Referential status and informational hierarchy in Natauran-Amis (Formosan)

Author(s): Bril, Isabelle

Referential status and informational hierarchy in Natauran-Amis (Formosan)

Isabelle BRIL

(LACITO-CNRS, LABEX EFL[1], Paris)

(Draft paper, do not quote without author's acceptance)

1. Introduction

Amis is an Austronesian language spoken on the eastern coast of Taiwan, with three main dialects (northern, central/coastal and southern, Tsuchida 1988). These dialects display differences in phonology, lexicon and morphosyntax. The present analysis bears on northern Amis (specifically Natauran Amis spoken around Hualien). Though the Amis group claims approximately 130.000 people, the actual number of speakers is much lower.

Here are some general features of Amis (East Formosan): the unmarked word order is predicate initial, arguments are marked for nominative (by *k-*), genitive (by *n-*), oblique (by *t-*) (Chen 1987, Huang 1995). Like some other Formosan languages, Amis has a fairly complex voice system: the two basic voices are Actor Voice (AV) marked by *mi-*, and Undergoer Voice (UV) marked by *ma-*. Secondary voices are the instrumental voice (INST) marked by *sa-* and locative voice (LOC) marked by *-an*.

In Actor Voice, the Actor is in the nominative and the theme is oblique (marked by *t-*). In all other voices (UV, INST, LOC), the pivot argument (whether undergoer, instrumental or locative) is in the nominative, while the Agent (if expressed) is in the genitive.

The voice system must be distinguished from discourse informational hierarchy. The voice system is based on the co-selection of an argument pivot in the nominative and a voice marker on the verb, with matching semantics. The choice of one of the two basic voice markers (AV *mi-*, UV *ma-*) correlates with various parameters: verbal semantic classes (Chen 1987, Wu 2006, Tsukida 2008), telicity, and to some more limited extent, definiteness and referentiality. *Mi-*verbs are actor-oriented activity verbs, while *ma-*verbs are undergoer- or experiencer-oriented. In the case of activity verbs which accept both AV *mi-* and UV *ma-*, the choice of *mi-* or *ma-* correlates with telicity: *mi-*verbs refer to atelic activities; transitive *ma-*verbs are generally telic, their nominative pivot is the semantic undergoer which is generally wholly affected, their agent, if mentioned, is in the genitive.

Pragmatic Informational Hierarchy (IH) is encoded by morphosyntactic strategies that are distinct from the voice system, and by distinct prosodic features.

Consider (1a), the verb is marked for Locative voice and is followed by its arguments. In (1b), the nominative pivot is left-dislocated as a pragmatic topic marked by the topic delimiter *iri* at its right edge.

(1) a. Tungangan-**an** n-uhni [**k-**uyaan ma-wacay-ay].
     mock-LOC.V   GEN-3PL   NOM-ANAPH UV-naked-NMZ
     'Those (who were) naked were mocked by them.' (Bril fieldwork, Buduy nu Pangcah.069)

Bril I.

(1) b. [Uyaan ma-wacay-ay **iri**,] tungangan-**an** n-uhni.
       ANAPH   UV-naked-NMZ TOP   mock-LOC.V   GEN-3PL
       'As for those (who were) naked, they were mocked by them.'

2. Referential status: Definiteness and indefiniteness

Indefinite entities are marked as bare nouns, so are definite entities with shared or unique reference that do not require any specific pinpointing. Definiteness is otherwise marked by a paradigm of deictic and anaphoric determiners or pronouns, with a three degree system for deictics. They also inflect for case: *k-* NOM; *n-* GEN; *t-* OBL.

dx1	**dx2**	**dx3**	**anaphoric**	
proximal	**medial**	**distal/visible**	**invisible/known**	
ini(a(n))	ina	ira	iya(n)	Natauran dialect
uni(an)	una	ura(an)	uya(an)	dialectal variations

2.1. Introducing new, indefinite entities in discourse

Brand new, indefinite entities are introduced in discourse by the existential/locative[2] verb *ira*, whose negative counterpart is *awa'ay*. Their argument is nominative.

(2)   **Ira** k-u suni.
      EXS   NOM-NM sound
      'There was a sound.' (Bril fieldwork)

  Ira may also be used with specific indefinite referents (i.e. specific at least for the speaker), which may be marked, as in (3), by a deictic or anaphoric determiner whose function is similar to the indefinite use of *this* in colloquial English ('there was *this* guy in the shop').

(3)   Ira **k-iya** cacay a remiad.
      EXS   NOM-ANAPH one   LNK day
      'One day …'' (Bril fieldwork, Lalagawan.018)

    The negative existential/locative verb *awa'ay* may also be used with an already referential entity marked by a deictic or anaphoric demonstrative as its nominative argument, as in (4).

(4)   Awa'ay=tu **k-inian** u nanum.
      NEG.EXS=PRF   NOM-DX1 NM water
      'There was no longer any (of the) water.' (that had flooded the land; before mentioned in the story) (Bril fieldwork)

2.2. Argument definiteness and voice selection

In some Philippine type languages (among which the often quoted Tagalog), the choice of voice correlates with the argument's referential status and definiteness: an indefinite patient triggers AV and bars UV constructions. This is not an absolute requirement in

---

[2] *Ira* certainly originates from a locative preposition *i* and a distal determiner *-ra* 'there' (Zeitoun 1999). When *ira* functions as a locative predicate, it is compatible with definite entities : *ira haw kisu* ? are you still there ?

Amis-Natauran: an activity verb with *mi-* Actor Voice may have a definite or indefinite theme (marked by *t-*), as in (5) and (10) respectively.

(5)   **Mi**-sangaq=tu haw **t-u**   batikar k-isu ?
       AV-make=PRF   QM   OBL.NM   bicycle   NOM-2sg
       'Have you repaired the bicycle ?' (Bril fieldwork)

The theme of an extended intransitive construction with the Undergoer Voice *ma-* may be indefinite as in (6).

