



# VU Research Portal

## Demonstratives, referent identification and topicality in Wambon and some other Papuan languages

de Vries, Lourens

### ***published in***

Journal of Pragmatics

1995

### ***DOI (link to publisher)***

[10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)00068-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)00068-P)

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

### ***citation for published version (APA)***

de Vries, L. (1995). Demonstratives, referent identification and topicality in Wambon and some other Papuan languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 24, 513-533.. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)00068-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)00068-P)

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

### **E-mail address:**

[vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl](mailto:vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl)

1995b

'Demonstratives, referent identification and topicality in Wambon and some other Papuan languages'. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 24, 513-533.

*Demonstratives, referent identification and topicality in  
Wambon and some other Papuan languages*

Lourens de Vries

IFOTT/Dept. of General Linguistics

University of Amsterdam

Spuistraat 210

1012 VT Amsterdam

The Netherlands

0. *Introduction*

In several Papuan languages demonstrative forms are used both in contexts of referent identification, e.g. as demonstrative operators in noun phrases, and in topicality contexts, e.g. as topic markers with adverbial clauses and phrases, recapitulative clauses, new topic NPs and given topic NPs.

Consider the examples (1) and (2) from Wambon (De Vries 1989, De Vries and Wiersma 1992) and (3a/b) from Urim (Hemmilä 1989). In (1) the demonstrative *evo* 'that' is used as a spatial-deictic clue for referent identification: search for the referent of *lan* 'woman' in the area close to the hearer. In

(2) -eve 'that' signals the topicality of the conditional clause (cf. Haiman 1978) and could be glossed as 'given that' ('Given that the Digul rises,...'). In (3a) *pa* 'that' occurs with an indefinite NP and it is used to introduce a new topic into the discourse for future reference whereas in (3b) *pa* 'that' is used with a textually given topic:

(1) Ev-o        lan        yaferambo  
       that-CONN womangood  
       'That woman is good.'

(2) Kikhuve ndetkhekehel-eve        eve Manggelum  
    Digul rise.3SG.CONDIT-that    that  
 Manggelum

konoksiva  
 go.NEG.1PL.INTENT  
 'If the Digul river rises, then we do not want to go to Manggelum.'

(3a) Kin        ur    pa    ekg    narenampen        tukgwan  
       woman INDEF that two gather    breadfruitripe  
       'Two women were gathering ripe breadfruits.'

(3b) Wampung    pa    tarkgim    la<sup>1</sup>    nam-peḷ.

<sup>1</sup>Verbs of saying occur in very many Papuan languages in intentional and purposive contexts because these languages tend to express intention as quoted thought (cf. De Vries 1990).

opossum    that turn            say    bite-3SG

'The opossum turned and tried to bite him.'

(The opossum has already been mentioned in the story.)

In this article I discuss the relationship between the topicality uses and the deictic operator uses of demonstratives in Wambon and some other Papuan languages.

Using notions from the Functional Grammar framework (Dik 1989), I present a non-unified account of the demonstrative forms: helping the addressee to identify referents by giving deictic hints like 'close to speaker' and orienting the addressee about the topical cohesion of the discourse are two separate functional domains in language.

This 'two-domain' hypothesis, which views the demonstrative forms as having two synchronically unrelated functions, explains the fact that in Wambon and Urim the demonstratives show important differences in form and behaviour depending on whether they are used for referent identification or for expressing topicality distinctions. When demonstratives are used for marking topics in Wambon, they cliticize and they may form compounds of proximate and non-proximate forms. In Urim the demonstrative *pa* 'that' may co-occur with the indefiniteness marker *ur* when it is used to

---

Thus 'he wants to come home' is often expressed as 'I want to come home-he says'. In the Wambon example (15) there is also an occurrence of a medial 'say' form in a purposive context (*nembelo*). Intention and emotion are expressed as non-verbalised 'inner speech' the speaker directs to himself.

signal the informationstatus 'new topic' (e.g. (3a), Hemmilä 1989).

The 'two-domain' hypothesis explains such formal differences but cannot explain the formal similarities between topic markers and demonstrative operators in several Papuan languages. To explain these formal similarities I suggest a diachronic development: in several Papuan languages topic markers developed from demonstrative operators. In the relatively well-documented Awyu-family of Papuan languages this process can be traced: in Wambon, the resumptive demonstrative pronoun *-eve* is integrated in the preceding NP as a topic marker in stative clauses with a very transparent dichotomous topic-comment structure. In Korowai, also of the Awyu-family, the clitic *-efè*, the cognate of Wambon *-eve* 'that', completely lost its function as a demonstrative term operator and functions solely as a topic marker.

The paper has the following structure. First, I present data on the distribution of demonstratives in Wambon and Urim. Second, I present a synchronic Functional Grammar analysis of these data. Third, I discuss for Wambon a diachronic process of functional extension in which demonstrative forms acquired topic marking functions. Fourth, I make some remarks on how my analysis of demonstratives in Papuan languages relates to the account of deixis in Ehlich (1983, 1989) who builds on the work of Bühler (1934, 1990).<sup>2</sup> Whereas in my Functional Grammar

---

<sup>2</sup>This paper is based on a lecture given during the Workshop on Pragmatics and Grammar, University of Hamburg, 11-12 December 1992. I should thank the participants in that workshop

account of demonstrative forms the topicality use and the deictic operator use are described as synchronically unrelated, Ehlich's account of deixis would suggest that in for example (2) the topical function of the first *-eve* is linked to the deictic function.

### 1. *The data*

The data are from Wambon and Urim, but seem to reflect more general tendencies in Papuan languages, although much more research is needed to establish how general these tendencies are.

Wambon (De Vries 1989, De Vries and Wiersma 1992) has three place deictic elements, *no(mbo)-* 'in the proximity of the speaker', *ep-* 'in the proximity of the addressee' and *ko-* 'away from both speaker and hearer'. Forms based on these elements generally allow for both a spatial and a temporal interpretation; the adverb *nombone* for example may mean both 'here' and 'now' depending on the context. Compare:

- (4) Nombone    nu    na-n-ap            ka-p  
       now        I    my-TR-house       go-1SG.INTENT  
       'I want to go home now.'

---

for their stimulating critical comments.

From the deictics *ep-* 'there' and *nombo-* 'here' , demonstratives are formed by using the connectives *-e* and *-o* .

