

*Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the
Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)*

**Ileana Paul
(ed.)**



**AFLA XXVI
The Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the
Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association**

University of Western Ontario
May 24-26, 2019

**MARKING ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION IN
KIMARAGANG**

Paul Kroeger
Dallas Intl. Univ. & SIL Intl.

Table of Contents

Paul, Ileana	<i>Preface</i>	i
Baclawski, Kenneth, Jr.	<i>Optional wh-movement and topicalization in Eastern Cham</i>	1-17
Chang, Henry Y.	<i>Tsou Exclamatives in comparative syntax</i>	18-35
Chen, Tingchun	<i>Raising-to-object in Amis</i>	36-53
Collins, James N. and Peter Schuelke	<i>Roviana fronting and the relationship between syntactic and morphological ergativity</i>	54-70
Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka, Theodore Levin and Coppe van Urk	<i>The typology of nominal licensing in Austronesian voice system languages</i>	71-87
Finer, Daniel and Hasan Basri	<i>Clause truncation in South Sulawesi: Restructuring and nominalization</i>	88-105
Hopperdietzel, Jens	<i>Pseudo noun incorporation and differential object marking: object licensing in Daakaka</i>	106-123
Hsieh, Henrison	<i>On the structure of Tagalog non-DP extraction</i>	124-141
Kroeger, Paul	<i>Marking accessible information in Kimaragang</i>	142-158
Kroeger, Paul and Kristen Frazier	<i>Crossed-control in Malay/Indonesian aslong-distance passivization</i>	159-174
Macaulay, Benjamin	<i>The prosodic structure of Paze</i>	175-191
Ono, Hajime, Koichi Otaki, Manami Sato, 'Ana Heti Veikune, Peseti Vea, Yuko Otsuka and Masatoshi Koizumi	<i>Relative clause processing in Tongan: an effect of syntactic ergativity on the object preference</i>	192-208
Paillé, Mathieu	<i>V=nya in colloquial Malay</i>	209-226
Tollan, Rebecca	<i>Subjecthood and unmarkedness in Niuean</i>	227-247
Travis, Lisa DeMena and Diane Massam	<i>What moves, why, and how: the contribution of Austronesian</i>	248-264

PREFACE

The 26th Annual Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA 26) was held on May 24-26, 2019 at the University of Western Ontario (Canada). The programme consisted of 24 presentations in addition to four plenary talks by Juliette Blevins, Vera Hohaus, Marian Klamer and Becky Tollan. This volume includes 13 papers from the conference.

As conference organizer, I received generous support from a variety of sources. Financial support came from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Research Western, the Joint Fund (Research Western, SOGS, SGPS), the Theoretical and Applied Linguistics Lab, the Canadian Linguistic Association, the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, the Graduate Program in Linguistics and three departments (French Studies, Modern Languages and Literatures, and Anthropology). The conference would not have been possible without the student volunteers (Sonia Masi, William Tran, Caylen Walker and Kang Xu), plus several others who helped out at the registration desk. Finally, I am grateful to the Department of French Studies for administrative support.

Many thanks to the abstract reviewers, to all those who attended, and to Mitcho Erlewine, who helped develop the current stylesheet.

Ileana Paul
University of Western Ontario

MARKING ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION IN KIMARAGANG*

Paul Kroeger

Dallas International University & SIL Intl.

paul_kroeger@diu.edu

This paper describes a discourse particle (*gima*) whose meaning and functions seem to be quite similar (but not identical) to those of German unstressed *ja*. *Gima* indicates that the at-issue content of the utterance is accessible and uncontroversial. Utterances containing *gima* often convey expressive content in addition to their descriptive content, and I suggest that *gima* may sometimes serve as a marker of exclamatory force, in addition to its core functions stated above.

1. Introduction

Kimaragang is an endangered Philippine-type language belonging to the Dusunic subgroup in northeastern Borneo. This paper discusses the meaning and functions of the Kimaragang use-conditional particle *gima*, comparing it with the German particle *ja*. I propose that the core meaning of *gima* includes at least the following two components of meaning: (a) uncontroversiality, and (b) accessibility. In other words, *p gima* indicates that the speaker takes the truth of *p* for granted (not debatable), and believes that *p* is known or knowable by the addressee.

I use the term “use-conditional”, following Gutzmann (2015), to refer to content which is part of the conventional meaning of an expression but does not contribute to the “at issue” truth-conditional meaning of the utterance. Potts (2005) and others have proposed a number of tests for identifying use-conditional content.¹ McCready (2010) identifies two properties as being the most reliable indicators for this purpose: (a) use-conditional content is “scopeless”, meaning that is never interpreted within the scope of semantic operators like negation, interrogative mood, conditionals, etc.; and (b) use-conditional content does not participate in denials, i.e., cannot form the basis for challenging the truth of a statement. In section 3 I apply these tests to justify the identification of *gima* as a use-conditional particle.