(6)   **Ma**-talaw cira   **t-u**   kawas.
       UV-fear   NOM.3SG   OBL-NM   spirit
       'He's afraid of spirits.' (Chen 1987: 272)

Transitive *ma-* Undergoer Voice constructions allow indefinite nominative pivots, like the indefinite pronoun *cima a tamdaw* in (7):

(7)   **Ma**-melaw numaku [**k-u**   cima a   tamdaw].
       UV-see   GEN.1sg   NOM-NM   who   LNK   person
       'I saw someone.' (Bril fieldwork)

2.3. Avoidance of indefinite pronouns as arguments

Yet, despite cases such as (7) above, there is a clear tendency to avoid indefinite pronouns as nominative pivots and to use existential predicates instead, as in other Philippine type languages. Thus, in (8), a deverbal gerund noun marked by *–ay* (referring to the actor) stands as the nominative argument of the existential verb *ira*, while in (9), the deverbal noun *tayni-ay* functions as the modifier of an indefinite ontological noun *tamdaw*.

(8)   Ira   k-u   tayni-**ay**.
       EXS   NOM-NM   arrive-NMZ
       'Someone is coming.' (lit. there's a comer) (Bril fieldwork)

(9)   Awa'ay hen k-u   tayni-**ay** n-u/a   tamdaw.
       NEG.EXS   still   NOM-NM   arrive-NMZ GEN-NM/LNK   person
       'Nobody has arrived yet.' (lit. there is no coming person) (Bril fieldwork)

3. Informational hierarchy

Let us now turn to informational hierarchy, topic and focus constructions. These terms are defined after Lambrecht (1994) and Krifka (2007).
(i) Topics are *frames* about which something, which constitutes the comment, is predicated. Topics are definite, referential entities, already present in discourse (Lambrecht 1994).
(ii) The focus is "the pragmatically non-recoverable element in an utterance (i.e. the assertion)." (Lambrecht 1994: 207). Cleft focus constructions comprise an asserted restrictor (the focus, which saturates a variable) and the presuppositional content (Krifka 2007).

3.1. Some distinctive features of topics and foci : left-dislocated topics vs. cleft foci

In Amis-Natauran, frames/topics and restrictors display distinctive morpho-syntactic and prosodic features. Left-dislocated topics are clause external and stand in sentence initial position, followed by a slight pause, rising intonation, and possible additional markers (*iri*) bounding their right edge.

(10) Tata'ang-ay a   quner **iri**, mi-ka'en t-u   tamdaw sa.
      big-MODF   LNK snake TOP AV-eat OBL-NM people   say
      'The big snake, it ate people.' (Bril fieldwork, 'uner.0007)

In cleft focus constructions such as (11), the exhaustive focus/restrictor (*u sakubad*) is predicative, and like all predicates, stands in clause initial position followed by its clausal argument which is marked as the nominative pivot by *k-u*, and which contains the presupposition.

(11) **U sakubad** [**k-u**   sa-ka-rebahuy [a ta-ira   i   Taulayang a   mi-adup]].
      NM wing   NOM-NM INST-NFIN-fly   CMP go-there LOC T.   CMP AV-hunt
      predicate/focus   <   argument/presupposition   >
      '*Wings* are what they used to fly and arrive at Taulayang to hunt.' (Bril fieldwork, Lalagawan.020)

Prosodically, there is a slight pause and rising intonation after the dislocated topic/frame; while the cleft restrictor/focus and the presupposition constitute one prosodic unit, without pause between them. On the other hand, the focus/restrictor is prosodically salient and stressed; this is the main criterion distinguishing it from a sentence initial predicate in a declarative sentence.

Examples (12-13) respectively display a left-dislocated topic *aku* (12) (followed by a pause), and a cleft focus/restrictor *aku* (13) which is predicative and followed by a nominative pivot argument (*ku kaka*).

(12) **Aku**, maka-tengil ma-rarum=tu   **k-aku**.
      FR.1SG ABIL-hear   UV-sad=PRF   NOM-1SG
      'As for me, (you) can hear that I am sad.' (Bril fieldwork, Cabay=aku.00153)

(13) "**Aku k-u**   kaka,   manay ci   kaka=isu."
      FR.1SG NOM-NM older.sibling so   PM older.sibling=GEN.2sg
      '*I'm* the elder, so I'm your elder sibling.' (Cabay=aku. 00144)

Compare a left-dislocated topic *ci Bulad* in (14) (two protagonists, Moon and Sun, are contrasted), with a cleft exhaustive focus *ci Cidal* in (15a).

(14) nika   ci Bulad,// ca'ay ka-ta-tudung.
      but   PM Moon   NEG   NFIN-Ca-apt
      'but as for Moon, he is not suited (for this).' (Bril fieldwork, U teker ni Adek.010)

In (15a) the focus/restrictor *ci Cidal* is predicative and marked as perfect; its nominative argument contains the presupposition. *Ci Cidal* is prosodically salient, but the sentence makes up one prosodic entity without pause. Compare with the declarative statement in (15b):

(15) a Ci Cidal=tu **k-u**   mi-kutay-ay.
        PM Sun=PRF   NOM-NM AV-replace-NMZ
        'It was Sun who was the substitute/replaced (him).'/ '*Sun* was the substitute.' (U teker ni Adek.018)

(15) b. Mi-kutay=tu ci Cidal.
        AV-replace=PRF PM Sun
        'Sun replaced (him).'

3.2. Focus constructions

Informative/cleft foci have distinct morphosyntactic properties from *in situ* foci which are now briefly presented (and are developed under §§4, 5, 6).

3.2.1. Informative foci and cleft foci

Informative foci answering open WH- questions such as *ma'an* '(be/do) what?' in (16b) are not formally distinct for cleft, restrictive focus constructions answering closed questions such as (18b). In both cases, the clause-initial focus is predicative, its argument containing the presupposition is in the nominative.