The connective *-o* links pre-nominal modifiers to the head noun; when *-o* combines with the deictics *ep-* and *nombo-*, the results are the demonstrative modifiers *evo* 'that' and *nombono* 'this'. Examples:

(5) *ev-o*<sup>3</sup>        *lan*        *yaferambo*

that-CONN        *womangood*

'that woman is good'

*nombo-n-o*        *lan*        *yaferambo*

this-TR-CONN        *womangood*

'this woman is good'

When *-e*, a general connective<sup>4</sup> which links pre-verbal

---

<sup>3</sup>The final /p/ of *ep-* is subjected to intervocalic fricativizing in morpheme-sequencing (De Vries 1989).

<sup>4</sup>In Wambon, and in the Awyu family in general, there occur vowel-clitics expressing a number of very general syntactic relations. An extensive treatment of the Wambon vowel-clitics *-e* and *-o* can be found in De Vries 1989: 94-100.

Wambon *-o* and *-e* have the same function but in different domains: in the NP, *-o* connects pre-nominal modifiers to the headnoun; in the clause, the connective *-e* links pre-verbal constituents to the verb, the head of the clause. Following Dik (1983) I have called the type of relation indicated by these clitics the *prefield-center* relation. This term 'prefield-center relation' is needed because in the Digul-Wambon dialect of Wambon, one vowel clitic (*-e*) functions in both domains: in NPs, it is a modifier-head connective and in clauses, it links all kinds of intraclausal pre-verbal constituents (both arguments and non-arguments, topics and non-topics, nouns and pronouns) to the verb. These connective clitics are extremely

constituents to the verb in clauses, combines with the deictics, the demonstratives *eve* and *nombone* are formed that function as heads of noun phrases:

(6) *ev-e lan*  
that-CONN woman  
'That is a woman.'

*nombo-n-e lan*  
this-TR-CONN woman  
'This is a woman.'

The examples (5) and (6) show the place deictic function of demonstratives, they provide spatial orientation relative to the deictic center to help the addressee to identify referents.

In (7) the second demonstrative has an anaphoric-resumptive function, it points back to the clause-external phrase 'that man' and resumes that phrase in the clause.

(7) *Ev-o kap, ev-e na-mbav-e*  
that-CONN man that-CONN my-father-CONN  
'As for that man, that is my father.'

(8) *Nombo-n-eve jakhove:"Nde-nok-siva"*  
this-TR-that they :come-NEG-1PL.INTENT.NEG

---

frequent in Awyu languages.



ne-knde<sup>5</sup>

say-3PL.PRES

'They say this: "We do not want to come." '

In (8) the compound demonstrative form *nomboneve*, consisting of the speaker-related deictic *nombo* 'this' and the addressee-related deictic *eve* 'that', is used cataphorically, pointing forward in the discourse, to the clause 'we do not want to come'. The compound demonstrative *nomboneve* is also used as a topic marker, see for example (30) below.

In (9) we see *-eve* 'that' as a cliticized topic marker (and also *eve* as a resumptive element):

- (9) Ko                    mba-khe-n-o                    kav-eve  
      therestay-3SG.PRES-TR-CONN        man-that<sup>6</sup>
- ev-e                    na-mbap-nde  
      that-CONN            my-father-is
- 'The man who is staying there, that is my father.'

---

<sup>5</sup>This sentence has the usual order for quotative constructions with the quoted clause ('we do not want to come') before the quote-marking verb of saying (*neknde* 'they say'). The cataphoric demonstrative *nomboneve* points forward to the quoted clause.

<sup>6</sup>In this data section I have glossed *eve* consistently as 'that', also in places where that gloss is less appropriate in my view, in order to present the distribution of *(-)eve* as unbiased as possible.

In (10) we see the demonstrative modifier *evo* and the topic clitic *-eve*:

(10) *Ev-o kav-eve na ..... nekhev-e*  
that-CONN man-that pause-marker he-CONN

*jambolokup*

*ill*

'As for that man, he is ill.'

In (9) and (10) the topic clitic *-eve* is used by the speaker with the meaning 'this is the entity I want to say something about.'

In (11) we see *-eve* 'that' with a topical Time phrase that provides the temporal frame within which the information of (11) is presented:

(11) *Sanopkuniv-eve ilo*  
on.tuesday-that descend.SS<sup>7</sup>

*nggapmokndevan-o...*

*cut.suppl.PRES.TR-COORD*

'On Tuesday we went down and cut (trees) and ...'

---

<sup>7</sup>SS (same-subject) and DS (different-subject) refer to switch-reference distinctions: DS suffixes indicate that the subject of the *next* clause in the clause-chain has a different referent, SS suffixes indicate that the next clause has the same subject.

Several types of subordinate<sup>8</sup> clauses in Wambon function as topical frames and also take -eve. In (12) -eve marks a subordinate clause with conditional interpretation, in (13) a head-internal relative clause, in (14) a subordinate clause with resultative interpretation, and finally in (15) a subordinate recapitulative clause:

- (12) Kikhuve      ndetkhekhe1-eve      eve      Manggelum  
    Digul  
    rise.3SG.CONDIT-that      that      Manggelum  
  
    konoksiva  
    go.NEG.1PL.INTENT  
    'If the Digul river rises, then we do not want to go to  
    Manggelum.'

In (12) the conditional subordinate clause takes eve 'that' (which has cliticised); the second eve functions as resumptive element 'in that case'/'then', pointing back to the conditional clause.

---

<sup>8</sup>Subordinate clauses in Wambon are clauses that function as noun phrases in a higher clause, take the same postpositions/subordinators as noun phrases, and allow only so-called final verb-forms. They function in contrast with medial clauses and final clauses (see for Wambon clause types, De Vries 1989; for a more detailed discussion of the applicability of the notion subordination/coordination to Awyu and Papuan languages, see De Vries 1993c).

(13) Alivandu-n-e                      takhima-lepo-n-eve  
 yesterday sago-TR-CONN      buy-1SG.PAST-TR-that

kaimo-nde

good-is

'The sago which I bought yesterday, is good.'

(14) Wano-n-e                      moke-knde-n-eve  
 child-TR-CONN      be.afraid-3PL.PRES-TR-that  
 nggulum-e              koyomke-khe  
 teacher-CONN      be.angry-3SG.PRES

'The children are afraid because the teacher is angry.'