Gima is one of several discourse particles in Kimaragang which “indicate the status of a proposition relative to the common ground (newness, expectedness,

*Thanks to Jim Johansson for making his draft dictionary available to me; to Jim & Nelleke Johansson for sharing drafts of translated materials; and to Janama Lantubon, my primary language consultant. Part of the research for this study was supported by NEH-NSF Documenting Endangered Languages fellowship no. FN-50027-07.

¹ Potts extends Grice’s term “conventional implicature” to cover essentially the same range of phenomena which Gutzmann identifies as use-conditional.

speaker commitment etc.)” (Repp, 2013). We might refer to such particles as STATUS PARTICLES, because they mark the information status of the base proposition. The Kimaragang status particles comprise a subset of a relatively large inventory of second-position clitics, as described in section 2. Section 3 provides evidence for the claim that *gima* contributes use-conditional rather than truth-conditional meaning. Section 4 discusses contexts where *gima* cannot be used. As we will see, many of the same restrictions are reported for unstressed *ja* in German. Section 5 discusses the most common uses of *gima*, all of which involve statements about information which is noteworthy even though it is already part of the common ground or at least accessible to the addressee. Section 6 discusses the expressive content associated with many uses of *gima*.

2. Second-position Clitics

Like many other Southeast Asian languages, Kimaragang has a large inventory of particles. Pure expressives such as *ay* ‘surprise’ or *woy* ‘what did I tell you?’ tend to occur sentence-initial, and can stand alone as a complete utterance. Second-position particles, in contrast, can never occur on their own. These include nominative and genitive pronouns, focus and aspect markers, at least one evidential, the frustrative marker, question particles, markers of intimacy or friendship, and status particles, which are the primary focus of the present paper.

2.1. Defining Second Position

Second-position (2P) particles occur immediately after the first constituent in their clause. In a normal verb-initial clause, this means immediately after the verb as illustrated in (1). When a negative or other adverbial element is fronted to pre-verbal position, 2P clitics will also precede the verb; this is exemplified in (2–3).

- (1) N-o-dindi *nu* *no* *gaam* *i=wogok?*
 PST-NVOL-hog.call 2SG.GEN IAM Q NOM=pig
 ‘Have you called the pigs?’
- (2) Sid=tana *ya* *n-odop-on.*
 DAT=earth 1PL.EXCL.GEN PAST-sleep-LV
 ‘It was on the ground that we slept (after our house burned down).’
- (3) Amu *oku* *po dati* *ko-guli* *dot* ...
 NEG 1SG.NOM yet probably NVOL.AV-return COMP
 ‘I probably cannot return (to work here tomorrow).’

In a subordinate clause, whether complement or adjunct, clitic pronouns and particles appear immediately after the first element of their minimal clause; this clearly indicates the location of sentence-internal clause boundaries. Sentence-level

conjunctions are not treated as a part of the minimal clause, and so do not affect the calculation of second position.

2.2. Linear Order of Clitics

As the preceding examples illustrate, it is not uncommon to find as many as three second-position clitics within a single clause. The relative order of the clitics within this second-position cluster is, for the most part, fairly rigidly determined. This ordering can be described in terms of six position classes, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Template for second-position (2P) clitic ordering

Obligatory 2P clitics			Optional 2P clitics		
GEN pron.	NOM pron.	focus/aspect	mood	evaluative	solidarity

In general, a single clause may contain at most one element from any particular class. In other words, particles assigned to the same class cannot (in general) co-occur with each other, and when two particles assigned different classes co-occur, they will occur in the order specified in this template.

The first three classes, namely GEN, NOM, and focus-aspect, obligatorily occupy the 2P clitic position. The last three classes (mood, evaluative, and solidarity) may optionally occur in clause-final position. When there are more than three particles in the same clause that could all appear in the 2P clitic position, one or more of the optional 2P particles usually appears clause-finally. Thus clitic clusters containing more than three particles are generally avoided.

2.3. Status Particles

Position class 5, containing what I have called the “evaluative” particles, is semantically somewhat heterogeneous. It includes one particle which does affect the truth-conditional meaning of the proposition, namely *dara* ‘frustrative’.² The other particles in class 5 appear to be purely use-conditional, and I refer to them as status particles. Some preliminary examples illustrating typical usage of the more common members of this set are presented in (4).

- (4) a. D<um>arun *dati*’ ... ‘It will *probably* rain (this afternoon)’
 b. D<in><um>arun *katoy*! ‘It did too rain (*contrary to what you claim*).’
 c. Ki-darun *bala*’ kosodoy! ‘Oh look, it rained last night (*and I didn’t know it!*)’

² The meaning of the frustrative particle is discussed in Kroeger (2017).

- d. ... ki-darun *gima*. ‘(I didn’t go to your house because...) it was raining, *after all / as you know*.’
- e. ... koo-dorun-an *mari*. ‘(At this time of year) it rains a lot (*certainly / generally*).’

I tentatively identify *dati* ‘probably’, *toomod* ‘probably’, and *mari* ‘certainly’ as validational markers, expressing the strength of the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the current proposition, rather than markers of modality in the strict sense. *Mari* is often used to indicate knowledge shared by the whole community, or certainty based on prior knowledge of someone’s characteristic properties or behaviour, but these particles have not been investigated in detail and I will not have much to say about them here. Further examples illustrating core uses of *gima*, *bala*’, and *katoy* are presented in (5–7).

