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1. Introduction
- Distinguish the system of argument pivot which triggers voice selection from pragmatic informational hierarchy (topic and focus).
- Some general features of the system in Amis (East Formosan)
  - unmarked word order: predicate initial
  - the choice of NOM pivot correlates with
    - profiling of a selected argument (pivot),
    - definiteness (only to some limited extent)

(1a) Vb in LOC voice, the syntactic pivot is left-dislocated as a pragmatic topic, compare with (1b).

   ANAPH UV-naked-NMZ TOP mock-LOC.V GEN-3PL
   ‘Those who were naked, they were mocked by them.’ (Bril fieldwork, Buduy nu Pangcah.069)

b. tungangan-an n-uhni [k-uyaan ma-wacay-ay].
   ‘Those who were naked were mocked by them.’

1.1. General questions
1.1.1. Which differences in information status are marked in the language?
Amis indefinite nouns are zero-marked; definiteness is marked by a paradigm of deictic and anaphoric markers; definite, already referential entities may also have zero marking.

1.1.2. How are discourse-new referents introduced?
Discourse-new entities are introduced by existential verbs & clauses.
ira ‘there is/loc’ (from DX3 ‘there’) + and negation awa’ay. Their argument is NOM.

A) In existential clauses, an indefinite specific NP may be marked by an anaphoric marker.

(2) Ira k-iya cacay a remiad.
   EXS NOM-ANAPH one LNK day
   ‘One day …’ (Bril fieldwork, Lalagawan.018)

(3) Aw’a’ay-ay=tu k-uyan (u) ka-ka’en-en.
   NEG.EXS-ASS=PRF NOM-ANAPH NM CA-eat-PASS.NMZ
   ‘There was no longer any food (left).’ (Bril fieldwork, Flooding.0022)

B) Presentative constructions with proximal deictic ini ‘here is’. Its argument is NOM.

(4) Ini k-u kidudung.
   PRST NOM-NM cloth
   ‘Here is some cloth.’ (Bril fieldwork, Buduy nu Pangcah.029)

1.1.3. How are the pragmatic relations topic and focus marked?
Topic: left dislocation & slight pause; various additional markers (iri, hantu, satu).
(5) Tata’ang-ay a ’uner iri, mi-ka’en t-u tamdaw sa.
big-MODF LNK snake TOP AV-eat ACC-NM people EVID(say)
‘That big snake, it ate people.’ (Bril fieldwork, ’uner.0007)

Arguments, adjuncts, & clauses may be topicalised in this way.

Focus/restrictor : predicative and clause initial, the presupposition is its argument in nominative:

(6) 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).

Arguments, adjuncts, & clauses may be focused in this way.

In terms of prosody:
- a slight pause after topic with rising intonation
- Focus : the syntactic relation between restrictor & presupposition constitutes one prosodic unit; prosodic saliency and stress on focus.

Compare a topic in (7) aku (+ pause) and a focused aku (8) followed by NOM pivot:

(7) 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)

(8) "Aku ku kaka, manay ci kaka=isu" han n-i ina=aku.
FR.1SG NOM-NM older.sibling so PM older.sibling= GEN.2s do.thus GEN-PM mother=GEN.1SG
‘I’m the older, so I’m your older sibling’ my mother said.’ (Bril fieldwork, Cabay=aku. 00144)

1.1.4. Does the language mark ‘new topics’ differently from ‘contrastive topics’ ?

(1) existential constructions are used for brand new entities, (2) left dislocated topics for already referential topics, (3) emphatic constructions are used for contrastive or selective topics.

1.2. Overview of talk

1st referential status & the question of argument definiteness:
2nd: informational hierarchy, (1) how topic & focus are encoded and (2) how different they are from the parameters that select voice type.

2. Referential status: Definiteness & indefiniteness

Zero marking is used for indefinite entities; definiteness is marked by determiners (or zero marking).

2.1. Definite markers

3 degree system for deictics ; inflect for case: k- NOM; n- GEN; t- ACC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dx1</th>
<th>dx2</th>
<th>dx3</th>
<th>anaph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>medial</td>
<td>distal/visible</td>
<td>invisible/known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ini(a(n))</td>
<td>ina</td>
<td>ira</td>
<td>iya(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-ni(an)</td>
<td>u-na</td>
<td>u-ra(an)</td>
<td>u-ya(an)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2. Selection of voice & argument definiteness

- AV : Undergoer can be indefinite or definite
- UV : Undergoer is generally definite, but can be indefinite too.