Finally, we find the demonstrative-based topic marker -eve in Wambon with so-called tail-head linkage constructions. Tail-head linkage is the term for the phenomenon that especially in narratives, sentences or paragraphs are linked by recapitulating the final clause or final verb of the preceding sentence in the first clause of the next sentence (Healy 1966, Longacre 1972, Thurman 1975). For example, the last clause of (15) is recapitulated in the first clause of (16):

(15) Koiv-o      talom-o      mben-o                      wakhoḷ-eve  
 last-CONN      year-CONN      seven-CONNmonth-that

Tuve-n-o                      Tituḷ-o  
 Tuve-TR-COORD      Titus-COORD

nokhov-a ilumtakhemo ndakono

we-CONN three and

jakho-salip sakmo.... lavilo kono...(pause)....

their-wife follow.SS go.down.SS and

Mbonop-nggambun-ka mbakhe-mbel-o nggerkaji

Mbonop-whirlpool-at stay-SS.SEQ-COORD saw

lavo-va ne-mbel-o ep-ka

take-1PL.INTENT say-SS.SEQ-COORD there-LOC

mba-levambo

stay-1PL.PAST

'July of last year Tuve and Titus, the three of us..their wives  
also...we went down and stayed at the Mbonop whirlpool to saw.'

(16) Ep-ka mba-levambo-n-eve sanov-e

there-LOC stay-1PL.PAST-TR-that monday-CONN

ilo ka-levambo.

go.down.SS go-1PL.PAST

'Given that we stayed there, on Monday we went down.'

The recapitulated first clause in (16) functions as the topical  
frame for the new information in (16) and links the new

sentence to the preceding one. The topic marker *-eve* may occur on such recapitulated initial clauses. Notice that *-eve* also occurs in (15) on the temporal frame constituent *koivo talomo mbeno wakho* *-eve* 'July of last year'.

In Urim (East Sepik, Papua New Guinea, see Hemmilä (1989)) demonstratives are also used extensively in the topicality domain. I shall concentrate here on *pa* 'that'. This *pa* or the combination *ur pa* (*ur* being an indefiniteness marker) is used *inter alia* for the introduction of new topics into the discourse, both in the beginning and in the middle of discourses.

(17)

Kin            ur    pa    ekg   narenampen       tukgwan  
 woman    INDEF   that two   gather       breadfruitripe  
 'Two women were gathering ripe breadfruits.'

(18)

Kin            warimpet   pa   kai   karkuk  
 womanyoungthat go    bathe  
 'A young woman went to have a bath.'

In (17) and (18) the topic marker *pa* 'that' is used with the newly introduced topics 'two women' and 'a young woman'. However, *pa* also marks textually given topics:

(19) Wampung    pa    tarkgim   la   nam-peɭ.

opossum that turn say bite-3SG

'The opossum turned and tried to bite him.'

Like in Wambon, the Urim demonstrative topic marker occurs also on adverbial subordinate clauses (20), adverbial time phrases (21) and recapitulative clauses (22):

(20) Hu wei pa, mentepm irki wan  
waterfall.IRR that 1IN stay.IRR house  
'If it rains we will stay at home.'  
or: 'Given that it rains, we will stay at home.'

(21)

Ak Trinde kong pa, poliskar awi-yo aye  
PR Wednesday morning that police.cartake-1PL carry

kawor Boromese.

enter BoromCMP

'Wednesday morning the police car took us to Borom'

(22)

..kil karpowunei. Kil karpowuneipa,  
..3SGgrab wunei3SG grab wuneithat

kupm no alm.

1SG come.up shoot

'It went to the Wunei-tree; given that it went to the Wunei

tree, I shot it.'

Urim *pa* is also used as a demonstrative operator in noun phrases to specify the reference of the NP, see the examples (27) and (28) below and the discussion there.

## 2. *A Functional Grammar account*

Functional Grammar (Dik 1989) will account for the data presented above in two places in the model: in the domain of terms and their operators and in the domain of pragmatic function assignment.

Demonstrative forms that are used by the speaker as searching directions for the hearer to identify referents in either the physical space or more abstract pragmatic spaces like the discourse are accounted for as operators on terms.<sup>9</sup>

Terms are those expressions in language that can be used to refer to entities in some world. Operators on terms are such grammatical categories as definiteness, genericity, number.

The demonstrative operators such as 'proximate to speaker' and 'remote from speaker' are intimately linked up with definiteness. The intrinsically definite nature of demonstratives is a general cross-linguistic property of demonstrative systems (Dik 1989: 147). Definite terms are used as invitations by the speaker to the hearer to identify

---

<sup>9</sup>I follow here the exposition on demonstrative operators in Dik (1989).



appropriate referents which the speaker assumes are available to the hearer. Now demonstratives provide searching directions or hints for these referents. These hints are relative to the deictic center, the basic parameters of the speech situation, that is the speech participants, the time and the location of the utterance. Thus when a speaker says 'John wants these apples', with the expression 'these apples' the speaker invites the hearer to identify apples which are accessible to him and to do so by searching in an area relatively close to the speaker. The deictic center is seen in FG as the central point in pragmatic space (where space must be interpreted in an abstract, cognitive sense). Although demonstratives are used in the first place to define relative distances in physical space, they are also used to signal more abstract searching directions, for example contextual distance, where demonstratives can be used to deliver instructions like: search for the referent among items mentioned earlier/recently/later in the ongoing discourse.

Essentially, demonstratives as used in (5)-(8) are accounted for in Dik 1989 as further specifications of the instruction "identify x" which is captured by the definiteness operator.

Let us now return to the use of demonstrative forms in data like Wambon (14) (repeated here as (23) and Urim (20) (repeated here as (24):

(23)Ep-ka                    mba-levambo-n-eve                    sanov-e

there-LOC stay-1PL.PAST-TR-that monday-CONN

ilo ka-levambo.

go.down.SSgo-1PL.PAST

'Given that we stayed there, on Monday we went down.'

(24)Hu wei pa, mentepm irki wan  
water fall.IRR that 1IN stay.IRR house  
'If it rains we will stay at home.'  
or: 'Given that it rains, we will stay at home.'