- (5) Isos-on nu *gima* banar ino mato nu,
 rub-OV 2SG.GEN GIMA really that.NOM eye 2SG.GEN
 sagay arang no.
 reason red IAM
 ‘*After all*, you keep rubbing your eye hard, that is why it is all red.’
- (6) Wiwidsing-o ku it=rangalaw nga’
 DUP.peel-ATEMP.OV 1SG.GEN NOM=rambutan but
 napapasa=i’ *bala*’ iri.
 PST.DUP.rotten=EMPH MIR this
 ‘I peeled the rambutan (“hairy fruit”) but (*I discovered*) it was rotten.’
- (7) Yalo *katoy* ot minanakaw, okon.ko’ yoku po.
 3SG.NOM KATOY NOM PST.AV.steal not 3SG.EMPH FOC
 ‘It was him that stole it, not me (*contrary to your assertion*).’

The status particles are a common feature of conversational speech, but generally do not occur in narrative monologue, apart from direct quotations. (The one exception is the mirative particle *bala*’, which can occur in narratives with a shift in perspective, to indicate surprise on the part of some central participant.)

3. Use-conditional Rather than Truth-conditional Meaning

As noted in the introduction, the meaning contributed by *gima* does not seem to be part of the “at issue”, truth-conditional content of the sentence. One reason for making this claim is the fact that the particle cannot be questioned or negated. In fact, this seems to be true for all of the Kimaragang status particles. They do not

seem to occur in questions at all, not even rhetorical questions.³ They may occur in another clause of a sentence that contains a question, as in examples (26) and (27) below, but not within the interrogative clause itself. Moreover, the status particles always take scope over clausal negation. Examples (8–9) illustrate this for *gima*.

- (8) Amu *gima* owo sinuput nu i=paip noputut,
 not GIMA PRTCL PST.connect.OV 2SG.GEN NOM=pipe broken
 intaay aso weeg tokow.
 look.DV.IMP not.exist water 1PL.INCL
 ‘You didn’t fix the broken pipe, *as you well know*; now look, we don’t have any water.’ (cannot mean: ‘It is not known to you that you fixed the broken pipe...’)
- (9) Amu *gima* notongkuban nu ino kuuy,
 not GIMA PST.cover.DV 2SG.GEN that.NOM cake
 ino bala’ ot=kororogis dino.
 that.NOM MIR NOM=DUP.reason.sandy that
 ‘You failed to cover the cakes, *as you well know*, and that is why they got all sandy.’ (cannot mean: ‘It is not known to you that you covered the cakes...’)

A second reason for analysing *gima* as use-conditional rather than truth-conditional in nature is that the presence of *gima* cannot form the basis for challenging the truth of a statement. Example (10) illustrates an appropriate challenge based on the truth-conditional content of a statement. Example (11, B1) shows that lack of familiarity or accessibility is not sufficient grounds for challenging the truth of a statement which contains *gima*. An acceptable way of challenging the appropriateness of *gima* in a particular context is illustrated in (11, B2).

- (10) A: Yokoy diti, musikin okoy, aso tarata ya.
 1PL.EXCL this poor 1PL.EXCL NEG.EXIST property 1PL.EXCL.GEN
 ‘As for us, we are poor, we have no wealth.’
- B: Momudut katoy, amu babanar; akaya yalo’ dilo’.
 AV.lie KATOY NEG true rich 3SG.NOM that
 ‘He is lying, that is not true; he is rich.’
- (11) A: Pi-ilang-o yoalo tu’ sompusasawo *gima*.
 RECP-eat.together-OV.IMP 3PL.NOM because married.couple GIMA
 ‘Have them eat together, because they are husband and wife *after all*.’

³ The only exception I have found to this generalization involves *bala’ay*, which seems to be the exclamatory form of the mirative particle and has been found in rhetorical questions.

B1: #Momudut katoy, amu babanar; a=ku nela'an!
 AV.lie KATOY NEG true NEG=1SG knew
 'You are lying, that is not true; I did not know that.' (odd in this context)

B2: Ay? A=ku nela'an!
 PRTCL NEG=1SG knew
 'Oh? I did not know that.' (appropriate response)

4. Contexts where *gima* Cannot be Used

A number of authors have observed that German unstressed *ja* occurs only in declarative clauses, and the same is true for *gima*, as noted in the previous section. Beyond that, the particle cannot be used in contexts which are incompatible with the elements of meaning proposed in section 1: *gima* indicates that the speaker (a) takes the truth of the base proposition for granted, not controversial or open for discussion, and (b) believes that *p* is known or knowable by the addressee.

In most contexts, *gima* is infelicitous if the addressee does not have prior knowledge of the relevant facts. The particle would be unnatural in (12) if the addressee does not already know who cleaned the fish, and in (13) if the addressee does not already know that the person in question was drunk at topic time.

