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1 Basic assumptions about information structure

(1) Structure-function independence
- language specific constructions must be conceptually separated from cross-linguistically relevant information structure configurations (henceforth just “configuration”)
  > bilateral one-to-many relation possible: one underspecified construction can encode different configurations; and vice-versa, one configuration can be encoded by different constructions; but existence of default/preferred/more frequent interpretations
  > major question: how are configurations distributed over a given set of language-specific constructions?

(2) Value asymmetry
- “opposed” values—parameters of different configurations are not symmetrical in terms of discourse-functional and hence formal markedness, rather default values > see below

(3) Default values in default structure
- “normal” discursive progression of information flow by asserting one new piece of information (= focus) based on activated/given information (= background) (cf., e.g., Chafe 1976, 1987; Pawley and Snyder 2000)
  > ‘lack of focus’ more marked than background—topic-focus structure
  > multiple foci more marked than single focus
  > contrast more marked than plain assertion
  > subject focus more marked than non-subject focus

(4) Illocution dependence
- information structure intimately tied to illocutionary force of speech act type, and predicate normally instantiates Hosts the illocution
  > predicate (operators) by default in the scope of focus

(5) Referentiality of information
- entities/referents are better topics and foci than states of affairs etc.
  > verb focus more marked than term focus
  > predicate focus more marked than term focus

(6) "Conservative" focus concept
- focus conceived of as a clause-level phenomenon: "sentence focus" (cf. Lambrecht 1987, 1994) viewed alternatively as "thetic statement" (cf. Sasse 1987)
- opposed to "categorical statement" in which a focus-background structure holds at least between a predication and a predication base, normally the subject
  > thetic statement as compact information unit, neutralizing/cancelling the sentence-internal focus-background configuration induced by the default interpretation of a particular morpho-syntactic construction > typical discourse contexts - Figure 1

1. EXISTENTIAL STATEMENTS (in a wider sense; presence, appearance, continuation, etc., positively and negatively)
2. EXPLANATIONS (with or without preceding questions such as 'what happened?', 'why did it happen?', etc.)
3. SURPRISING OR UNEXPECTED EVENTS
4. GENERAL STATEMENTS (aphorisms, etc.)
5. BACKGROUND DESCRIPTIONS (local, temporal, etc., setting)
6. WEATHER EXPRESSIONS
7. STATEMENTS RELATING TO BODY PARTS

Figure 1: Diagnostic contexts for thetic statements (Sasse 1987: 566-7)

(7) Default structure
- language-specific "unmarked clause type" conveys UNMARKED (or LEAST MARKED) configuration, and is thus a central construction regarding information structure
  > mostly "categorical statement" in which a nominal subject is the background: assertive focus on non-subject term or on predicate + non-subject term (~ "verb phrase")
  > tripartite salience hierarchy with highest position for non-subject, even if new predicate

Subject   Predicate   Non-subject

Figure 2: Default salience hierarchy (exemplified with simple SV(O) clause)
2 Predicate operator focus

- predicate is host of two major functions:
  (a) instantiates illocutionary act
  (b) identifies/selects a state of affairs

> multiple import for information structure - intended meaning of ambiguous term
  "predicate focus", terminological precision must disambiguate between:
  (a) focus on verb (lexeme) – state-of-affairs
  (b) focus on predicate operator (including truth value—"verum" focus)

+ different morphosyntactic host compared to term focus
> implies overall different encoding

+ both focus types with just one marking locus in simplex predicate
> if a given language does not disambiguate both types by distinct constructions, possible
  cover term "predication focus" - Güldemann (1996, 2003) for certain Bantu languages
  complex predicate may dissociate these two functions in two separate constituents with
  consequences for formal encoding

+ illocution entails assertion and normally a verb
> no "extra" obligatory marking, possibly no contrastive variant

+ paper dedicated to the relation between predicate operator focus and all-new/thetic
  utterances - based on Güldemann's (1996: 159-229) more detailed discussion

3 Preverbal /ni/(-) in Kenyan Bantu

3.1 Kikuyu (E51)

- most conjunctival paradigms occur in three basic predicate types, two of which are
  relevant for the information structure in main clauses:

The first of the three for Affirmative verbs is the Focussing Form. This differs from the other
forms in tone, in most cases. At one point we would have called it "Independent", but no Kikuyu
Affirmative verb is truly independent. This requires a following noun, adverb, or other
modifier; it cannot be the only nor the last word in the sentence. To have the equivalent of an
'Independent' Affirmative verb, we have to take the Non-Subject Relative, preceded by (and
dependent upon) ny. (Bennett et al. 1985: 147-8, emphasis mine)

With a following Subjunctive, it simply emphasizes:

1 The forms ny and nĩ reflect alternative orthographic representations of the same element.
5 Ghent-Berlin Workshop “Information structure in Bantu”

(4) ńi nį uũ kw-andika #
now PF 2S:PRS:knowINF INF-write
Do you know how to write now?
ńi njũũ kw-andika o na gö-thooma Giküü
PF 1S:PRS:knowINF as well as INF-read Kikuyu
I know how to write as well as to read Kikuyu. (Bennett et al. 1985: 257)

(5) thiku ici ūnool Günugu na mathabu
days these 2S:NEG:knowINF English COM maths
ńdi-ng-andik-wo ū-karan #
NEG:2S-POT-write-PASS ABSTR-clerk
These days if you don’t know English and maths you can’t get hired as a clerk.
ńi njũũ Günugu o na mathabu mũno
PF 1S:PRS:knowINF English as well as maths well
I (do) know both maths and English well. (ibid.: 261)

3.2 The origin of proclitic /ni/-
+ ńi widely attested in Bantu as an identification marker (and secondarily as equational copula) with scope over nominals
> regular development to predicative/focus marker in cleft-like constructions, see (3)b.
- in preverbal function with scope over (dependent) predicate, oscillates morphologically between particle and ‘preinitial’ verb prefix (= before the ‘initial’ subject cross-reference)
> formal + functional counterpart of preinitial metalinguistic negative (Güldemann 1999):
Thus it will be seen that the effect of ńi is to give positiveness or emphasis to the word or phrase it precedes. Preceding a verb, it conveys a definiteness, an assertiveness, which the verb would not otherwise possess. (Barlow 1927: 224-5)

3.3 Preverbal /n/- in Gusii (E42)
+ most conjugational paradigms distinguish two forms, one with and one without preinitial n; element cognate with above proclitic ńi, but seems to have a different function:
The most important distinction between the two forms is that the n-forms introduce a new point or theme; either by starting a conversation, or continuing a conversation in a new topic. By the same token, n-less forms continue a discussion already in progress. ...
(6) n-aa-minyoka goika akarga vs. igo kwa-minyoka goika kwarga
?1:PST-run until he was tired  ? 2S:PST-run until you were tired
He ran until he was exhausted. So you ran until you were exhausted.
A new topic, to be enlarged on later. This presumes an earlier reference to your running.

(7) n-kwa-many-ire go-soma vs. kwa-many-ire go-soma
?2S:REM-know-ISTA INF-read 2S:REM-know-ISTA INF-read
Do you know how to read? Do you know how to read then?
On first discovering the fact. After talking about the availability of books for those who can read, the question is asked casually.

(8) no-gend-e Kisimu ankio yaaya igo n-daa-gend-e ankiende
?:2S-go-FUT Kisumu tomorrow No! ? 1S-POT-go-FUT after.tom.
Will you go to Kisumu to-morrow? No, I'll go the day after.
Closely bound up with this phenomenon are the items 'igo' and 'niggo' which may be heard at the beginning of sentences and phrases. Where a new topic is introduced by a n-form it is not preceded by 'iggo', where the conversation is continued by a n-less form it is often preceded by 'igo'. (cf. (6), (8)) ... (Whiteley 1965: 93)
> possibly related to class-17 locative deictic
- n-form also at the beginning of discourse providing setting:

(9) Bwana D.O. na-ba-chig-ete aba-nto
1.Mr. D.O. ?:1-2-advice-PRS.PROG 2-Mensch
buna baraanyaare koba na o boche nu
how to have health
The D.O. is advising people how to improve their villages (how to have health). ...
(Whiteley 1965: 95,112)
+ very little and thus insufficient data for conclusive analysis, but hypothesis: distinction functions on a level higher than the clause-internal information structure
n-form n-less form (with or without (n)igo
new discourse topic topic continuity
marked thematic statement unmarked categorical statement
no internal focus-background internal focus-background
Table 2: The distinction between two major clause types in Gusii
... a fundamental difference between utterances which are logically analyzed into two successive mutually related judgements, one naming an individual and one naming an event (categorical statements), and utterances in which the logical relations between various parts of the communicated state of affairs remain unanalyzed (thetic statements). (Sasse 1987: 554)

The thetic statement forms a unit with respect to what it contributes to the discourse at a given point. It expresses a pragmatically unanalyzed state of affairs and presents it as a piece of complex information. ... Thetic statements are thus uttered at those points of the discourse when compact information is required. This is not the case with the categorical statement. It presents a state of affairs as something analyzed, dissected into different information units. It selects one of the participants of the state of affairs in order to present it as a predication base and arranges the rest in such a way that it forms the predication about the selected predication base. We thus utter categorical statements at those points of the discourse when information is built up in successive bits. (Sasse 1987: 558)