The use of demonstrative forms with the conditional clause in (24) and the tail-head linkage clause in (23) cannot be accounted for in terms of providing searching directions or hints for referent identification. Rather the hint given by -eve in (23) is: take the information 'that we stayed there' for granted and process the new information in this given frame. Such hints do not belong to the functional domain of referent identification but to the topicality domain to be accounted for by pragmatic function assignment. In (18) (repeated here as (25)), the demonstrative form *pa* is used with an indefinite term 'a young woman', which is newly introduced into the discourse. The demonstrative in (25) does not specify directions where to look for a referent assumed to be accessible for the hearer. This is even more clear in (17) (repeated here as (26)), where the demonstrative co-occurs with an indefiniteness marker:

(25)

Kin            warimpet   pa   kai   karkuk  
womanyoungthat go   bathe  
'A young woman went to have a bath.'

(26)

Kin            ur   pa   ekg   narenampen   tukgwan  
womana        that two   gather   breadfruitripe  
'Two women were gathering ripe breadfruits.'

In the Urim data (17)-(22), the demonstrative forms are used to express informational relations between constituents or informational statuses of constituents. For example in (25) the informational role or relation is New Topic: the speaker signals: this is the entity I am going to talk about in the coming piece of discourse. In example (24) the informational status is Frame: take this information for granted as the frame for processing the new information.

Urim *pa* can be used as a deictic specifying the reference of a noun; however, as Hemmilä (1989: 57) notes, 'there also seem to be some restrictions in the use of *pa* as a demonstrative within a noun phrase'. These restrictions are pragmatic in nature: the phrase noun plus *pa* can only be used when the referent is textually given (as in (27 )); when this is not the case, *pa* is used within a proadverb, as in (28):

(27) Atom tu    nalu-n-to            wayu pa    eng    men    al  
       then 3PL   pick-IO-1PL        taro that for   1PL   eat  
       'Then they harvested that taro for us to eat.'

(28) Tu    nalu-n-to            wayu arpmakai-pa  
       then pick-IO-1PL        taro sit            go-that  
       'They harvested for us that taro (over there).'

These pragmatic restrictions on the use of *pa* as a demonstrative operator suggest that *pa* is primarily used in the domain of informational relations (topicality) and retains only some restricted tasks in the domain of place-deictic reference specification. This is a difference with Wambon -eve, which is fully operative in both domains. In Korowai (see below) the marker -*efè*, the cognate of Wambon -eve, has completely lost its place-deictic functions. Urim *pa* seems to represent the situation where the demonstrative form is developing into a marker of informational relations but with still some residual place-deictic functions.

In Functional Grammar there are three types of functional relations between constituents: syntactic functions like Subject and Object, semantic functions like Agent and Instrument, and pragmatic functions like Topic and Focus. These functional relations are seen as fundamental; expression-rules triggered by the functional specifications in the underlying predication express these functions in the form and order of constituents. Informational relations as in (25) (New Topic)

and (22) (Frame) are accounted for by pragmatic function assignment to constituents. In his approach to pragmatic functions, Dik (1989) makes a crucial distinction between the notional ('etic') language-independent typologies of topicality and focality and the language-specific ('emic') articulation of Topic and Focus systems of individual languages.<sup>10</sup> 'Etic' typologies present a universal set of possible distinctions for a given domain of verbal interaction. Not all languages grammaticalize the same distinctions and not all languages grammaticalize the distinctions in the same way; these different 'emic' coding patterns explain why "not all languages have the same set of distinctive Topic and Focus functions" (Dik 1989: 266).

In Indo-European languages, topics are not or only marginally coded in the grammar. In the absence of formal coding mechanisms in these languages, linguists who are not familiar with topic coding languages have found topics undefinable and elusive things. However, in languages where topics receive considerable formal coding (cf. Li and Thompson 1976), the notion 'topic' as a discrete grammatical category is certainly not elusive, at least no more elusive than the notion 'subject' in Indo-European languages.

On the basis of studies of topic coding languages Gundel (1988: 210) has proposed this notional definition of topic: "An

---

<sup>10</sup>Dik (1989: 285) for example distinguishes explicitly between the 'etics' and 'emics' of focality. De Vries (1992a) extensively discusses the methodological implications of the distinction 'etic'/'emic' for defining pragmatic functions.

entity, E, is the topic of a sentence, S, if in using S the speaker intends to increase the addressee's knowledge about, request information about, or otherwise get the addressee to act with respect to E". This definition is notional because it does not invoke criteria of overt expression of the topic in the sentence.

Gundel (1988) regards assumed familiarity with the topical entity as a property that topics very often have but she does not include 'familiarity' or 'givenness' elements in her notional definition. Since the cognitive plausibility of the notion 'topic' is precisely in that listeners need easily accessible 'destinations' or 'storage points' in their memory to send incoming information to, I include assumed familiarity in the notional criteria for topics. Thus there are three notional criteria for topics:

- (i) they are entities
- (ii) the speaker assumes that these entities are easily accessible for the addressee (assumed familiarity)
- (iii) the speaker intends the addressee to attach incoming information to those easily accessible entities (aboutness)

Of course, these three notional criteria of 'familiarity', 'entity-status' and 'aboutness' need notional explications themselves. An excellent explication of notional criteria for 'assumed familiarity' can be found in Prince 1980. Criteria for

'entity' status and 'aboutness' are harder to formulate. Linguistics should look at psychological theories of cognition and information processing because the intuitive plausibility of the notion 'topic' lies in its cognitive and processing role. Listeners need 'destinations' in their memory to send incoming information to (hence: 'aboutness'). It would seem that (first order) entities are easier to use as cognitive destinations or storage points than, say, events or relations.

In topic coding languages there are grammatical mechanisms that speakers utilise to give hearers clues to quickly identify the 'destinations' to which the incoming information can be sent. When one studies which type of constituents are marked as topics in such languages, the referents of the great majority of these marked constituents satisfy the three notional topic criteria: they are easily accessible first order entities (Lyons 1977) in terms of which the speaker directs the addressee to process the incoming message.

Combining distinctions from the work of Prince (1980), Gundel (1978, 1988), Hannay (1985), Chafe (1987) and Dik (1989), at least three notional subtypes of topics can be distinguished that fall under the scope of the definition of topic as an 'aboutness' relation between a familiar entity and a clause.