(12) Ololonsi no iti tunturu ku,
 DUP.stink IAM this.NOM finger 1SG.GEN
 yoku *gima* o=minonobuk di=sada.
 1SG.EMPH GIMA NOM=AV.PST.stab ACC=fish
 'My fingers stink, (because) I was the one *after all* who cleaned the fish.'

(13) Songkoboroso dialo dot asot tatantu, owukan *gima*.
 speak.wildly 3SG COMP NEG.EXIST DUP.certain drunk GIMA
 'He was saying crazy things, *after all* he was drunk.'

Zimmermann (2011) states that the following types of contexts are incompatible with the use of unstressed *ja*, and these same restrictions apply to *gima* as well:

In contrast, *ja* is illicit whenever the truth of the propositional content of an utterance is [known not] to be shared by the addressee, or even known to be controversial. This is typically the case in breaking news..., in answers to questions, which denote a set of controversial alternatives to be resolved by the addressee..., or in corrections of previous assertions...

4.1. Breaking News/Out of the Blue Statements

When a speaker conveys new information which the addressee would have no way of knowing, especially when that information is unexpected, the particle *gima* cannot felicitously be used. A striking example of this type, in which the news comes literally "out of the blue", is found in the beginning of St. Luke's gospel,

when the angel Gabriel appears to the Virgin Mary with some unexpected news. As (14b) shows, the use of *gima* in this context would be highly unnatural.

- (14) a. Monon-tiyan ko nôono dino om monusu
 AV.wear-stomach 2SG.NOM PRTCL that and AV.give.birth
 dot kusay ot=tanak.
 COMP male NOM=child
 ‘You will become pregnant and give birth to a son’ (Luke 1:31)

b. #Monontiyán ko *gima* om monusu dot kusay ot tanak.

4.2. Answering a Question

We have said that the use of *gima* indicates the speaker’s belief that the base proposition is known or knowable by the addressee, and is not controversial or open for discussion. If the base proposition is presented as the answer to a question which the addressee has just asked, then the information is normally not known by the addressee and the truth of that proposition is in fact the current issue under discussion. Under these circumstances, the use of *gima* would again be highly unnatural, as illustrated in (15).

- (15) Q: Nunu ot=tonomon daalo ad gopu yo dilo’?
 what NOM=plant.OV 3PL in garden 3GEN that.DIST
 ‘What will they plant in their garden plot?’

A. Togilay *dati’/mari’/#gima* ot=tonomon daalo.
 maize probably/certainly/GIMA NOM=plant.OV 3PL
 ‘Probably/naturally/#as you know they will plant corn/maize.’

4.3. Contradictions of Previous Assertions

As discussed below (section 5.2), *gima* can be used to highlight accessible information which is relevant to current purposes but seems to be ignored or overlooked by the addressee or some other salient person. However, *gima* is not appropriate when the speaker directly contradicts something that has just been stated. In such contexts *katoy* would be used instead. In (16), for example, if the speaker has just been told that he was accused of stealing by the owner of the coconuts, *katoy* would be appropriate but *gima* would not. A similar example is seen in (17), where the owner of a certain chicken is reported to have claimed (mistakenly or falsely) that he bought it. In the reply, only *katoy* and not *gima* can appropriately be used to correct the misstatement.⁴

⁴ In addition to marking a contradiction, *katoy* can also be used as an expressive particle to indicate disapproval. Perhaps both functions are intended in (16), and also in (10).

(16) Yalo *katoy* ot minangangat dogon manganu di=niyuw doalo.
 3SG PRTCL NOM AV.PST.invite 1SG AV.take NOM=coconut 3PL
 ‘He was the one who invited me to take some of their coconuts (contrary to what he now claims)!’

(17) A: Minomoros i=Jim dot “At=manuk dilo’ binoli ku,” ka.
 AV.PST.say NOM=Jim COMP NOM=chicken that PST.buy.OV 1SG QUOT
 ‘Jim said, “I bought that chicken.”’

B: Doo maantad do manuk ilo’,
 3SG.DAT originally LNK chicken that
 okon.ko’ binoli yo *katoy*/**gima*.
 NEG PST.buy.OV 3SG PRTCL
 ‘It was his chicken in the first place, he didn’t buy it (contrary to what he now claims).’

5. Uses of *gima*

Grice explained why we do not normally tell people what they already know: it would be uninformative, and thus a violation of the maxim of Quantity. *Gima* typically functions as a QUANTITY HEDGE, like the English phrase *after all* (Levinson 1983: 162): a signal to the hearer that the current utterance may not be informative. This function is illustrated in examples (18–19), in which the clause containing *gima* expresses information which must clearly be known to the addressee at the time of speaking:

(18) G<in>umu nu *gima* monorimo,
 <PST>much 2SG.GEN GIMA AV.cook.rice
 orubat nopo ami=i’ naawi mangakan.
 waste only NEG=EMPH finished AV.eat
 ‘*After all*, you cooked a lot of rice; it is a shame that it didn’t all get eaten.’