**Mi-AV with definite undergoer PAT :**

(9) ma-banaq=tu 'amin a mi-sangaq [...] t-u buduy n-uhni.
UV-know=PRF all CMP AV-make ACC-NM clothes GEN-3PL
‘All learned how to make their clothes.’ (Bril fieldwork, Buduy nu Pangcah.071-72)

**Ma-UV with indefinite pronoun as nominative pivot :** but minimally specific

(10) ma-melaw numaku [k-u cima a tamdaw].
UV-see GEN.1sg NOM-NM who LNK person
‘I saw someone’ (specific) (Bril fieldwork)

2.3. Avoidance of indefinite pronouns as arguments

avoid indefinite pronouns and use existential/locative constructions instead with a nominalised construction.

(11) Ira k-u tayni-ay.
EXS NOM-NM arrive-NMZ
‘Someone is coming.’ (lit. there’s a coming x) (Bril fieldwork)

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

In (13-14) a locative NMZ marked by –an is used in avoidance of an indefinite patient :

(13) Na mi-kilim k-aku tu badal inacila, ira k-u ni-ka-tepa-an numaku.
PST AV-look.for NOM-1SG ACC berry yesterday EXS NOM-NM PRF.NMZ-NFIN-find-LOC GEN.1SG
‘yesterday I looked for berries and found (some).’ (lit. there was some finding by me)

And in the negative:

(14) [-------------------------------------------] awa’ay k-u ni-ka-tepa-an numaku.
NEG.EXS NOM-NM PRF.NMZ-NFIN-find-LOC GEN.1SG
‘yesterday I looked for berries and found none.’ (there was no finding by me) (Bril fieldwork)

2.4. Existential constructions

Existential predicates introduce new entities in discourse.

2.4.1. Introducing new, indefinite entities in discourse

(15) Ira k-u suni.
EXS NOM-NM sound
‘There was a sound.’ (Bril fieldwork)

2.4.2. Introducing specific referents or already referential referents

*Ira* is compatible with specific referents or minimally referential entities.

(16) Ira k-uyu tumuk hananay n-uhni.
EXS NOM-ANAPH chief so.called GEN-3PL
‘They had a chief as they say.’ (Bril fieldwork, Cikasuan.019)
Demonstratives also appear when *ira* (a) reactivates a known or a specific entity or (b) refers to deictically identifiable entities. Negative existential *awa'ay* combines with demonstrative when referent is specific, reactivated and familiar.

(17)  
\[
\text{Awa'ay}=\text{tu} \quad \text{k-inian} \quad \text{u nanum.} \\
\text{NEG.EXS}=\text{PRF} \quad \text{NOM-DX1} \quad \text{NM water} \\
\text{‘There was no longer any (of the) water.’} \quad (i.e. \text{mentioned before, that had flooded the land}) \quad \text{(Bril fieldwork)}
\]

3. Informational hierarchy

(i) **topicalisation** comprises a frame and a comment (Lambrecht 1994)

(ii) **focus** constructions comprise an asserted restrictor and a presuppositional content (Krifka 2007). Distinctive morpho-syntactic and prosodic features of **frames** and **restrictors**.

3.1. Topic constructions

**Topics** are definite, stand in sentence initial position followed by a pause and raising intonation, with or without a topic marker *iri*, *satu* (*iri*), *hantu* (*iri*), etc. *Iri* also a sequential marker ‘then’ (frequent origin of topic markers in Austronesian languages, Bril 2007 & 2011).

3.1.1. Autonomous, detached topics

Some left-detached topics stand in loose relation with the rest of the sentence; “syntactically autonomous, extra-clausal elements.” (Lambrecht 1994: 193).

