifies for Hungarian and English as a syntactic (as well as semantic) contrast between Identificational (exhaustive) focus and Information (new information) focus. However, whereas Kiss finds that, of these two kinds of focus constituents, it is only Identificational focus that involves the Focus projection of the CP domain, if the Maori Actor-Emphatic construction (without the contrastive reading) is Information focus, then, in Maori, as argued here, an Information focused constituent is not restricted to an IP-internal position.

### 3.0. Negation

Maori has a two-way system of sentential negation, using a variety of forms (kāhore, kīhāt, e kore, ...) for sentence negation and a single form, ēkara, for what is described as predicate negation (Biggs 1969; Hohepa 1969; Chung 1978; Bauer 1993, 1997). In the terms of the present analysis, the two-way distinction can be captured as a distinction between IP versus CP negation. The example (40a) shows the use of ēkara before a preposed contrastively focused constituent. The preposed topic in (40b), otherwise nondistinct from the preposed focus constituent in (40a) cannot be the focus of negation, although this same constituent can be preposed in a negated clause, as it is in (40c).
40. a. Ehara ko te poaka i patu-a e Hōne (ko te kau).
   NEG ko the pig T/A kill-PASS by Hone ko the cow
   ‘It wasn't the pig that was killed by Hone, (it was the cow).’
b. Ko te poaka kāore/ēhara i patu-a e Hōne.
   ‘As for the pig it wasn't killed by Hone.’
c. Kāore te poaka i patu-a e Hōne (*ko te kau)
   NEG
   ‘The pig wasn't killed by Hone (*it was the cow).’

The use of ēhara in the predicative and Actor-Emphatic constructions in (41a,b) also matches with the interpretation that the preposed DPs in these constructions have raised out of their IP (whatever may be the exact rendition of the ko focus structure).

41. a. Ehara ko koe te tohunga.
   NEG ko 2SG the priest
   ‘You are not the priest.’ [= someone else is]
b. Ehara nā Hōne i patu te poaka.
   NEG n-GEN Hone T/A kill the pig
   ‘It wasn't Hone that killed the pig.’ [= it was someone else]

4.0. Conclusion

This paper has proposed that the ko particle marking a topicalized constituent has the characteristics of a complementizer. When the ko particle marks a focused constituent, it is obligatorily overt and combines together features of the complementizer, Force, and the F, leading to a cleft interpretation. The ko marking before a preposed topic, on the other hand, is a simple complementizer which is not obligatorily present. Preposed nāhuā constituents are in SpecFocusP and are quantificational.
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