(16) a. U ma'an **k-u**   demak numisu ?
      NM what NOM-NM work GEN.2SG
     'What work do you do ? (lit. it is 'what' your work?) (Bril fieldwork)

(16) b. U kingcal **k**-aku.
      NM policeman NOM-1SG
     'I'm a policeman.' (Bril fieldwork)

In (17a), the WH- word *ma'an* is used as an interrogative verb 'do what?' and is inflected for instrumental voice (*sa-pi-ma'an* 'used what for?'), like the focal verb form *sa-pi-cikcik* in the answer (17b).

(17) a. **Sa-pi-**ma'an=isu   **k-**unian a pu'ut ?
      INST-NFIN-do.what?=GEN.2SG NOM-DX1 LNK knife
     'what do you use this knife for ?'

(17) b. **Sa-pi-**cikcik=aku   **k**-unian a pu'ut.
      INST-NFIN-cut=GEN.1SG NOM-DX1 LNK knife
     'I use this knife *to cut*.' (lit. this knife is used by me for cutting) (Bril fieldwork)

On the other hand, closed questions with a cleft argument in predicate function, as in (18a), trigger restrictive, exhaustive or contrastive foci such as (18b) which are prosodically more salient and stressed than informative foci.

(18) a. Nacila [**na isu** haw] **k-u**   tayni-ay ?
      yesterday PST FR.2SG EPIS NOM-NM arrive-NMZ
     'Is it *you* who came yesterday ?' (lit. is it you the arriver?) (Bril fieldwork)

(18) b. Ca'ay ka=aku,   [**u saba**=**aku**]   **k-u**   tayni-ay.
      NEG CONEG=FR.1SG NM young.sibling=GEN.1SG NOM-NM arrive-NMZ
     'No it's not *me*, it's *my younger brother* who came.' (Bril fieldwork)

Cleft constructions trigger some syntactic restructuring. Compare the declarative sentence in (19a) with the cleft in (19b), where the exhaustive, contrastive cleft actor *ma-tu'as-ay* 'parents' is predicative and marked for past tense by *na*. The deverbal actor *mi-diput-ay* 'educator' is its nominative pivot, and contains the presupposition.

(19) a. Na mi-diput **k-u**   ma-tu'as-ay i-takuan.
      PST AV-protect NOM-NM UV-old-NMZ LOC-1SG.OBL
     '(My) parents brought me up.' (Bril fieldwork)

(19) b. Na ma-tu'as-ay **k-u** mi-diput-ay.
 PST UV-old-NMZ NOM-NM AV-protect-NMZ
 'It was (my) parents who brought (me) up.' (lit. it was (my) parents who were (the) educators) (Bril fieldwork, urip nu Balah.007)

3.2.2. *In situ* **foci**

While cleft foci are predicative, involve some syntactic restructuration and are semantically exhaustive and/or contrastive, *in situ* salient foci do not trigger any syntactic restructuration, they retain their function in the sentence, and simply carry illocutionary force. *In situ* foci are marked by postposed quotative and similative forms, used mostly in their perfect form *sa=tu*, *han=tu* as focal markers. In (20), the *in situ* focus noun *Pangcah* 'Amis people' under the scope of *han=tu* is part of a left-dislocated NP (*iya Pangcah*) marked at its right edge by the delimiting, sequential topic marker *iri*.

(20) [Iya Pangcah **han**=**tu** **iri**], **ma**-bukil a si-buduy.
 ANAPH Amis do.thus=PRF TOP UV-ignorant CMP have-clothes
 'As for the *Amis*, they were ignorant of how to dress.' (Buduy nu Pangcah.006)

In situ salient foci will be further analysed in §4.

3.3. Topic constructions

Topics also subdivide into various types. Left-dislocated topics stand in sentence initial position followed by a pause and rising intonation, possibly marked at their right edge by *i(ri)*, which is also a sequential marker 'and then'. Sequential connectors are a frequent origin of topic markers in various Austronesian languages (others being additive or adversative coordinators, see Bril 2007, 2011).

3.3.1. Autonomous, detached topics

Not all detached topics are syntactic constituents (argument or adjunct) of the clause with which they are pragmatically associated; some of them are "syntactically autonomous, extra-clausal elements" (Lambrecht 1994: 193) standing in loose relationship with the rest of the sentence and providing a general frame. In (21), *kilakilangan* 'in the forest' is such an autonomous, loose locative frame.

(21) [Kilakilang-an], ira k-u buhang n-iya kilang, kay itini=tu.
 RED-forest-OBL EXS NOM-NM hole GEN-ANAPH tree perhaps here=PRF
 'In the forest, there was a hole in that tree, perhaps it (the frog) was there.' (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.077)

Example (22) also illustrates a loosely connected topic:

(22) [Ina tumuk ngangan], ca'ay=tu k-ami ka-banaq t-ina tumuk
 DX2 chief name NEG=PRF NOM-1P.EXCL NFIN-know OBL-DX2 chief
 'As for the chief's name, we no longer know the chief

 n-ina Cikasuan.
 GEN-DX2 Cikasuan
 'of the Cikasuan.' (Bril fieldwork, Cikasuan.020)

3.3.2. Neutral topic-comment equative constructions

Equative constructions ('identity statement') such as (23-24) also take the form of topic-comment constructions, but are distinct from left-dislocated topic constructions in that the pause is shorter (marked by /) and no topic marker appears.

(23)   Ci   ama=aku/   ci Buting Sabung, ci ina=aku/   ci   Lahuk   u   Buting.
       PM   father=GEN.1SG   PM Buting Sabung   PM mother=GEN.1SG PM   Lahuk   NM Buting
       'My father was Buting Sabung, my mother was Lahuk u Buting.' (urip nu Balah.005)

(24)   U   kaka/   u   babahiy-an,   u   saba/   u   babainay-an.
       NM   elder.sibling NM girl-LOC   NM   younger.sibling NM boy-LOC
       'The elder child was female, the younger was male.' (Bril fieldwork, Flooding.0011)

Equative constructions are pragmatically 'neutral' topic-comment constructions, in contrast with left-dislocated topic constructions which are pragmatically marked.