(18)  
\[
\text{[Kilakilang-an], ira k-u buhang n-iya kilang, kay itini}=\text{tu.} \\
\text{RED-forest-OBL} \quad \text{EXS} \quad \text{NOM-NM} \quad \text{hole} \quad \text{GEN-ANAPH} \quad \text{tree perhaps here}=\text{PRF} \\
\text{‘In the forest, there was a hole in that tree, perhaps it (the frog) was there.’} \quad (\text{Bril fieldwork, Frog story.077})
\]

(19)  
\[
\text{[Ina tumuk ngangan], ca'ay}=\text{tu} \quad \text{k-ami ka-banaq t-ina tumuk n-ina Cikasuan.} \\
\text{DX2 chief name NEG=PRF NOM-1p.excl NFIN-know ACC-DX2 chief GEN-DX2 Cikasuan} \\
\text{‘As for the chief’s name, we no longer know the chief of the Cikasuan.’} \quad (\text{Bril fieldwork, Cikasuan.020})
\]

3.1.2. Topic-comment equative constructions

**Equative** constructions take the form of **topic-comment** constructions with a slight pause.

(20)  
\[
\text{Ci ama}=\text{aku}/ \quad \text{ci Buting Sabung, ci ina}=\text{aku}/ \quad \text{ci Lahuk u Buting.} \\
\text{PM father}=\text{GEN.1S} \quad \text{PM B} \quad \text{S} \quad \text{PM mother}=\text{GEN.1S} \quad \text{PM L.} \quad \text{NM B} \\
\text{‘My father was Buting Sabung, my mother was Lahuk u Buting.’} \quad (\text{Bril fieldwork, urip nu Balah.005})
\]

(21)  
\[
\text{U kaka}/ \quad \text{u babahiyan, u saba}/ \quad \text{u babainay-an.} \\
\text{NM elder} \quad \text{NM girl-LOC} \quad \text{NM younger} \quad \text{NM boy-LOC} \\
\text{‘The elder child was female, the younger was male.’} \quad (\text{Bril fieldwork, Flooding.0011})
\]

Equative constructions such as (20-21) are “neutral” topic-comment constructions, distinct from left-dislocated topic constructions.
3.1.3. Left-dislocated topics

Left-dislocated topics are constituents of the clause, unmarked for case, their syntactic function is retrieved within the clause. All arguments and adjuncts (location, time, etc.) can be left-dislocated with a pause, *iri*, *hantu* (*iri*), etc.

(22) shows extra-clausal position of topic, longer pause, may host topic markers (*iri* for instance).

(22)  

\[ U \text{ babainay} ///, \ « \text{ci Bulad} » \text{ ku ni-pa-ngangan,} u \text{ babahi} ///, \ « \text{ci Cidal} » \text{ ku ni-pa-ngangan.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{NM} & \text{boy} & \text{PM} & \text{Moon} & \text{NOM} & \text{PRF-CAUS-name} & \text{NM} & \text{girl} & \text{PM} \text{ Sun} & \text{NOM} \\
\end{array} \]

‘The boy, Moon is the name given (to him), the girl, Sun is the name given (to her).’ (Bril fieldwork, U teker ni Adek.004)

In (23), Moon and Sun are contrasted.

(23)  

\[ \text{nika ci Bulad} ///, \text{ca’ay ka-ta-tudung.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{llll}
\text{but} & \text{PM} & \text{Moon} & \text{NEG} \\
\end{array} \]

‘but as for Moon, he is not suited (for this).’ (Bril fieldwork, U teker ni Adek.010)

Compare with focus constructions (24) which make up one sentence (no pause), focus/predicate is prosodically salient; NOM argument contains the presupposition.

(24) a  

\[ \text{Ci Cidal=tu k-u mi-kutay-ay.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{PM} & \text{Sun} & \text{PRF} & \text{NOM-NM} & \text{AV-replace-NMZ} \\
\end{array} \]

‘It was Sun who was the substitute/replaced (him).’ (Bril fieldwork, U teker ni Adek.018)

Compare with the neutral predication:

b. \[ \text{mi-kutay=tu ci Cidal.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{AV-replace=PRF} & \text{PM} & \text{NOM} & \text{Sun} \\
\end{array} \]

‘Sun replaced (him).’