(19) Subay.ko ipag-on nu yalo dilo’ tu’
 should brother.in.law-OV 2SG.GEN 3SG.NOM that because
 tobpinee di=sawo nu yalo *gima*.
 sibling GEN=spouse 2SG.GEN 3SG.NOM GIMA
 ‘You should/must call him *ipag* (‘brother-in-law’), because *after all* he is your wife’s brother.’

Even when a quantity hedge is used, the assertion of information which is already available to the addressee is generally somewhat odd, apart from special motivating circumstances. The most common types of circumstances which license such statements, and thus uses of *gima*, seem to belong to one of the following types. First, *gima* frequently occurs in reason clauses. In this construction the content of the reason clause itself may be already known, but the assertion of a causal relation

between the two clauses could still be informative. A second common use of *gima* is for reminding the addressee of information which is already accessible but which the addressee seems to have forgotten or ignored. Third, *gima* frequently occurs with certain kinds of expressive meaning, in particular with expressions of surprise, scolding, and certain types of exclamatory utterance. In these cases the truth-conditional, at-issue content of the utterance may be known or accessible to the addressee, but the expressive content may be new. On the other hand, expressive content does not seem to be governed by the maxim of Quantity in the same way as descriptive content; speakers all too often express their feelings even when this information is well known to the addressee.

5.1. Reason Clauses

Examples (12) and (13) illustrated the use of *gima* in unmarked reason clauses, which are simply juxtaposed to the main clause. Another such example is presented in (20).

- (20) Nopuunan ko bo dino, winajak nu
 hexed 2SG.NOM PRCL that PST.spoke.clearly.OV 2SG.GEN
gima momoros yalo dot pangansakon.
 GIMA AV.speak 3SG.NOM COMP cause.to.cook.OV
 ‘You have brought a hex on yourself, *after all* you asked her directly to cook food for you.’

More often, however, reason clauses are marked with the conjunction *tu’* ‘because’ as seen in examples (11-A) and (19). Further examples of this type are presented in (21–24). As noted above, *gima* appearing in the ‘because’ clause indicates that the reason is shared or accessible information. Example (21) for example would be unnatural if the addressee does not already know that the deceased woman was a priestess (shaman).

- (21) Imboluan yalo’ dilo’ tu’ boboliyan *gima*.
 toll.gong.DV 3SG.NOM that because priestess GIMA
 ‘They will toll the funeral gong for her, because *after all* she was a priestess.’
- (22) Isot babatang nga’ a=ku elaan tu’ a=ku
 one DUP.letter also NEG=1SG know because NEG=1SG
 nokosikul *gima* owo.
 attended.school GIMA PRCL
 ‘I don’t know even one letter, because *after all* I never went to school.’
- (23) Munaru po yalo dilo’ tu’ omulok po *gima*.
 grow.longer yet 3SG that because young yet GIMA
 ‘He/she will grow taller, because *after all* he/she is still young.’

- (24) Amu needu bâanar iti bongkuris diti wagas
 NEG removed truly this rice.hull this uncooked.rice
 tu' tinutu gima.
 because pounded GIMA
 'The hulls were not completely removed from this rice, because *after all* it was pounded (in wooden mortar and pestle, rather than being milled).'

Another way of marking causal relations is with the conjunction *sagay* 'reason'. This conjunction is used to introduce clauses expressing a result, with *gima* frequently occurring in the reason clause as illustrated in (25).

- (25) Sagay nelaan ku ot=wayaan mongoy sid=Kudat,
 reason PST.know.DV 1SG.GEN NOM=way AV.go DAT=Kudat
 babaya nokoongoy oku gima.
 previously AV.PST.NVOL.go 1SG.NOM GIMA
 'The reason I knew the way to Kudat was because I've been there before, *after all*.'

5.2. Correction

One way in which mutually accessible information might be worthy of mention is if the addressee (or some other salient person) has failed to access that information when it would be relevant to current purposes. In German the particle *doch* would be used in these contexts, but since there is no equivalent to *doch* in Kimaragang, *gima* is sometimes used on such occasions:

- (26) Kukuro yoalo' misasawo, miobpipinee gima.
 how 3PL.NOM RECP.spouse RECP.DUP.sibling GIMA
 'How can they marry each other, *after all*, they are siblings.'
- (27) Siongo mat kisakot ilo' togilay yo
 where RQ grassy that corn 3SG.GEN
 dot pigamasan yo gima.
 COMP clear.repeatedly 3SG.GEN GIMA
 'How could there be grass growing in his corn field, *after all* he always clears/cuts (the grass) there?'

However, *gima* is not used to directly contradict something that has just been stated. As illustrated in (16–17) above, only *kato* and not *gima* can appropriately be used for this purpose.