3.3.3. Left-dislocated topics

Left-dislocated topics are followed by a longer pause (marked by //) with clear rising intonation. All arguments and adjuncts (location, time, etc.) can be left-dislocated. Left-dislocated arguments are unmarked for case, their syntactic function within the clause is retrievable *in situ*.

— *Optionality of topic marker* iri

The topic marker is optional, for instance in parallel topic constructions such as (25a), which displays two left-dislocated, parallel topics (*babainay* 'boy' and *babahi* 'girl') followed by their comment clause.

(25)a. [U babainay//, ci Bulad k-u   ni-pa-ngangan],
         NM boy   PM Moon   NOM-NM   PRF.NMZ-CAUS-name
         'As for the boy, Moon is the name given (to him),

         [u babahi//, ci Cidal   k-u   ni-pa-ngangan].
         NM girl   PM Sun   NOM-NM   PRF.NMZ-CAUS-name
         the girl, Sun is the name given (to her).' (Bril fieldwork, U teker ni Adek.004)

Compare with the focus construction in (25b) :

(25)b. Ci   Bulad ku   ni-pa-ngangan   nu   babainay.
        PM   Moon   NOM   PRF.NMZ-CAUS-name GEN boy
        '*Moon* is the name given to the boy.'

3.4. Syntax of left-dislocated topics vs. cleft foci constructions

Here are some syntactic features of left-dislocated topics and cleft foci.

3.4.1. Left-dislocated topics

Left-dislocated arguments are outside the clause and unmarked for case, their syntactic function within the clause is sometimes retrievable by functional traces, as in (26) where the left-dislocated NP (*ina kapah ci Adek*) is co-indexed by the possessive determiner *n-ira*:

(26) [Ina kapah ci Adek], ira haw k-u   balucuq n-ira.
      DX2 youth   PM Adek   EXS EPIS NOM-NM   heart   GEN-3SG
      'As for that young Adek, he had a plan.' (Bril fieldwork, U teker ni Adek.057)

In (27a) the left-dislocated agent *uhni si-kawas-ay* is unmarked for case, while in the
neutral predication (27b), it is marked as the genitive agent (*n-uhni si-kawas-ay*) :

(27)a. [**Uhni** si-kawas-ay], ma-araw=tu k-iya   isaw.
       FP.3PL have-spirit-NMZ UV-see=PRF   NOM-ANAPH surely
       'They the shamans, (they) can see that surely.' (lit. this can surely be seen by them)
       (Bril fieldwork, Cabay aku.00116)

(27)b. Ma-araw=tu k-iya   {**n-uhni** si-kawas-ay} isaw.
       UV-see=PRF   NOM-ANAPH GEN.3PL   have-spirit-NMZ surely
       'The shamans can see that surely.' (lit. that is seen by the shamans) (Bril fieldwork)

On the other hand, adjuncts can be dislocated with their prepositional markers :

(28) … **i** putal **iri**, ta, ma-peciq k-iya   kureng.
       LOC outside TOP then UV-break   NOM-ANAPH jar
      '... outside, then the jar was broken.' (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.047)

3.4.2. Clefts

Cleft arguments also appear as case-less predicative entities in sentence initial position,
their case form is co-indexed on the deverbal argument marked for nominative by *k-u* and
which contains the presupposition. In (18b) repeated from above, the deverbal nominative
argument is marked by the actor gerund form *–ay*.

(18)b. [**U** **saba**=**aku**]   **k-u**   tayni-ay.
       NM young.sibling=GEN.1SG NOM-NM arrive-NMZ
       'It's my younger brother who came.' (lit. the comer) (Bril fieldwork)

In (11), (also repeated from above) the cleft focus *u sakubad* 'wings' is predicative and
has a deverbal argument (*sa-ka-rebahuy*) marked as nominative by *k-u* and containing the
presupposition. This deverbal argument is marked for instrumental voice by *sa-* and the
cleft NP *sakubad* is co-indexed for instrumental semantics with it.

(11) [**U** **sakubad**] **k-u**   sa-ka-rebahuy.
       NM wing   NOM-NM INST-NFIN-fly
      '*Wings* are what they used to fly.' (Bril fieldwork, Lalagawan.020)

While cleft core arguments are unmarked for case, prepositional adjuncts and oblique
arguments are cleft in sentence-initial position with their prepositional marker or their
case-marking, without any impact on the voice system within the clause. In (29a), the
locative adjunct marked by preposition *i* is predicative and marked for past tense by *na*.

(29)a. [**Na i** Tayliku haw] **k-**isu a mi-nanam t-u   suwal   n-u   Hulam ?
       PST LOC China   EPIS NOM-2SG CMP AV-know OBL-NM language GEN-NM Chinese
       'Was it in mainland China that you learnt the language of Chinese ?' (Bril fieldwork)

Compare with the declarative sentence:

(29) b. Mi-nanam **k**-aku t-u suwal n-u Hulam **i** Tayliku.
　　　AV-know　　NOM-1SG OBL-NM language GEN-NM Chinese LOC China
　　　'I learnt Chinese in mainland China.' (Bril fieldwork)

Cleft oblique arguments also retain their case marking, like *ci ama-**an*** in (30).

(30)　Ci ama-**an**=aku **k**-aku a mi-nanam.
　　　PM father-OBL=GEN.1SG NOM-1SG CMP AV-learn
　　　'It's from my father that I learned.' (Bril fieldwork, wawa nu Ciwidian.112)

3.4.3. Cleft within a subordinate clause

Clefts may be extracted from a subordinate clause. In (31a), the cleft focus *ci Kilang* is predicative, marked for past tense, prosodically salient. Its nominative argument is the gerund clause that contains the presupposition.