- Subject topic (actor or agent)

(25)  

\[ [\text{Uhni si-kawas-ay}], \text{ma-araw=tu k-iya isaw.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{FP.3PL} & \text{have-spirit-NMZ} & \text{UV-see=PRF} & \text{NOM-ANAPH} & \text{surely} \\
\end{array} \]

‘They the shamans, (they) see that surely.’ (lit. this can surely be seen by them) (Bril fieldwork, Cabay aku.00116)

- Topic is possessive determiner, coreferent with *n-ira*:

(26)  

\[ [\text{Ina kapah ci Adek}], \text{ira haw k-u balucuq n-ira.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{DX2 youth} & \text{PM Adek} & \text{EXS EPIS} & \text{NOM-NM} & \text{heart} & \text{GEN-3SG} \\
\end{array} \]

‘As for that young Adek, he had a plan.’ (Bril fieldwork, U teker ni Adek.057)

3.2. Strategies for introducing new entities at the beginning of stories

\[ \text{Frog story.003}; \text{Bril fieldwork} \]

(27)  

\[ \text{Ina kungku sa=tu t-ina} \text{ kungku,} \text{ira ku wawa,} \text{ira ku wacu,} \text{ira ku tatakulaq.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{DX2 story} & \text{say=PRF} & \text{ACC-dx story} & \text{EXS NOM child} & \text{EXS NOM dog} & \text{EXS NOM frog} \\
\end{array} \]

‘As for the topic of this story, there is a child, a dog and a frog

\[ \text{Frog story.005} \]

(28)  

\[ \text{Sulinay,} \text{ira k-iya} \text{ wawa,} \text{…} \]

\[ \text{indeed EXS NOM-ANAPH child} \]

‘indeed, there is this child …’
Frog story.008

(29) ya tatatakuq han=tu t-iya tatatakuq iri,
ANAPH frog do.thus=PRF ACC-ANAPH frog TPC
< neutral > < accusative >
‘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 TPC UV-be.thus-MODF NM bottle
‘it was put by the child, (in) what seems a kind of bottle.’

3.3. Topic shift and emphasis with satu and hantu

3.3.1. Hantu and satu as evidential verbs and voice markers

Hantu is compatible with AV or UV constructions; satu are only allows AV.

(30) [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, the child was pecked by the owl, (emphatic, on purpose)

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)

b. ma-kalat n-iya deku k-iya wawa.
UV-bite GEN-ANAPH owl NOM-ANAPH child
‘the child was pecked by the owl’ (plain assertion)

(31) Simsim sa=tu k-u binaulan. Vs. mi-simsim k-u binaulan.
think say=PRF NOM-NM villager AV-think NOM-NM villager
‘The villagers thought.’ (Bril fieldwork)

3.3.2. Hantu and satu as selective, contrastive topic markers

Indicate topic shift, or selective, contrastive topics.
- actor or agent topic NP:

(32) [Inian u sa-kaka-ay han=tu], mi-sangaq-ay t-уйinan u lumaq.
DX1 NM SUP-elder-NMZ be.thus=PRF AV-build-NMZ ACC-DX1 NM house
‘As for the eldest one, he works in house-building, (lit. he’s a builder of houses).’ (Bril
fieldwork, Uriip nu Balah.025)

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

3.3.3. Hantu and satu as topic markers in emphatic constructions

Signal topic shift, the topic NP is repeated with different cases:
- neutral and accusative cases (with satu)
- neutral and accusative or neutral and genitive cases (with hantu)

(34) Sulinay, [iya wacu han=tu n-iya wacu iri],
indeed ANAPH dog be.thus=PRF GEN-ANAPH dog TPC
‘Indeed, as for that dog, (it is thus),
mi-kilim t-iya galasu a kureng hananay.

AV-look.for ACC-ANAPH glass LNK jar so-called

(he’s) looking (in) that glass jar, like that.’ (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.038)

(35), another change of topic, the sentence before is about the water:

(35) Tuwa, [wacu han=tu nu wacu iri], tebuy-en=tu n-ira a mi-lakec.

then dog be.thus=PRF GEN dog TPC carry-UV=PRF GEN-3S CMP AV-cross.ford

‘Then as for the dog, (it is thus), it was carried by him (the child) across the ford.’ (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.110)

3.4. Clausal topics: forwarding vs. constrastive topic or topic shift

Same strategies: just a pause, iri, satu (iri) or hantu(iri).

3.4.1. Iri : topic with sequential forwarding ‘then’

(39) there’s a change of pivot (from dog as actor to the jar as location pivot).