Given topics (GIVTOPs) are situationally or textually evoked discourse referents that the speaker assumes the addressee is attending to ('active', Chafe 1987; 'activated', Gundel 1978). Resumed topics are formerly active topics that

the speaker reactivates (Dik 1989). Sub topics are inferrable topics that the speakers assumes the addressee is peripherally conscious of ('semi-active') (Prince 1980, Hannay 1985).

In several topic-prominent languages topic marking devices may occur with two types of topics that do not fully satisfy the three notional criteria for topics, viz. 'familiarity', 'entity-status', 'aboutness'.

In the first place, speakers may want to indicate, when they refer to an entity for the first time in the discourse, whether that entity constitutes a future topic of the discourse (that will be referred to again) or not. In Urim this notional topic role, 'future topic', is coded in the grammar. See examples (23) and (24): when the topic marker *pa* in Urim occurs with a constituent that refers to a new entity, then that constituent introduces a Future Topic or New Topic into the discourse. When new entities are introduced without *pa*, they will not be referred to again in the coming discourse.

These New Topics satisfy the 'entity' criterion but they violate the 'familiarity' criterion: the addressee is not assumed to be familiar (in any sense) with the new topic entities. New Topics satisfy the 'aboutness' criterion at discourse-level but not or marginally at clause-level. In Dik (1989), the 'aboutness' criterion is applied at the discourse-level: "If a discourse is to be about a certain D-Topic, that D-Topic will, at some point, have to be introduced for the first time. Such a first presentation of a D-Topic will be called a New Topic (NewTop);.."



Notice that New Topics or Future Topics receive the same topic marker *pa* that also occurs with types of topics in Urim which fully satisfy the notional topicality criteria (see e.g. (19) above, with a Given Topic).

Urim is not the only Papuan language in which the introduction of a new topical discourse entity and its subsequent being maintained as a given topic is expressed with the same device. Another example of a Papuan language using the same topic marker with future topics and given topics is Berik (Westrum 1987, Jones 1988, De Vries 1993a).

These data from Papuan languages like Urim and Berik point to the fact that New or Future Topics are treated in the coding system of these languages as Topics although they violate the familiarity criterion. However, since New Topics satisfy two of the three topic criteria (they are 'entities' 'about' which the discourse communicates something), they receive Topic treatment in several Papuan languages.

The second type of topics that only partially fulfills the three notional criteria for topics and nevertheless gets Topic treatment in very many (if not all) topic-prominent languages, is the type of topic which is called Theme by Halliday (1970), and Frame by Clark and Clark (1977). Frames present information that the speaker wants the addressee to take for granted, to accept as a given framework for the rest of the clause. Frames often have both a forward cohesive role and a backward cohesive role. The forward cohesive role is to serve as a frame in which the rest of the clause forms the

insert, or as a peg on which the message is hung (Halliday 1970). The backward role is to link the present utterance to the preceding discourse. The most common expressive devices for the pragmatic function Frame in Papuan languages are tail-head linkage clauses, adverbial clauses and phrases, all clause-initial (cf. De Vries 1993b). Very often, topic markers occur on these clauses and phrases to signal the topical frame status of the constituent. Examples are (21) from Wambon, (22) from Urim, (11)-(14) from Wambon and (29) from Kombai:

(29) Amakhalo khumolei ro mene,  
Amakhalo die.3SG.NFthingthis/Frame

dadagu khe bokhugi-n-o beginning he  
DUR.be.ill.3SG.NF-TR-CONN

ro mofene  
thingFrame/that

khwaimigi waluwano: Foromojamonone.  
foreignersPERF.say.3PL.NF carry.SS descend.IMP.PL

`As for the death of Amakhalo, when he was ill in the beginning, the foreigners had said : "Bring him down (to us)!".

Example (29) contains two paratactically linked frame clauses the first frame is marked by *mene* 'this' and the second by

*mofene* 'that'.

All types of information, entities, events, places, times, can be used as frames with respect to which the following information is presented as a relevant insert. The criterion of 'entity' status is not relevant for their specific type of topicality. The 'aboutness' criterion is also violated by Frames. Conditional clauses, frequently acting as topical frames in Papuan languages and often obligatorily taking topic markers, can rarely be seen as entities about which the rest of the clause communicates something. The reason that topic-prominent languages employing topic markers very often treat conditional, temporal and other frames as topics is that they satisfy the 'familiarity' criterion; however, it is not the kind of (referential) familiarity which results from textual or situational givenness or from inferrability. Rather, by using the topic marker the speaker indicates: treat this information as familiar, as a peg to hang the coming message on, as an universe of discourse with respect to which the coming message is relevant<sup>11</sup>. That is why topic markers with time and condition clauses, tail-head clauses, adverbial phrases, so often haven been paraphrased as 'given that...'

If we compare New Topics and Frames, we can say that New

---

<sup>11</sup>Dik (1978) defines his Theme function in terms of the presentation by the speaker of an universe of discourse with which the coming predication has a pragmatic relevance relation, not a syntactic relation; i.e. in Dik (1978), Themes are always predication-external constituents. In the present paper predication-externality is not used as a criterion for Theme (or Frame) status.

Topics violate the 'familiarity' criterion, but satisfy the 'aboutness' criterion (in an adapted sense: on the discourse level), whereas Frames violate the 'aboutness' criterion but satisfy the 'familiarity' criterion (in an adapted sense: not necessarily referentially given, but presented as a starting point for the message).

In a framework which distinguishes notional information roles from coded information roles, we can say that Papuan languages like Wambon and Urim code new topics and frames as Topics, even though notionally they are 'semi-topics'.

If demonstrative forms in languages like Wambon and Urim really serve in two separate functional domains, viz. referent identification (term operators) and topicality (pragmatic functions), then formal differences connected to this functional difference would confirm our two-domain analysis. There are such differences, both in Wambon and in Urim.

When demonstrative forms function in the topicality domain in Wambon, that is, when they express a pragmatic function, they cliticise to the topical NP or topical clause. When they function in the reference domain, that is when they express a term operator, they never cliticise. Secondly, when the demonstrative forms express topicality (and also in cataphoric usage), they may combine into compound forms of proximate and non-proximate demonstrative forms:

- (30) ...nukh-eve      nombo-n-eve      ndayonge-ka-lepo-n-o..  
                  I-that      this-TR-that      oar-go-1SG.PAST-TR-SS

'..and as far as I am concerned, I had travelled by canoe...'