(31) a. Ma-banaq k-aku [[**na ci Kilang**] [**k-u** mi-araw-ay t-iya tamdaw-an]],
　　　UV-know　　NOM-1SG PST PM Kilang　　NOM-NM AV-meet-NMZ OBL-ANAPH person-OBL
　　　< main clause > <focus predicate> < sentential argument, presupposition >
　　　'I know it was Kilang who met that person,

Compare with the declarative clause in (31b) :

(31) b. Ma-banaq k-aku mi-araw ci Kilang t-iya tamdaw-an.
　　　UV-know　　NOM-1SG AV-meet PM Kilang OBL-ANAPH person-OBL
　　　'I know that Kilang met that person.'

3.5. Discourse strategies and their combinations

Example (32) displays a sequence of various strategies: a **detached topic** (in bold), followed by a *topic frame clause* (in italics) and a restrictive <u>focus</u> (underlined).

(32)　Hay **wawa**, *uru u ca'ay-ay hen pi-kikung*,
　　　yes child that.one NM NEG-NMZ still NFIN-marry
　　　'Yes (among) the **children**, *that one who's still unmarried*,

　　　<u>uraan=tu a cacay</u> k-u sa-simsim-en nu niyam.
　　　DX3=PRF LNK one NOM-NM Ca-think-PASS GEN GEN.1PL.EXC
　　　<u>it was about that one</u> only that we have concerns.' (lit. it is that one which is our concern) (Bril fieldwork, urip nu Balah.083-084)

In order to illustrate how brand new entities or participants are first introduced in discourse, then flagged, some excerpts from a story (*Frog story*) are now presented in their sequential order of appearance.

In (ref.3), ex. (33)), *kungku* 'story' is left-dislocated and turned into an emphatic, focal topic by a stylistic device which repeats the topicalised NP, once in its neutral form, unmarked for case (*ina kungku*) and the second time under its oblique form (*t-ina kungku*). An optional focus marker appears between them, the markers *sa=tu* or *han=tu*, which are respectively the perfect forms of the quotative verb *sa* 'say' and of the similative verb *han* 'do thus, be thus', both of which also serve as evidential (second-hand information) markers. In the second part of the sentence, new participants are introduced by the existential verb *ira*.

(33) **Ina** kungku **sa=tu** **t-ina** kungku, **ira** k-u wawa, **ira** k-u wacu,
      Dx2 story say=PRF OBL-dx story EXS NOM-NM child EXS NOM-NM dog
      'As for the *topic* of this story, there is a child, a dog

      ira k-u tatakulaq.
      EXS NOM-NM frog
      and a frog.'

When the 'child' is reactivated again in (ref.5, ex. 34) with the existential verb *ira*, since he is already referential, the anaphoric determiner *k-iya* appears. Thus *ira ku wawa* in (33) introduces a brand new participant, while *ira k-iya wawa* (34) is an anaphoric reactivation.

\ref **Frog story.005**

(34) Sulinay, **ira** **k-iya** wawa, …
      indeed EXS NOM-ANAPH child
      'indeed, there is this child …'

In (ref.8, ex. 35), a **topic shift** triggers the emphatic construction used for focal entities within topic expressions, with the repeated topic NP, once neutral (unmarked for case), then oblique, and the occurrence of the similative verb *han=tu* between them, signalling some *in situ* focus. The topic marker *iri* stands at the right edge of the left-dislocated NP.

\ref **Frog story.008**

(35) a. **ya** tatakulaq **han**=tu **t-iya** tatakulaq **iri**,
       ANAPH frog do.thus=PRF OBL-ANAPH frog TOP
       < neutral > < oblique >
       'as for that *frog*,

       pa-tayra-(**a**)**n** n-iya wawa **iri**, ma-ha'en-ay u puduk.
       CAUS-go-LOC.V GEN-ANAPH child SEQ UV-be.thus-MODF NM bottle
       'it was put by the child then, (in) what seems a kind of bottle.'

In (35a), the pragmatic, left-dislocated topic *(i)ya tatakulaq* 'frog' is unmarked for case, its syntactic function is retrievable in the main clause as the pivot of the verb in locative voice *pa-tayra-an*. The neutral construction given in (35b) shows *tatakulaq* to be the nominative pivot :

(35) b. Pa-tayra-(**a**)**n** n-iya wawa **k-**iya tatakulaq.
       CAUS-go-LOC.V GEN-ANAPH child NOM-ANAPH frog
       'That frog was put [there] by the child.'

4. The pragmatic functions of *satu* and *hantu*

  The pragmatic functions of *sa=tu* and *han=*tu (the perfect forms of the similative verb *han* 'do so' and the quotative verb *sa* 'do, say') are now analysed in more detail. Both have quotative functions as shown by (36-37). *Han* may have undergoer or actor pivot, while *sa* only has actor pivot.

(36)   "Kapah=tu   haw   k-isu ?"   **han**=aku   k-u   cabay.
     good=PRF   EPIS   NOM-2SG   do.so=GEN.1SG   NOM-NM   friend
     '« Are you fine ? » I said to my friend.' (lit. my friend my told by me) (Bril fieldwork,
     Cabay aku.00082)

(37)   "Ta haw"   **sa**=tu   k-iya   niyaruq.
     go EPIS   say=PRF   NOM-ANAPH   villager
     '« Let's go ? » said the villagers.'

4.1. *Han=tu* and *sa=tu* as evidential verbs and voice marking substitutes

Han=tu and *sa=tu* may function are substitutes of voice markers (UV *ma-* & AV *mi-*) with an evidential component. *Han=tu* is compatible with AV or UV construction types, whereas *sa=tu* only accepts AV construction types. Their use is a discourse strategy that stands in contrast with the declarative voice constructions with *ma-* and *mi-*.