(36) Sulinay mi-kilim k-iya wacu iri, mukmuk-an n-ira k-iya kureng,

indeed AV-look.for NOM-ANAPH dog TPC stuck-LOC.NMZ GEN-ANAPH NOM-ANAPH jar

‘Indeed, (as) the dog is searching, he gets stuck into the glass jar.’ (lit. the jar was the place where he got stuck.’ (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.040)

3.4.2. Satu iri (AV) or hantu iri (AV, UV): topic shift, constrastive or selective topic

(37) [Ma-qepud sa=tu iri], "bahaw u lilac=isu" sa c-ina=aku.

UV-come.down be.thus=PRF TOP ONOM NM dirt=GEN.2S say PM-mother=GEN.1SG

‘(the souls) came down then, "woah! How dirty you are ! (lit. the dirt of yours) my mother said.’ (Bril fieldwork, Cabay aku.0113-114)

But compare (38-39)

(38), the preceding sentence is about the dog’s head being freed from the jar ; satu signals a change of perspective and evidential stance.

(38) 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)

(39), the preceding sentence mentions the (dog) chased by the bees; another change of perspective, but iri forwards the story.

(39) Tuwa, [na=ma-ha’en iri], ira k-uyu buhang n-iya tatakulaq saan haw,

Then, PST=UV-be.thus TOP EXS NOM-ANAPH hole GEN-ANAPH frog EVID EPIS

‘Then, this being so then, “is that the frog’s hole?’, he thinks.’ (Bril fieldwork, Frog story.064)

4. Focus constructions

Focus/restrictor is predicative, in initial position, stressed. No pause. Restrictor contains the salient information & specifies or restricts the truth value of the presupposition (Krifka 2007).

4.1. General features

focus has the syntactic pattern: focus/predicate <NOM argument>.

(40) a. Na ma-tu'as-ay k-u mi-diput-ay.

PST UV-old-NMZ NOM-NM AV-protect-NMZ

‘It was elderly people who brought (me) up.’ (Bril fieldwork, urip nu Balah.007)
b. Na mi-diput k-u ma-tu'as-ay i-takuwan  
PST AV-protect NOM-NM UV-old-NMZ LOC-1SG.ACC  
‘Elderly people brought me up.’ (Bril fieldwork)

(41), compare **detached topic**, then a **topic argument** (italics)+ restrictive focus (underlined)

(41) Hay wawa, uru u ca’ay-ay hen pi-kikung,  
yes child that.one NM NEG-ASS still NFIN-marry  
‘Yes (among) the children, that one who’s still not married,  
uraan=tu a cacay k-u sa-simsim-en nu niyam.  
DX3=PRF LNK one NOM-NM Ca-think-PASS GEN GEN.1P.EXC  
it was about that one only that we have concerns.’ (Bril fieldwork, urip nu Balah.083-084)  
it (is that one which is a cause of concern for us)

4.2. Informative, identifying, constrastive focus

Only prosodic saliency on the focus distinguishes it from standard predicate-argument order. All subtypes of focus follow the same pattern.

4.2.1. Informative, identifying focus

(42) U kingcal k-aku.  
NM policeman NOM-1SG  
‘I'm a policeman.’ (Bril fieldwork)  
answer to ‘what do you do?’ > *u ma’an ku demak numisu?*

(43) U mi-ma’an-ay k-isu? — U pa-se-banaq-ay k-aku.  
NM AV-do-NMZ NOM-2SG NM CAUS-have-knowledge-NMZ NOM-1SG  
‘What (work) do you do?’ — ‘I'm a teacher.’ (Bril fieldwork)  
(what are you a doer of?)