Such 'this-that' combinations (also reported for Urim) are never allowed in the domain of referent identification.

A final but crucial difference is that demonstrative forms in the topicality domain may co-occur with indefiniteness markers; in the reference domain this never happens. Compare Urim:

- (31) Mentekg    ari    mantour    pa    arpma  
         we        see    pig        a        that sit
- kai-nar    wap    haung  
         go-down    tree fallen
- 'We saw a pig down near a fallen tree.'

In (31) the pig is introduced into the discourse for the first time. Example (31) is followed by a story about how the pig was shot. The demonstrative form *pa* is a marker of New Topic here and combines with the indefiniteness marker *ur* 'a'.

### 3. *From demonstrative operator to topic marker*

Just like lexical elements may develop multiple meanings (polysemy) in different contexts, grammatical forms may add

functions in a diachronic process of functional extension and become multifunctional. Sometimes the new function gradually may become more prominent until the old function is lost. These processes of functional extension and functional shift need a route or channel through which the extension of functions takes place.

The anaphoric use of demonstratives in stative clauses with a dichotomous topic-comment structure is a good candidate for the channel through which the topicality functions of demonstrative forms added. There are data from Wambon which indicate that the use of the resumptive non-attributive *eve* in stative clauses with their very transparent topic-comment structure is the source-context in which we can see the process of cliticisation of resumptive *eve* to the constituent it originally pointed back to:

(32) Ev-o kap na-mbap-nde

that-CONN man my-father-is

'That man is my father.'

(33) Ev-o kap, ev-e na-mbap-nde

that-CONN man that-CONN my-father-is

'That man, that is my father.'

(34) Ev-o kav-eve na-mbap-nde

that-CONN man-TOP my-father-is

'That man is my father.'

(35) Ev-o kav-eve, ev-e na-mbap-nde  
 that-CONN man-TOP that-CONN my-father-is  
 '(As for) that man, that is my father.'

The examples (32)-(35) are all acceptable expressions in Wambon. In (32) there is a stative clause with a dichotomous topic-comment structure ('that man'=topic, 'is my father'=comment). In (33) the clause-external topic<sup>12</sup> (separated by a slight pause from the following clause) is resumed in the clause by *eve* 'that'. In such stative clause contexts, the resumptive *eve* associates closely with the topic NP it resumes in the clause; eventually, it phonologically integrates in that NP as a topic-clitic (cf. (34)) and the need for a resumptive element is filled by a new *eve* (cf. (35)). The change from /p/ to /v/ in *kav* 'man' confirms that phonological integration of the topic-clitic; fricativisation of /p/ in intervocalic conditions is a regular process in Wambon morpheme-sequencing (De Vries 1989).

Notice in (36) that when *-eve* functions as a clausal topic-clitic with Wambon conditionals, there is a dichotomous frame-insert structure analogous to the topic-comment structure in (35) with a first *-eve* as a topic-clitic and a second *eve*

---

<sup>12</sup>In De Vries (1989), I have argued that Topics and Themes (Frames) may occur in Papuan languages in different degrees of integration in the clause, from fully clause-internal to fully clause-external. This degree of integration reflects processing strategies rather than different pragmatic functions.

resuming the topical frame clause in the main clause:

(36) Kikhuve     ndetkhekhel-eve     eve     Manggelum

Digul

rise.3SG.CONDIT-frame     that     Manggelum

konoksiva

go.NEG.1PL.INTENT

'If the Digul river rises, then we do not want to go to Manggelum.'

or: 'Given that the Digul river rises, in that case we do not want to go to Manggelum.'

Once firmly established in stative clauses as a topic-clitic, the use of -eve could spread to other topical contexts.

In languages of the Awyu-family (to which Kombai and Wambon belong) that have different demonstratives forms for attributive and independent uses, it is the form that is used as a head of NPs which becomes the topic-clitic. In Wambon the demonstrative modifier in NPs is *evo* 'that' (+proximate to Addressee, e.g. (5)). This *evo* occurs before the noun. The form *eve* 'that' is used as head of NPs (e.g. (6)). This form *eve* is used as postclitic marking topicality of clauses and phrases whereas the demonstrative pre-nominal modifier *evo* is never used as a topic marker. This choice of the independent form -eve follows from the hypothesis that the topic-clitic -eve originally was a resumptive (independent) demonstrative



form, pointing back to the NP and therefore following the NP.<sup>13</sup>

The hypothesis that in Awyu-languages topic markers developed from demonstratives, is supported by a comparison of Wambon and Korowai (De Vries and van Enk (f.c.)).

In Wambon, the demonstrative form (-)eve functions as a topic-marker, as a demonstrative operator in the NP, and as head of a subject NP in equative clauses (see (5)-(14) above)). In Korowai, we find the demonstrative forms *ip* 'this' (proximate to speaker), *wap* 'that' (proximate to addressee), and *khop* 'that' (proximate to neither speaker nor addressee) only as demonstrative operators on terms and as heads of subject NPs in equative clauses, but not in topicality contexts; by contrast, we find *-efè*, the cognate of the Wambon demonstrative (-)eve, as a topic-clitic, e.g. on conditionals. Korowai *-efè* is diachronically a demonstrative operator (which its Wambon cognate counterpart still is) that has lost its demonstrative operator functions and has become a specialised topic-marker. Consider the following Korowai data:

- (37) Nokhuf-efè Kolufo imban  
we-TOP Korowai people  
'We are Korowai people.'

---

<sup>13</sup>Of the available demonstrative forms in Kombai and Wambon, only a subset is also used as a topic marker. In Kombai both the speaker-related form *mene* 'this' and the addressee-related form *mofene* 'that' are used as topic-markers (cf. (25)), but never the third-person related deictic *ko*. The unmarked choice is the speaker-related one. In Wambon the addressee-related deictic *eve* 'that (+proximate to addressee)' is the unmarked choice for topic marker.

(38) If-è mahüon ye-khokhu-fè mbakha?

this-CONN message its-meaning-TOP what

'What is the meaning of this message?'

(39) Wa goḷ üḷme-tél-e-kha-fè nokhu-goḷ

that pig kill-3PL.NF-TR-CONN-TOP our-pig

'That pig which they killed is our pig.'