+ n-form cancels the canonical categorical interpretation of an unmarked predicate by disrupting the link between it and the subject topic
- n- is historically a marked illocutionary operator with scope over an (originally non-assertive dependent) predicate

Figure 4: Salience hierarchy in thetic statement (cf. Figure 2)

+ n-form with affinity to other "split-structures" (Sasse 1987), but different scope of n-correlates with subtle functional distinction - event-central thetic statement

As a terminological prerequisite we will introduce the distinction between entity-central and event-central thetic expressions. Both share the property of 'positioning' something ..., but they differ crucially as to what is positioned: an entity-central thetic statement is a type of utterance stating the existence of an entity, while an event-central thetic statement is one which states the existence of an event. (Sasse 1987: 526, emphasis mine)

> apparently corroborated by available data: statements with n-forms orient not just towards new entities but entire states of affairs

4 Preverbal /ka/- in Central Bantu

4.1 Chokwe (K11): "emphatic tense adjunct"

+ preinitial "emphatic tense adjunct" ku- in all persons marks truth operator focus:

(i) Assertion, affirmation, intensification; 'certainly', 'definitely' ...

(ii) Mild contrast or contradiction; 'but yes', 'surely', 'after all', 'on the other hand' (cf. the German doch which covers all these meanings). (Atkins 1955: 264)

(10) *ku-ma-fua*

PF-FUT:1-die

he will surely die (Atkins 1955: 271)

(11) *ku-ngu-na-ku-sange*

PF-1S-PRS-2S-love

amo-te [I love you, ?!”emphatic”] (Diarra 1990: 44)

4.2 The origin of preinitial /ka/(-)

+ Chokwe ka- related to a particle/proclitic in other Bantu languages which is used in contexts of focus, presentation, and exclamation; all possibly from “(n)ka(-) ‘(t)here is’

(12) Luba-Lulua (L31) kat-

a. *ka* *di-kela* diadia

PRES 5-egg 5:DIST.DEM

there is the egg

b. *mu-ntu* *ka* yeu

1-person PRES-1:DEM

here is the man

c. *ka* *tu-ye*

PRES-1P-go:SUBJ

let us go

(Morrison 1930: 57-8)

(13) Shi (J53) ka

*ka* *ba-sháku-lé*

PF 2-pound:SUBJ

Let them pound! [unemphatic without ká] (Polak-Bynon 1975: 313)

3 cf. also Eynde (1960: 110) "konfirmatief" and Diarra (1990: 44) "confirmativo"
4.3 Chokwe (K11): "primary [subject] prefixes"

+ 3rd-person subject prefixes only distinguish between a 'primary' set (singular ka-/plural ka-) and a 'secondary' set (singular a-/plural aa-); 'primary' possibly only for referents high on animacy hierarchy (marked on the verb by agreement class pair 1/2)

The terms 'primary' and 'secondary' do not refer to statistical frequency, but rather to position and function in the sentence.

The primary prefix is used when the verbal heads the sentence. It also occurs when only a simple subject such as a personal name, a single nominal or a nominal group precedes the verbal.

The secondary prefix seems to be obligatory in the second part of a complex sentence, that is to say whenever a whole clause precedes the verbal.

A secondary prefix sometimes occurs in primary position, but only when the subject to which the prefix refers has been clearly specified in the preceding narrative. This seems to be a stylistic device rather than an inviolable rule of grammar.

\[\text{ka-pwil} \varepsilon \text{Mwanangana umuwika } \text{dyina } \text{ly-nyi } \text{Mwinyikanyoka} \]
\[?:1\text{PST-be } 1\text{.chief } 5\text{.name } 5\text{-his } 1\text{.PN} \]
Er was eens een groote chef, zijn naam was Mwinyikanyoka [There was a big chief, his name was Mwinyikanyoka], \text{ka-shahil } \text{kashitu dyina } \text{ly-nyi } \text{tshenhge} \]
\[?:1\text{PST-kill animal } 5\text{.name } 5\text{-his } \text{Chihenge} \]
hij doodde een beest met name tshihenge [he killed an animal called Chihenge]. \[\text{tshenhge } \text{awo } \text{ka-kwetx } \text{mu-a } \text{a-nene } \text{a-tama} \]
\[1\text{.Chihenge } 1\text{.DEM } ?:1\text{-have } 6\text{-tooth } 6\text{-long } 6\text{-white} \]
Die tshihenge heeft groote witte tanden [This Chihenge has long white teeth]. \[\text{mvwinyikanyoka } \text{yanda } \text{li-} \text{ly-a } \text{tshenhge} \]
\[\text{now } 1\text{.PN } \text{NAR:1-take } 5\text{-tooth } 5\text{-GEN } \text{Chihenge} \]
Mwinyikanyoka nu, nam een tand van de tshihenge [Now, Mwinyikanyoka took one tooth of the Chihenge] ...   (Delille/Burssens 1935/6: 54-5)