  In (38) below, the clause *kalat hantu niya deku kiya wawa* 'the child was pecked by the owl', is syntactically (but not pragmatically) equivalent to a transitive *ma-* UV construction, with similarly case-marked arguments, i.e. a nominative undergoer pivot *kiya wawa*, and a genitive agent *niya deku*. But *kalat han=tu* is stressed and carries illocutionary force. In the second part of (38), the same information is repeated in a pragmatically neutral way with a verb in locative voice (*kalat-an*).

  The topic clause at the beginning of the sentence, *na ma-ha'en iri* 'this being so then' sums up the situation (the sentence preceding (38) states that the owl was irritated by their noise) and prepares for the consequence.

(38)   [Na ma-ha'en **iri**], kalat **han**=**tu**   n-iya   deku k-iya   wawa,
     PST UV-be.thus TOP bite   do.thus=PRF   GEN-ANAPH owl   NOM-ANAPH   child
     'After that/this being so, the child was *pecked* by the owl,

     kalat-**an**   nu   deku k-iya   wawa sa'an.
     bite-LOC.V   GEN   owl   NOM-ANAPH   child   EVID
     'the child was pecked by the owl.' (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.085-86)

  Compare with the declarative construction *ma-kalat* in (39):

(39)   [Na ma-ha'en **iri**], **ma**-kalat n-iya   deku k-iya   wawa.
     PST UV-be.thus TOP UV-bite   GEN-ANAPH owl   NOM-ANAPH   child
     'After that, the child was pecked by the owl.'

  What then is at stake in the choice between those three constructions ?
-     a similative verb : *kalat **han**=**tu** niya deku kiya wawa*
-     a locative voice : *kalat-**an** niya deku kiya wawa*
-     an undergoer voice : ***ma**-kalat niya deku kiya wawa*

  All of them have the undergoer as their nominative pivot and a genitive agent. Differences thus lie in discourse effects and semantic perspectives.
-     The construction *kalat han=tu* makes the verb and event, focal and salient, carrying illocutionary force with some evidential component (signalling indirect evidence); it signals a shift of perspective, and possible contrast.
-     The locative voice *kalat-an* simply refers to a state of affairs.
-     The undergoer voice *ma-kalat* is a plain declarative statement, generally expressing some achievement.

Similar observations hold for *sa=tu* in (40a), *simsim sa=tu* is focal, with some evidential stance, while *mi-simsim* (40b) is a declarative actor voice whose informational content is entirely new (it could answer a question such as 'what happened then?'). The construction with *sa=tu* has the same argument structure as an AV *mi-* construction.

(40) a. Simsim **sa=tu** k-u   binaulan… vs.   b.   **Mi**-simsim k-u   binaulan…
       think   say=PRF NOM-NM people   AV-think   NOM-NM people
       'The people *thought*…'   'The people thought…'

Han=tu and *sa=tu* thus have pragmatic functions operating *in situ* focus and carrying illocutionary force.

4.2. *In situ* verbal focus with *hantu* and *satu*

There is some more complication in that *sa=tu* and *han=tu* may scope over a verb already marked for voice as in (41). Thus, the verb *ma-qepud*, which is part of a topic clause marked by *iri*, is made focal by *sa=tu*.

(41)   [Ma-qepud **sa=tu iri**], "bahaw u   lilac=isu" sa   c-ina=aku.
       UV-come.down say=PRF TOP   ONOM   NM dirt=GEN.2S say   PM-mother=GEN.1SG
       '(the souls) having *come down* then, "woah! How dirty you are ! (lit. the dirt of yours) my mother said.' (Bril fieldwork, Cabay aku.0113-114)

In such cases, since the verbs are already voice-marked, *sa=tu* and *han=tu* are not voice substitute strategies (of the type analysed in §4.1 above), they give pragmatic focal saliency to a verb/event within the larger domain of a frame/topic clause.

4.3. *In situ* NP focus with *hantu* and *satu*

Han=tu and *sa=tu* are not restricted to predicate focus as in (41). They also focus NPs with selective or contrastive meaning, signalling a shift in perspective or lending some focal contrastive value to some entity. In (42), *sa-kaka-ay* which is part of a left-dislocated topic NP (*inian u sa-kaka-ay* 'as for the eldest') is thus made focal by *han=tu*.

(42)   [Inian u   sa-kaka-ay   **han=tu**],   **mi**-sangaq-ay t-uinian u   lumaq.
       DX1   NM SUP-elder-MODF do.thus=PRF AV-build-NMZ   OBL-DX1 NM house
       'As for the *eldest one*, he works in house-building (lit. he's a builder of houses).' (Bril fieldwork, Urip nu Balah.025)

— *Emphatic left-dislocated topics with* in situ *focal han=tu and sa=tu*

Han=tu and *sa=tu* also appear in emphatic left-dislocated topic constructions with a repeated topic NP displaying different case-marking:
  - (i) either neutral and oblique cases with *sa=tu* (in keeping with their AV pattern)
  - (ii) neutral and oblique, or neutral and genitive cases with *han=tu* (respectively in keeping with their AV or UV patterns).
These emphatic constructions generally signal contrastive topics or topic shifts, as in (43); the sentence preceding (43) is about the frog:

(43)   Sulinay, [**iya** wacu **han=tu**   **n-iya**   wacu   **iri**],
       indeed   ANAPH dog   be.thus=PRF GEN-ANAPH dog   TOP
       'Indeed, as for *that dog* thus,

    mi-kilim   t-iya   galasu a   kureng hananay.
    <small>AV-look.for   OBL-ANAPH glass   LNK   jar   so.called</small>
    (he's) looking (in) that glass jar, like that.' (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.038)

Example (44) also signals a change of topic; the preceding sentence mentions the water's shallowness and the consequent ability to ford the river:

(44)   Tuwa, [wacu **han**=**tu**   **nu** wacu **iri**], tebuy-en=tu n-ira   a   mi-lakec.
        <small>then   dog   be.thus=PRF GEN dog   TOP carry-PASS=PRF GEN-3SG CMP AV-ford</small>
        'Then as for *the dog*, it was carried by him (the child) to ford (the river).' (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.110)

5. Informational hierarchy at clause level

    Clauses can also be turned into topics or made focal by similar means.