The following example illustrates -efè with topical frames:

(40) Gedun-tefül-efè fola-khé-top nokhu

six-day-Frame afternoon-3SG.F-DS.and we

khalakh kha-khe-lè

upward go-F-1SG

'On Saturday in the afternoon we shall go up.'

(41) Imonè kha-khe-tél-e-kha-fè menèḷ lu-kha-té.

now go-F-3PL-TR-CONN-TOP quickly arrive-F-3PL

'If they go now, they will arrive early.'

(42) Yu yamo-mbo-kha-fè ye-ni khomilo

he cry-PROGR.3SG-CONN-TOP his-mother die.3SG.NF

'That he is crying is because his mother died.'

The Korowai-Wambon comparison also supports the idea that the topic marking function and the demonstrative operator function are synchronically unrelated: it is possible to lose the latter function while retaining the former. We shall discuss now a view of deixis in which both functions are seen as synchronically related and in which the Wambon topic marker -eve would be called a 'paradeictic' marker.

#### 4. Concepts of deixis

Ehlich (1983, 1989) and Rehbein (1984) have established a rather strict action-theoretical perspective in which deixis is viewed as a kind of sub-act (called the deictic procedure) of acts (like the propositional and illocutionary act) which in their turn make up actions which are again embedded in larger social and institutional frameworks of action.<sup>14</sup> Unfortunately, the notion 'procedure' is left practically undefined within this action-theoretical framework.

Deictic procedures have two characteristics: speakers *refer* to elements in some pragmatic space (physical speech act space or more abstract pragmatic spaces) and speakers *single out* these referents by placing the attention of the hearer on the elements referred to (the German term *fokussieren* 'to focus' is used in this context), implying that the attention was not yet on that element. When a pronoun like *he* is used for

---

<sup>14</sup>In this section I draw heavily on the exposition of functional pragmatics given by Rombouts (1991).

a person who is already in focus, Ehlich (1982: 330) does not want to speak of deixis but of a 'foric' procedure (which includes anaphora and cataphora). Foric procedures have to do with continuity of focus (instructions to the hearer to maintain continuity of focus<sup>15</sup>). The foric and the deictic procedure are both orientation procedures, aimed at placing the attention (deictic procedure) or keeping the attention (foric procedure) where it is needed. However, the foric procedure is located by Ehlich (1986) in the functional domain of the *Operationsfeld*, the operator field, to which also determinators and conjunctions belong. Operative procedures have language-internal processing functions. Deictic procedures are placed in the *Zeigfeld*, the functional domain of focussing on referents in pragmatic spaces.

When elements from one functional domain or *Feld* are also used in another functional domain, they retain their original function and the new function builds somehow on this original function. This is called field transposition. Redder (1990), for example, defends the thesis that the German particles *denn* and *da*, which are used in the operator field, are transposed deictic elements; their deictic origin is somehow synchronically relevant in their operator function.

---

<sup>15</sup>Anaphoric elements are defined by Ehlich (1983: 96) as "...sprachliche Einheiten, die [...] einen Rückbezug auf propositionale Elemente herstellen, die vorgängig bei S und H fokussiert sind, und die so eine Kontinuität der vorgängigen Fokussierung signalisieren." (Quoted via Rombouts (1991).

Consider the Wambon data from the perspective of these notions. When Wambon *-eve* is used as a topic-clitic on conditional clauses or recapitulative clauses, it functions in the *Operationsfeld* since it gives instructions how to process propositional content, it does not contribute to this content. But since *-eve* is a deictic element from the *Zeigfeld* which in conditional clauses acquires a function in the operative field, the concept of field transposition is relevant here; this implies that somehow the deictic feature of referring to some entity in some pragmatic space must be linked to *-eve*, for example when it functions as a topic marker in the conditional context of (43):

- (43) Kikhuve      ndetkhekhel-eve      eve      Manggelum  
    Digul  
    rise.3SG.CONDIT-TOP      that      Manggelum

konoksiva

go.NEG.1PL.INTENT

'If the Digul river rises, then we do not want to go to Manggelum.'

or: 'Given that the Digul river rises, in that case we do not want to go to Manggelum.'

Reasoning now from the FG perspective, the first *-eve* in (39) is not used to give instructions to the addressee to locate a referent in pragmatic space (it is not a deictic element in

(43)) but it is used to indicate the information role of the conditional clause (topical frame): given the hypothetical state of affairs that the Digul river rises.

Ehlich (1983, 1989) regards topicality notions like '*fokussieren*' and '*Kontinuität der Fokussierung*' as aspects of deixis and anaphora. This (synchronic) linking of deixis and anaphora with topicality would have the advantage of providing a natural explanation for the fact that deictic elements occur in both referential and topical contexts in several well-documented Papuan languages. On the other hand, under a 'two domain' analysis, the formal differences reported above and the relationship between definiteness and demonstrative systems can be far better accounted for. When demonstrative forms are used to express topical pragmatic functions, they do not imply definiteness (e.g. Urim (29)), but when they are used to identify referents, as demonstrative operators, they are intrinsically definite. In the reference domain, the opposition +proximate and -proximate is crucial; however, in the topicality domain that distinction is irrelevant and accordingly we find combinations of proximate and non-proximate forms (e.g. (30)) marking topicality. In addition, we find some languages selecting proximate forms and other non-proximate forms to express topicality. In Wambon, demonstrative forms occur after the noun as clitics when they function in the topicality domain but they occur before the noun as free forms when they function to help identify referents.

## 5. Conclusion

The central question of my paper has been the relationship between topicality uses and deictic operator uses of demonstrative forms in Papuan languages like Wambon and Urim.

I proposed a 'two-domain' analysis to account for the formal differences related to the two synchronically unrelated functions: in Wambon the demonstrative-based topic marker *-eve* cliticises, always follows the noun and may form compounds of proximate and non-proximate forms. In Urim the demonstrative-based topic marker *pa* may co-occur with the marker of indefiniteness.

To explain the formal similarities between these topic markers and demonstrative operators, I proposed a diachronic hypothesis for Wambon: the resumptive demonstrative pronoun *-eve* integrated in the preceding NP as a topic marker in stative clauses with a very transparent dichotomous topic-comment structure. From the stative clause context, the use of demonstrative forms as topic markers then spread to other topical contexts. In Korowai, the clitic *-efè*, the cognate of the Wambon demonstrative *-eve* 'that', completely lost its function as a demonstrative term operator and now functions solely as a topic marker. In Urim the demonstrative form *pa* is primarily a topic marker but can still be used as a demonstrative term operator under specific pragmatic conditions.