(44a) [Cima] k-u mi-senat-ay tu taruduq numisu?  
who NOM-NM AV-cut-NMZ ACC finger GEN.2SG  
‘Who cut your finger?’ (Bril fieldwork)

FR.1s=PRF NOM-NM AV-cut-NMZ ACC finger GEN.1SG self/body  
‘I cut my own finger.’ (Bril fieldwork)

(45a) the pragmatic focus is coreferent with the pivot of the **LOC-V** marked by –*an*:

(45a) a. [U ma’an] k-u libabuy-an n-iya wacu?  
NM what NOM-NM bark-LOC.V GEN-ANAPH dog  
‘What is this dog barking at?’

b. [U mi-takaw-ay] k-u libabuy-an niya wacu.  
NM AV-steal-NMZ NOM-NM bark-LOC.V GEN-ANAPH dog  
‘It's a thief that the dog is barking at.’ (Bril fieldwork)

(46) focus is coreferent with the pivot of the **INSTR** voice:

(46a) a. [Na=unian a pu’ut haw] k-u sa-pi-cikcik numisu tu titi?  
PST=DX1 LNK knife EPIS NOM-NM INST-NFIN-cut GEN.2SG ACC meat  
‘Was it with this knife that you cut the meat?’
b. Ca’ay ka-unian, [na=uraan a hawan] ku sa-pi-ckcik=aku t-ina titi-an
NEG CONEG-DX1 PST=DX3 LNK machete NOM INST-NFIN-cut=GEN.1SG ACC-DX2 meat-ACC
‘No, it’s not with this one, it was with that machete that I cut the meat.’ (Bril fieldwork)

In (c) interrogative verb ma’an is inflected with INSTR Voice:

c. 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?’

d. Sa-pi-ckcik=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 to cut) (Bril fieldwork)

- **Adjuncts**: are focused with their preposition marker or their case marking:

1) LOC prepositional adjunct

(47) [Na=i Tayliku haw] k-isu a mi-nanam tu suwal nu Hulam ?
PST=LOC China EPIS NOM-2SG COMP AV-know ACC language GEN Chinese
‘Was it in mainland China that you learnt the China language of Chinese ?’

2) Focused oblique arguments

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

4.2.2. Constrastive focus : same syntactic pattern

(49) a. Nacila [na=isu haw] k-u tayni-ay ?
yesterday PST=FR.2SG EPIS NOM-NM arrive-NMZ
‘Is it you who came yesterday ?’ (the arriver)

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)

4.3. Focus in a subordinate clause

(50) ma-banaq k-aku [na ci Kilang] [ku mi-araw-ay t-iya tamdaw-an].
UV-know NOM-1SG PST PM Kilang NOM AV-meet-NMZ ACC-ANAPH person-ACC
< main clause > <focus predicate> < sentential argument, presupposition >
‘I know it was Kilang who met that person.’ (Bril fieldwork)

5. Conclusion & main results

- Existential clauses introduce new indefinite entities in discourse.
- Definiteness either zero-marked or by determiners.
- Topics are left-dislocated, referential and definite, marked by a pause, sequential iri or by two evidential verbs.
- Only salient prosody distinguishes focus from neutral predications with predicate-argument order.
- Pragmatic I.H. devices combine with the syntactic-semantic device of voice systems ; to what extent is voice selection related to considerations such as topic continuity or argumentative effects?
- Shuanfan Huang’s study on Seediq (2002) concludes “although some AF clauses take non-referential patients, lexical patients in NAV are not significantly more referential and/or definite than those in AV clauses (I999:425).
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Abbreviations

| ABIL | abilitative        | EXCL | exclusive       | NM  | noun marker |
| ACC  | accusative         | EXS  | existential     | OBL | oblique     |
| ANAPH| anaphoric          | FR   | free (pronoun)  | ONOM| onomatopeia |
| ASS  | assertive          | FUT  | future          | PASS| passive     |
| AT   | actor trigger      | GEN  | genitive        | PM  | personal marker |
| Ca   | Ca-reduplication   | INCL | inclusive       | PRF | perfect     |
| CAUS | causative          | INST | instrumental    | PL  | plural      |
| CMP  | complementiser     | LOC  | locative        | PRST| presentative |
| CONEG| conegative marker | LNK  | linker          | PST | past        |
| DET  | determiner         | MODF | modifier        | QM  | question marker |
| DX1  | proximal deictic   | NEG  | negation        | RED | reduplication |
| DX2  | medial deictic     | NFIN | non-finite      | SG  | singular    |
| DX3  | distal deictic     | NM   | noun marker     | SEQ | sequential  |
| EPIS | epistemic          | NOM  | nominative      | SUP | superlative |
| EVID | evidential         | NMZ  | nominaliser     |     |             |