5.1. Clausal topics with *iri*: sequential, forwarding perspective

Left-detached clausal topics, optionally marked by *iri* and a pause, function as pragmatically backgrounded clauses, adjoined to the following clause. They are the frame and anchor for the propositional content of the other clause, which contains the assertion. In (45), the clausal topic bounded by *iri* 'then' is the backgrounded frame, sequentially leading to the event of the following main clause that states the new information.

(45)   [Sulinay mi-kilim k-iya   wacu **iri**],
        <small>indeed   AV-look.for NOM-ANAPH dog   TOP</small>
        'Indeed, (as) the dog is searching,

        mukmuk-an n-ira   k-iya   kureng.
        <small>stuck-LOC.V   GEN-ANAPH NOM-ANAPH jar</small>
        he gets stuck into the glass jar.' (lit. the jar was his trap) (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.040)

  But the pragmatic and discourse effects of topic-comment structure are distinct from the syntactic functions of voice and choice of pivots.
  Sentence internally, a voice shift is observed (from AV *mi-kilim* to the locative deverbal form *mukmuk-an*), also triggering a shift of syntactic pivot: the *dog* is the actor pivot of AV *mi-kilim*, while the *jar* is the nominative pivot of the locative form *mukmuk-an*. The shift of syntactic pivot also shifts the centre of attention, and the semantic perspective from an activity to a resulting state of affairs.

    Example (46) shows a clausal topic *na ma-ha'en iri* 'this being so/after that' with anaphoric and forwarding functions. The sentence preceding (46) mentions the chasing of the dog by the bees, *na ma-ha'en iri* thus forwards the story, shifting the perspective to the boy who is peeking into the hole of a tree, wondering whether the frog might be hiding there.

(46)   Tuwa, [na ma-ha'en **iri**], ira k-uyu   buhang n-iya   tatakulaq saan haw,
        <small>then,   PST UV-be.thus TOP EXS NOM-ANAPH hole   GEN-ANAPH frog   EVID EPIS</small>
        'Then, this being so then, 'is that the frog's hole?' he thinks.' (Frog story.064)

  And the next sentence concludes :

ca'ay ka u buhang n-u tatakulaq.
NEG CONEG NM hole GEN-NM frog
'It was not a frog's terrier.' (Frog story.064)

5.2. Focal shifts with *sa=tu* and *han=tu*

In contrast with the sequential and forwarding effect of *iri* in *na ma-ha'en iri* (46), in (47), the verb *na ma-ha'en* is made focal by *sa=tu* expressing focal shift, with selective and contrastive pragmatic functions. The sentence preceding (47) mentions the freeing of the dog's head from the jar; then comes sentence (47) with *sa=tu* expressing evidential stance, and conveying focal shift and focal saliency effects to the clause under its scope.

(47)   Tuwa, [na ma-ha'en **sa**=**tu**], ma-hkulung=tu k-uhni tara i putal.
         then, PST UV-be.thus say=PRF UV-go.together=PRF NOM-3PL go LOC outside
         'Then, this *being so*, they went together outside.' (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.055)

6. Interaction of pragmatics and syntax in focus constructions

Cleft arguments trigger some syntactic reorganisation that departs from the basic order of a declarative sentence, and that interacts with the system of verbal voices and syntactic pivots. The following examples are cases of cleft exhaustive foci answering questions.

6.1. Wh- questions

In (48a) *cima* 'who?' is predicative, its nominative argument is the gerund clause that contains the presupposition. In (48b), the cleft free pronoun *aku* is stressed and lengthened (/aku:/), it is predicative, marked for perfect (by *=tu*), its nominative argument is the gerund clause form.

(48) a**.** [**Cima**] [**k-u** mi-senat-ay t-u taruduq numisu ?]
         who NOM-NM AV-cut-NMZ OBL-NM finger GEN.2SG
         'Who cut your finger ?' (lit. who is it the cutter of your finger) (Bril fieldwork)

(48) b.   [**Aku**:=tu] **k-u** mi-senat-ay t-u taruduq n-u tireng.
         FR.1SG=PRF NOM-NM AV-cut-NMZ OBL-NM finger GEN-NM self/body
         '**I** cut my own finger.' (lit. <u>it was me</u> the cutter of my finger) (Bril fieldwork)

The cleft pronoun *aku* in (48b) is coindexed with the actor pivot of the gerund AV verb *mi-senat-ay*; this is evidenced by the declarative clause (48c) where the 1st person pronoun takes the nominative form (*k-aku*).

(48) c.   Mi-senat k-aku t-u taruduq n-u tireng.
         AV-cut NOM-1SG OBL-NM finger GEN-NM self/body
         'I cut my own finger.' (Bril fieldwork)

6.2. Closed questions

In closed questions (49a), the segment that is focused and questioned (*unian a pu'ut*) is cleft, focused, predicative and marked for past tense by *na*; its nominative argument is the gerund clause containing a deverbal form marked for instrumental voice by *sa-*. In (49b), the predicative focus (*uraan a hawan*), also marked for past tense, is coindexed with the syntactic pivot of the instrumental voice. The declarative clause in (49c) shows *k-uraan a hawan* to be the nominative pivot of the verb form marked for instrumental voice.