Demonstrative-based topic markers occur with a wide range of types of topics in Papuan languages like Wambon, Korowai and Urim, both with topics that fully satisfy the criteria of 'aboutness', 'entity-status' and 'assumed familiarity' (e.g. Given Topics) and with topics that partly violate those notional criteria (New Topics, Frames) but that are treated as full Topics in the coding system of the language because they satisfy either the 'familiarity' criterion or the 'aboutness' criterion.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

3	third person
ATTR	attributive
CMP	completive marker
CONDIT	conditional
CONN	connective
COORD	coordinator
DS	Different Subject (switch-reference)
DUR	durative
F	Future
FG	Functional Grammar
GIVTOP	Given Topic
IMP	imperative
IN	inclusive
IO	indirect object



INDEF	indefinite
INTENT	intentional
IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative
NEG	negation
NF	Non-Future
PAST	past tense
PERF	perfective
PL	plural
PR	preposition
PRES	present
PROGR	progressive
SEQ	sequence
SG	singular
SS	Same Subject (switch-reference)
TOP	topic
TR	transitional sound

## 6. REFERENCES

- Bolkestein, A.Machtelt, Casper de Groot and J.Lachlan Mackenzie, eds, 1985. Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chafe, Wallace, 1987. Cognitive constraints on information flow. In: R.S. Tomlin, ed., Coherence and grounding in discourse, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 20-52..
- Clark, Herbert H. and Eveline V. Clark, 1977. Psychology and Language. An introduction to psycholinguistics. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- Bühler, Karl, 1934. Sprachtheorie: die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache. Jena: Gustav Fisher.
- Bühler, Karl, 1990. Theory of language: the representational function of language. Translated from the German by

- Donald Fraser Goodwin. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dik, Simon C., 1978. *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Dik, Simon C., 1983. Two constraints on relators and what they can do for us. In: S.C. Dik, ed., *Advances in Functional Grammar*, Dordrecht: Foris, pp. 267-298.
- Dik, Simon C., 1989. *The theory of Functional Grammar, Part 1, The structure of the clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ehlich, Konrad, 1982. Anaphora and Deixis: Same, Similar, or Different? In: R.J. Jarvella and W. Klein, eds, *Studies in Speech, Place and Action. Studies in Deixis and Related Topics*, London: Wiley, pp.315-338.
- Ehlich, Konrad, 1983. Deixis und Anapher. In: Gisa Rauh, ed., *Essays on Deixis*, Tübingen: Narr, pp. 79-97.
- Ehlich, Konrad, 1986. *Interjektionen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Ehlich, Konrad, 1989. Deictic expressions and the Connexity of text. In: M.E. Conte, J. Petöfi, E. Sözer, eds. *Text and discourse connectedness*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp.33-52.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., 1978. Stress, pronominalization and the given-new distinction. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics* 10: 1-13.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., 1988. Universals of topic-comment structure. In: M. Hammond et al, eds, *Studies in Syntactic Typology*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 209-239.
- Haiman, John, 1978. Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54: 564-589.
- Halliday, M.A.K., 1970. *Language structure and language*

- function. In: J. Lyons, ed., *New Horizons in Linguistics*, London: Pelican Books, pp. 140-165.
- Hannay, Mike, 1985, Inferrability, discourse-boundness and sub-topics. In: A. M. Bolkestein et al., eds, pp. 49-63.
- Healy, P.M., 1966. Levels and chaining in Telefō sentences. *Pacific Linguistics*, Series B, no.5.
- Hemmilä, Ritva, 1989. The demonstrative pronouns *pa* and *tī* in Urim discourse. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 20: 41-63.
- Jones, Linda K., 1988. In pursuit of discourse particles. *Notes on Linguistics* 43, 22-30.
- Longacre, Robert E., 1972. *Hierarchy and Universality of Discourse Constituents in New Guinea Languages: Discussion*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Lyons, John, 1977. *Semantics*. Two volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prince, Ellen, 1980. Towards a taxonomy of given-new information. In: P. Cole, ed., *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 223-256.
- Rehbein, Jochen, 1984. Remarks on the empirical analysis of action and speech. The case of question sequences in classroom discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 8: 49-63.
- Redder, Angelika, 1987. *Grammatiktheorie und sprachliches Handeln: denn und da*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Rombouts, Jan, 1991. *Handelingspatronen, procedures en partikels*. *Linguistica Antwerpiensia* 25: 197-232.
- Thurman, R.C., 1975. Chuave medial verbs. *Anthropological*

Linguistics 17: 342-352.

Vries, Lourens de, 1985. Topic and Focus in Wambon discourse.

In: A.M. Bolkestein et al., eds, pp. 155-180.

Vries, Lourens de, 1989. Studies in Wambon and Kombai. Aspects of two Papuan Languages of Irian Jaya. PhD dissertation

University of Amsterdam.

Vries, Lourens de, 1990. Some remarks on direct quotation in Kombai. In: Harm Pinkster and Inge Genée, eds, Unity in Diversity. Papers presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th birthday, Dordrecht: Foris, pp. 291-308.

Vries, Lourens de and Robinia Wiersma, 1992. The morpho-

logy of Wambon of the Irian Jaya Upper-Digul area.

With an introduction to its phonology. Verhandelungen series no. 151. Royal Institute of Linguistics and Anthropology. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Vries, Lourens de, 1993a. Notional and coded information roles. Working Papers in Functional Grammar 52, Dept. of General Linguistics, University of Amsterdam.

Vries, Lourens de, 1993b. Forms and functions in Kombai, an Awyu language of Irian Jaya. Pacific Linguistics. Series B, no. 108. Canberra: Australian National University Press.

Vries, Lourens de, 1993c. Clause combining in oral Trans-New Guinea languages. TEXT 13: 481-502.

Vries, Lourens de, and Gert van Enk (f.c.). The Korowai of Irian Jaya. Aspects of their language and oral tradition. Oxford University Press.

Westrum, Peter N, 1987. The Berik particle 'Ga'. NUSA 27: 49-

70.