5.3. Surprise

Another reason for asserting information that is already mutually accessible might be that the information is newly discovered by the speaker. Examples (28–30)

involve information which is new and surprising to the speaker, but known to the hearer and most likely observable in the immediate speech context.⁵ German unstressed *ja* can also be used in contexts of this type, e.g. ‘Oh, you have *ja* green eyes’ (noticed for the first time; Grosz, 2014). In these contexts, *gima* may be interchangeable with the mirative particle *bala*.⁶

- (28) Kawantang no diri ilot tanak nu momoros *gima*
 fluent IAM this that child 2SG.GEN AV.speak GIMA
 dot okodok po om.
 COMP small yet and
 ‘Your child can already speak really well, even though it is still small!’
- (29) Nakaganaru ko=no diiri *gima*.
 grew.longer 2SG=IAM this GIMA
 ‘You have gotten taller (since I last saw you)!’
- (30) Sabat po om a=ku notutunan ika,
 little yet and NEG=1SG PST.recognize.DV 2SG.NOM
 orurungut ko=no dino bongit *gima*.
 DUP.overgrown 2SG.NOM=IAM that beard GIMA
 ‘I almost didn’t recognize you, your beard has gotten so long and shaggy.’
 (lit: ‘you have been overgrown with beard’)

It appears that *gima* cannot be used for describing past discoveries on the part of the speaker; only *bala* is possible for such statements, as illustrated in (31–32). This restriction is presumably related to the fact that the information being reported is not observable in the immediate speech context, and so cannot be assumed to be accessible to the addressee.

- (31) Powurilongo ku it=takod ku sid=luwang nga’
 put.into.hole 1SG.GEN NOM=foot 1SG.GEN DAT=hole but
 aralom *bala*’/**gima* iri.
 deep MIR/GIMA this
 ‘I stuck my foot into the hole, and it turned out to be deep.’
- (32) a. Tantaman ku sompusasawo yoalo, miobpipinee *bala*’ay.
 thought 1SG.GEN married.couple 3PL.NOM RECP.DUP.sibling MIR
 ‘I thought they were husband and wife, but they turned out to be siblings.’
- b. ?*Tantaman ku sompusasawo yoalo, miobpipinee *gima*.

⁵ Malay translations of such sentences frequently include the adverbial particle *pula* ‘also’, indicating surprise.

⁶ In other similar contexts, either particle may be possible but with a subtle difference in meaning. However, no consistent pattern has yet been found in these reported differences.

5.4. Scolding

Yet another reason for stating information that is already known to the addressee is to express displeasure with something the addressee has done. *Gima* is frequently used in scolding and complaints about the behaviour of the addressee, as seen in examples (8–9) above. Additional examples are presented in (33–36).

- (33) Unanawon ku no itit paray, monuu ko=po *gima*.
DUP.crush.OV 1SG.GEN IAM this rice AV.order 2SG.NOM=yet GIMA
'Here I am already crushing the rice seed (e.g. to feed chickens) and you tell me to do it *gima*!'
- (34) Monigagang ko *gima*, sodoy om muli ko nogi.
AV.frighten 2SG.NOM GIMA night and return 2SG.NOM only.then
'You frightened/worried me *gima*, coming home so late at night!'
- (35) Osorulakan nu manganit ino kulit do=kayu *gima*.
backwards 2SG.GEN AV.peel that skin GEN=tree GIMA
'You peeled that bark off against the grain *gima*!'
- (36) Ad=susut *gima* ot=pinangalaasan nu dino suduwon,
LOC=below.house GIMA NOM=place.of.splitting 2SG that fire.wood
intaay pogi nakawawantuk no=ino kapak dilot tontom.
look.IMP PRTCL PST.NVOL.DUP.snag IAM=that axe that floor.joist
'You chose to split the firewood under the house *gima*, now look, the axe has caught on the floor joist!'

6. Expressive Meaning

Gima frequently occurs in exclamatory statements, i.e., declarative sentences which not only assert a proposition but also express the speaker's feelings or attitude toward the proposition being asserted.⁷ Intonation plays an important role in distinguishing exclamatory statements from other declarative sentences, but exclamations can also be identified by the presence of certain sentence-initial expressive particles, as in (37–38), or other formulaic elements.

- (37) *Woy obo*, nakaabir at=takanon, osongow ko *gima* monook!
PRTCL PRTCL scattered NOM=cooked.rice rough 2SG GIMA scoop
'Now look what happened! The rice is scattered all over because you scooped it out so roughly/carelessly *gima*!'

⁷ I follow Rett (2011) in distinguishing these declarative exclamations from exclamatives. An exclamative is formed from something other than a declarative sentence and does not count as an assertion of its propositional content, e.g. *How very beautiful she was! Was he ever mad! The nerve of some people!* No investigation has been attempted as yet on exclamatives in Kimaragang.

- (38) *Woy obo* oled om nitutup nu nogi' *gima* it=tuunuson,
 PRTCL PRTCL long.time and closed 2SG then GIMA NOM=gate
 nokosuwang it=karabaw doalo sid=paray tokow.
 AV.PST.NVOL.enter NOM=buffalo 3PL DAT=rice.plant 1PL.INCL
 'Now look what happened! You were too slow in closing the gate *gima*, and
 now their buffalo have gotten into our rice field!'

The expressive particle *woy* by itself generally conveys the sense of, 'What did I tell you?' or 'I told you so'. *Obo* can occur by itself as an interjection of surprise, but the sequence of particles observed in (37–38) seems to be an exclamation formula meaning something like 'Now look! What do you expect?', and often rendered in Malay translations as *Itu=lah!* 'that=FOC'. Another formulaic marker of exclamations was seen in (8) and (36) above, *intaay (pogi)* 'just look!', which occurs frequently in scolding and complaints. An additional example is provided in (39).