\[\text{amu } \text{ha } \text{tanda } \text{ne-kotuk-anga } \text{ya } \text{naye } \text{ya } \text{Kalunga } \text{ka-no-fu} \]
\[1\text{.ADE Tanda } 1\text{.PST-come.from } \text{VOC } 1\text{.God's mother } ?:1\text{-ISTA-die} \]
Ik ben weggegaan van "de tanda" [place of mourning over a death] van de moeder van God die stierf [I am mourning. Friend! God's mother is dead!]; ...   (Delille/Burssens 1935/6: 48-9)

\[\text{mu-thu } \text{u-li } \text{nyi } \text{mwono } \text{ka-li } \text{nyi } \text{uwaminyino} \]
\[1\text{-person } 1\text{.REL-be COM life } ?:1\text{-be } \text{COM hope que tem vida, tem a esperança (Who is alive has hopes)} (Diarra 1990: 48) \]
+ 'emphatic tense adjunct' ku- and k- of 'primary prefixes' are complementary
- respective forms identical > derived from the same morpheme complex *ka-Subject prefix
> ?thetic-focus distinction of ka- not available for speech-act participants (see §4.4 below)

Person-number  "Emphatic tense adjunct"  "Primary (subject) prefix"  Original
1S       kun(gu)-  -  *ka-ngu
1P       kutu-  -  *ka-tu
2S       ku-  -  *ka-u
2P       kunu-  -  *ka-nu
3S = Class 1 ka-  ka-  *ka-a
3P = Class 2 kaa-  kaa-  *ka-ba

Table 3: The formal relation of Chokwe preinitials for predicate focus and theticity

4.4 Lamba (M54)
+ so-called "historic tenses" with preinitial ka- similar to "primary prefix"-form in Chokwe:
(a) Imperfective states of affairs – background information (19)
(b) Setting at the beginning of narrative (20)
(c) Unexpected states of affairs with non-topical subjects (21)
(d) Specialized exclamatory question (22)

(19) pa-ku-fika aika-ntu ka-n-ci-lya
16TIME-INF-arrive 2-person ?-1S-PRST-eat When the people came I was still eating. (Doke 1938: 270)

(20) aka-ntu ka-ka-ya ne muryakwe mu-mpanga
13-Mensch ?-13-go COM his.companion INE-forest A man went with a companion into the forest, ... (Madan 1908: 62)

(21) uyo muryakwe ne-kunwa-po # ati a-mv-e-po #
1:DEM 1:his.companion SEQ-drink-ADE when 1-drink-ANT-ADE
ichiso ka-li-shyala pa menda
5:Auge ?-5-stay ADE water And the man drank it. When he had drunk, one of his eyes remained in the water.
(Madan 1908: 62)

(22) ka-fi-wama
?-8-be.nice
D'you suppose they'd be nice? (indicates sarcasm and incredulity) (Doke 1938: 447)

5 The relationship of predicate operator focus and theticity
+ formal affinity between theticity and focus is not restricted to predicate focus
> instead specific pairing of focus-theticity subtypes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thetic statement</th>
<th>Categorical statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) entity-central vs. term focus</td>
<td>(Sasse 1987, Güldemann 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) event-central vs. predicate operator focus</td>
<td>(Güldemann 1996—here)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ relationship mediated in both (a) and (b) by the same factor: absence/presence of clause-internal focus-background configuration — status of subject-topic
- recall apparent restriction of "primary prefixes" to 3rd-persons in Chokwe, implying lack of distinction for speech-act participants - not fully conclusive, e.g., (11) actually ambiguous
> but in principle motivated: speech-act participants inherently given and thus topical (otherwise contrastive focus) > "variant of a universal theme" - distinction less relevant

+ at issue here - specific common denominator for thetic-focus-pair under (b):
- sentence with predicate operator focus is a categorical statement in which the operator is highlighted in the clause vis-à-vis non-subjects (which arguably are more salient by default)
- levelling of clause-internal configuration in thetic statement - assertion operator has scope over entire proposition
> focus operator with original scope over the central clause element, the predicate, is, so-to-speak, "upgraded" to the higher level of inter-clausal salience relations; cf. traditional term "sentence focus" (only possible meaning 'focus against discourse background' like another less salient sentence)

Figure 5: Operator scope excluding (~ focus) or including (~ thetic) subject

Abbreviations


Arabic numbers: person, if followed by S or P; otherwise - nominal agreement class
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