(49)a. [Na unian a   pu'ut haw] **k**-u   **sa**-pi-cikcik numisu t-u   titi ?
        PST DX1   LNK knife   EPIS NOM-NM INST-NFIN-cut GEN.2SG OBL-NM meat
     'Was it with this knife that you cut the meat ?' (Bril fieldwork)

(49)b. Ca'ay ka-unian, [na uraan   a   hawan] **k**-u   **sa**-pi-cikcik=aku
        NEG   CONEG-DX1   PST DX3   LNK machete NOM-NM INST-NFIN-cut=GEN.1SG
     'No, it's not with this one, <u>it was with that machete</u> that I cut

     t-ina   titi-an.
     OBL-DX2   meat-OBL
     that meat.' (Bril fieldwork)

(49)c. **Sa**-pi-cikcik=aku   t-ina   titi-an   **k**-uraan a   hawan.
        INST-NFIN-cut=GEN.1SG   OBL-DX2   meat-OBL   NOM-DX3 LNK machete
     'I cut the meat with that machete.' (lit. that machete is used by me to cut the meat) (Bril fieldwork)

7. Conclusion & main results

To conclude, indefinite, new entities are introduced in discourse by existential clauses, which are also used to reactivate already referential entities.

Definiteness has limited impact on the choice of AV *mi-* and UV *ma-* voices. Huang Shuanfan (2002) also showed that in Seediq (Formosan) "although some AV clauses take non-referential patients, lexical patients in NAV (non-actor voice) are not significantly more referential and/or definite than those in AV clauses.

Concerning Informational Hierarchy, left-dislocated topics are marked by a pause and by the optional marker *iri*. Focus constructions fall under two main subtypes: cleft/restrictive foci and *in situ* foci. Since cleft foci are predicative and thus sentence initial, only stress and salient prosody distinguish them from neutral declarative predications which are also predicate initial. By contrast, *in situ* foci, which are not predicative, retain their function and position within the clause; they are marked by postposed quotative and similative forms originating from two verbs mostly in their perfect form (*sa=tu*, *han=tu*) and also used as evidential verbs signalling second-hand information.

Pragmatic devices (topic, focus) interact with the syntactic-semantic voice system, but at distinct levels and with distinct functions. Informational Hierarchy operates at the level of discourse organization, while voice selection is triggered by various factors such as verb classes, active/stative semantics, telicity, patient affectedness, and, to some extent, argumentative effects.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bril, Isabelle. 2011 [2007]. Coordination, information hierarchy and subordination in some Austronesian languages". In Azeb Amha, Christian J. Rapold, Sascha Völlmin and Silvia Zaugg-Coretti (eds), *Converbs, medial verbs, clause chaining and related issues.* 213-243. *Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter* 19. Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

— 2010. Informational and referential hierarchy: clause-linking strategies in Austronesian-Oceanic languages". In Bril (ed.). *Clause-linking and clause hierarchy: syntax and pragmatics*. 269-311. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Chen, Teresa. 1987. *Verbal constructions and verbal classifications in Nataoran-Amis*. Canberra: Pacific linguistics (Series C).

Gundel, Jeanette K. and Hedberg, Nancy. Forthcoming. Reference and Cognitive Status: Implicature and Typology. In, Fernandez-Vest, M. M. Jocelyne and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr., eds. *Information Structure and Spoken Language in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Hedberg, Nancy. Applying the Givenness Hierarchy Framework: Methodological issues. Tokyo workshop 2013.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2005. 'The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological Characteristics.' In Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.), *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar,* 110-181. London: Routledge.

Huang, Lillian M. 1995. The case markers and pronominal system in Amis. *The Journal of National Chengchi University* 70: 217-258.

Huang, Shuanfan. 2002. The Pragmatics of Focus in Tsou and Seediq**.** *Language and Linguistics* 3.4: 665-694. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Kaufman, Daniel. 2009. Austronesian typology and the nominalist hypothesis. In, *Austronesian historical linguistics and culture history: A festschrift for Robert Blust*, ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Andrew Pawley, 197–226. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Krifka, Manfred 2007. Basic Notions of Information Structure. In: C. Féry, G. Fanselow & M. Krifka (eds.), *The Notions of Information Structure*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag, 13-55.

Krifka, Manfred & Renate Musan (eds.). 2012. *The Expression of Information Structure.* Berlin/Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.

Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsuchida, Shigeru. 1988. *Amis*. The Sanseido Encyclopedia or Linguistics, Vol 1: Languages of the World, Part one, Takashi Kamei, Rokuro Kono & Eiichi Chino (eds.). Tokyo: Sanseido. 447-449.

Tsukida, Naomi. 2008. Verb Classification in Amis. In Mark Donohue and Søren Wichmann (eds.) *The Typology of Semantic Alignment*. 277-293. Oxford University Press.

Wu, Joy. 2006. *Verb classification, case marking, and grammatical relations in Amis*. Ph.D State University of New York at Buffalo.

Zeitoun, Elizabeth, Lillian M. Huang, Marie M. Yeh and Anna H. Chang. 1999. Existential, Possessive, and Locative Constructions in Formosan Languages. *Oceanic Linguistics*, Vol. 38, 1: 1-42.

Abbreviations

ABIL	abilitative	DX3	distal deictic	LOC	locative
ANAPH	anaphoric	EPIS	epistemic	LNK	linker
ASS	assertive	EVID	evidential	MODF	modifier
AT	actor trigger	EXCL	exclusive	NEG	negation
CA-	Ca-reduplication	EXS	existential	NFIN	non-finite
CAUS	causative	FR	free (pronoun)	NM	noun marker
CMP	complementiser	FUT	future	NOM	nominative
CONEG	conegative marker	GEN	genitive	NMZ	nominaliser
DET	determiner	INCL	inclusive	NM	noun marker
DX1	proximal deictic	INST	instrumental	OBL	oblique
DX2	medial deictic			ONOM	onomatopeia

PASS	passive
PM	personal marker
PRF	perfect
PL	plural
PRST	presentative
PST	past
QM	question marker
RED	reduplication
SG	singular
SEQ	sequential
SUP	superlative