- (39) Bibinuak nu *gima* i=weeg owo,
 DUP.PST.waste.OV 2SG.GEN GIMA NOM=water PRTCL
intaay pogi asot pomoog da=pinggan.
 look.DV.IMP FOC NEG.EXIST IV.wash ACC=plate
 'You wasted the water, now look, we don't have any to wash the plates
 with!'

In addition to scolding, complaints, and expressions of surprise, *gima* appears in other types of exclamations as well. The exclamatory formula *Sagay gima* 'No wonder!', typically rendered in Malay as *Patut=lah!* 'appropriate=FOC', introduces exclamations about causal relations. *Sagay* by itself is used to introduce clauses expressing a result, as illustrated in (25) above. When the two words *sagay* and *gima* appear together, as seen in (40–43), they indicate exclamatory force. One indication of the formulaic nature of this combination is that the particle *gima* seems to occur in the "wrong" clause: in this construction it marks the result rather than the reason.

- (40) *Sagay.gima* aso no=ot=weeg siti=id=dagay,
 no.wonder NEG.EXIST IAM=NOM=water here=LOC=1PL.EXCL
 nonus i=paip.
 PST.pull.out.OV NOM=pipe
 'No wonder we don't have any water, the pipe has been pulled out!'
- (41) *Sagay.gima* dumarun nopo owo,
 no.wonder AV.rain only PRTCL
 urangkadon dialo at=lobong da=tulun.
 DUP.dig.up.OV 3SG NOM=grave GEN=person
 'No wonder it just keeps raining, he broke open/is breaking open someone's
 grave!'

- (42) *Sagay.gima* nakalabus no i=sada owo,
 no.wonder AV.PST.NVOL.escape IAM NOM=fish PRCL
 nayangat i=pangat.
 PST.NVOL.bent NOM=hook
 ‘No wonder the fish got away, the hook bent/straightened!’
- (43) *Sagay.gima* nokosuwang no=ilo’ sapi,
 no.wonder AV.PST.NVOL.enter IAM=that cow
 amu nokoolit ilo’ lalawangan.
 NEG CV.PST.NVOL.restore that gate
 ‘No wonder the cows got in, the gate did not get closed!’

Exclamations are utterances that convey expressive meaning (frequently in addition to descriptive meaning). The fact that *gima* often occurs in such utterances suggests an association between *gima* and expressive meaning. A further indicator of this association comes from expressive reduplication.

Kroeger & Johansson (2017) describe a pattern of partial reduplication in Kimaragang which they refer to as EXPRESSIVE REDUPLICATION. They illustrate a wide range of semantic functions associated with expressive reduplication, and discuss a number of criteria by which expressive reduplication can be distinguished from aspectual reduplication.

In a number of the examples presented above, *gima* is reinforced by the use of expressive reduplication: <ba>baya in (25), *miob*<pi>pinee in (26), *o*<ru>rungut in (30), *naka*<wa>wantuk in (36), and <bi>binuak in (39). The reduplicated form <ba>batang ‘letter’ is used in (22) to emphasize total illiteracy (‘not one single letter!’), occurring in the same sentence as *gima* but not in the same clause. The same is true for *ko*<ro>rogis ‘reason for becoming sandy’ in (9), *o*<lo>lonsi ‘stink’ in (12), and <ta>tantu ‘certain’ in (13).⁸

Since both *gima* and expressive reduplication are frequently observed in exclamations, it is not surprising that they should frequently co-occur. In some contexts, however, this co-occurrence seems to be obligatory (or at least strongly preferred). My informant stated that examples (44, 45a) would be unnatural if the expressive reduplication is omitted but *gima* is retained.⁹ The simple declarative example (45b), in contrast, which contains neither *gima* nor expressive reduplication, is fully acceptable.

⁸ *U*<na>nawon in (33) and *u*<ra>rangkadon in (41) are ambiguous between expressive reduplication and aspectual reduplication. Examples of expressive reduplication occurring with the mirative particle *bala* were seen in (6) (<wi>widsingo ‘peel’ and *na*<pa>pasa ‘rotten’) and (32a) (*miob*<pi>pinee ‘related as siblings’).

⁹ My informant made a similar comment about <bi>binuak ‘wasted’ in example (39), but he also stated that this root is rarely used without reduplication. Perhaps a reference to someone wasting something usually involves expressive as well as descriptive meaning.

(44) Amu *gima* si-sinobut dialo it=gopu yo
 NEG GIMA DUP-PST.visit.OV 3SG NOM=field 3SG.GEN
 sampay notowunan do=sakot i=togilay.
 until PST.NVOL.cover.DV GEN=grass NOM=corn/maize
 ‘He never went to check on his field *gima*, so his corn got overgrown with grass.’

(45) a. Ri-rinumangkama=i’ do *gima* i=kangkung
 DUP-PST.AV.creep=EMPH LNK GIMA NOM=water.spinach
 tinanom ku.¹⁰
 PST.plant.OV 1SG.GEN
 ‘The *kangkung* (water spinach) that I planted has spread out (I am surprised to see)!’

b. Rinumangkama no i=kangkong tinanom ku.
 PST.AV.creep IAM NOM=water.spinach PST.plant.OV 1SG.GEN
 ‘The *kangkung* that I planted has spread out.’ (neutral statement)

One interpretation of these facts is that *gima* sometimes functions as a marker of exclamatory force, in addition to marking accessibility and uncontroversiality, and in some such cases reinforcement by expressive reduplication is strongly preferred.

7. Conclusion

In some ways it seems curious for a language to have a grammatical morpheme which indicates that the information being expressed is already available to the addressee, since this should be a somewhat abnormal kind of utterance. In fact, as noted by Zimmermann (2011) and Grosz (2016 ms.), such morphemes have been reported in a number of languages. The motivation for using such markers is summarized by Crone (2017: iv–v) as follows:

It so happens that redundant utterances ... are quite often explicitly marked as redundant... The puzzle is why a speaker would ever explicitly mark an utterance as redundant, when this is unnecessary for achieving the speaker’s goals. It is argued here that speakers do so in order to ensure that their listeners are well-informed with respect to the speakers’ beliefs about their listeners. Put differently, if I don’t tell you that I know you know, you might conclude that I don’t know you know. To ensure that you know that I know you know, I tell you that I know you know.

Gima, like other status particles, helps speaker and hearer to manage the common ground by signalling the speaker’s awareness of the hearer’s knowledge. I have noted a number of similarities of usage between *gima* and German unstressed *ja*,

¹⁰ The phrase *do gima* seems to be interchangeable with *gima* in some contexts, as here, but not in others. The differences between the two are not yet understood.

but there are differences as well. As Grosz (2016 ms.) points out, this is a common situation in comparing the discourse particles of one language with those of another language:

Nevertheless, from a cross-linguistic perspective, the issue of the discourse particles' individual contributions is precarious. While other closed-class items, such as modal auxiliaries, exhibit a certain degree of equivalence across unrelated languages, it appears to be rather difficult to establish one-to-one correspondences between a particle α in one language and a particle α' in another language... Nevertheless, tentative correspondences can be established... Moreover, on a pretheoretic level, we observe that, in particular, the uncontroversiality component of *ja...* and the contrast component of *doch...* surface as 'semantic atoms' in many languages (where the term 'semantic atoms' informally refers to a part of the meaning contribution of an abstract functional element).

Of course part of the challenge in understanding these particles is that the number of languages for which detailed information is available concerning the meanings and functions of such particles is still relatively small. This case study is offered as a small contribution toward enriching the empirical basis for further investigation. Additional case studies from other Austronesian languages should be encouraged wherever possible.

8. Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this paper, in addition to others listed in the Leipzig Glossing Rules.

ATEMP	atemporal	IV	instrumental voice
AV	actor voice	ITER	iterative aspect
CV	conveyance voice	LNK	linker
DUP	reduplication	LV	locative voice
DV	dative voice	MIR	mirative
EMPH	emphatic	NVOL	non-volitive
EXCLM	exclamation	OV	objective voice
EXIST	existential	PRTCL	particle
HAB	habitual	RQ	rhetorical question
IAM	iamitive aspect		

References

- Crone, Philip. 2017. Redundancy and awareness in discourse. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Grosz, Patrick. 2014. German *doch*: An element that triggers a contrast presupposition. *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 46, 163–177.

- Grosz, Patrick G. 2016 ms. Discourse particles. To appear in *The Wiley Blackwell companion to semantics*, eds. Lisa Matthewson, Cécile Meier, Hotze Rullmann, and Thomas Ede Zimmermann. Oxford: Wiley.
- Gutzmann, Daniel. 2015. *Use-conditional meaning: Studies in multidimensional semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kroeger, Paul. 2017. Frustration, culmination, and inertia in Kimaragang grammar. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 2(1).56:1–29.
- Kroeger, Paul & Jim Johansson. 2016. Descriptive vs. expressive reduplication in Kimaragang. *AFLA 23: The Proceedings of the 23rd Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, eds. Hiroki Nomoto, Takuya Miyauchi, and Asako Shiohara (eds.), 1–19. Asia-Pacific Linguistics 34. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCready, Eric. 2010. Varieties of conventional implicature. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 3(8):1–57.
- Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Repp, Sophie. 2013. Common ground management: Modal particles, illocutionary negation and VERUM. *Beyond expressives: Explorations in use-conditional meaning*, eds. Daniel Gutzmann and Hans-Martin Gärtner, 231–274. Leiden: Brill.
- Rett, Jessica. 2011. Exclamatives, degrees and speech acts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 34(5):411–442.
- Zimmermann, Malte. 2011. Discourse particles. *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, Handbooks of linguistics and communication science 33.2, eds. Paul Portner, Claudia Maienborn, and Klaus von Stechow, 2012–2038. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.