Focus-aspect polysemy in Kimaragang

Paul Kroeger (paul_kroeger@diu.edu)
Dallas International University & SIL Intl.
AFLA, May 2021

1. Marked Topic vs. Focus constructions

The focus of an answer can be clefted, but not topicalized:

(1) a. *Isay ot tulun* dit awasi ot takal yo?
'*Which person* is clever/has a good mind?'

    b. *I=Ginggiritai* kabarasan   ot   awasi   ot=takal.
       NOM=(name) it.is.said   NOM good   NOM=wit/thought
       'It is *Ginggiritai*, they say, who is clever.'   [CLEFT = good answer]

    c. *#I=nopo*   *Ginggiritai nga'* awasi ot=takal   kabarasan.
       NOM=PRTCL (name)   TOP good   NOM=wit/thought it.is.said
       #'As for *Ginggiritai*, he is clever they say.' [20-Oct-07, mod]
       [TOPICALIZATION; grammatical but not appropriate as answer to (1a)]

The current topic of discussion can be topicalized, but not clefted:

(2) a. Mantad siombo *ino gonding nu*?
'Where did you get *that rattle of yours*?'

    b. *Iti*   *gonding nga'* binoli   ku   sid=Kota.Belud.
       this rattle   TOP PAST-buy-OV 1sg.GEN DAT=Kota.Belud
       '*This rattle* I bought in Kota Belud.'
       [TOPICALIZATION; acceptable answer to (2a)]

    c. *#Iti* *gonding* ot   binoli   ku   sid=Kota.Belud.
       this rattle   NOM PAST-buy-OV 1sg.GEN DAT=Kota.Belud
       #'It was *this rattle* that I bought in Kota Belud.'
       [CLEFT; grammatical but not appropriate as answer to (2a)]

2. Cleft constructions and focus particles

(3) a. [I=Ginggiritai]$_{PRED}$ [ot   awasi   ot=takal]$_{SUBJ}$.
     NOM=(name)   NOM   good   NOM=wit/thought
     'It is Ginggiritai who is clever.'

   b. [Iti   gonding]$_{PRED}$ [ot   binoli   ku   sid=Kota.Belud]$_{SUBJ}$.
     this   rattle   NOM   PAST-buy-OV   1sg.GEN   DAT=Kota.Belud
     'It was this rattle that I bought in Kota Belud.'

There does not seem to be anything special about the syntactic structure of the (pseudo-)cleft construction. It is an equative structure with no overt copula. The focused NP comes first, and functions as the grammatical predicate of the clause, while a headless relative clause occupies the subject position (see Paul 2001 and references cited there).

Nominal predicates in general behave much like any other predicate: the denotation of the subject NP is asserted to belong to the set denoted by the predicate NP.

(4) a. [Tobpinee   ku]$_{PRED}$ [yalo   dilo']$_{SUBJ}$.
     sibling   1SG.GEN   3SG.NOM   that
     'She is my sister.' (Gen. 12:19)

   b. [Tulun   topurak]$_{PRED}$ [ot   negitan   dit=tanak   ku]$_{SUBJ}$.
     person   white   NOM   NVOL.PAST.DV.engage   GEN=child   1sg.GEN
     'The woman my son got engaged to is a white person (European).'

What is special about the (pseudo-)cleft is the semantic type of the NP which occupies the predicate position: it is a referring expression, which induces a SPECIFICATIONAL interpretation (Mikkelsen, 2005). This in turn requires that the predicate NP, rather than the subject, must be focused.

Mikkelsen (2008: 474):

> **Early on it was noticed that ==specificational copular clauses exhibit a fixed topic-focus structure==: *NP$_{TOPIC}$ be NP$_{FOCUS}$* (Halliday 1967, Akmajian 1979, Higgins 1979, Heycock and Kroch 1999, 2002, Partee 2002), whereas other types of copular clauses are not restricted in this way.**

In English, of course, the subject comes first and the predicate nominal last. In Kimaragang, a predicate-initial language, the order is reversed.

The referential status of the predicate NP is signaled by the presence of a determiner (demonstrative or article):

"**articles minimally create arguments out of predicates**" (Gillon 2015: 176). (Exception: "natural kinds" can be arguments without Det, as in (7).)

(5)   **Kimaragang case markers**

	NOM	GEN	DAT/Loc
Personal name markers	i	di	sid+i
Common nouns (definite)	i(t)	di(t)	(s)id
Common nouns (indefinite)	o(t)	do(t)	(s)id
Common nouns (unique ref.)	a(t)	da(t)	ad

The Kimaragang cleft is not as highly marked as the English *it*-cleft (the same seems to hold for Malay, Tagalog). The specific type of focus assigned to the predicate NP is indeterminate, but can optionally be specified by adding a focus particle.

Hasegawa (2010: 11; cf. König 1991: 33): **The main semantic function of focus particles is to evaluate the text proposition containing the focused constituent with respect to other contextually available context propositions containing alternatives.**

(6) a. [*I=koniab*]_FOC   [ot   pinonutuwan   dialo   di=paray]_SUBJ.
       NOM=yesterday   NOM   CIRCV:PST:pound   3SG   ACC=rice
       'It was yesterday that he pounded the rice.'

    b. Okon.ko' [*ikaw*]_FOC   [ot   loow-on]_SUBJ.
       NEG   2SG.NOM   NOM   call-OV
       'It isn't you that is being called.'

(7) **Exhaustive focus**:
       [Kanas   *no*]_FOC [ot   ko-kogop   dot=logop   ot=niyuw]_SUBJ.
       wild pig FOC   NOM   NVOL.AV-bite   ACC=old/dry NOM=coconut
       'It is (only) wild pigs that can crunch a dry coconut (with their teeth).'

(8) **Inclusive/non-exhaustive focus**:
       [Ikaw   *po*]_FOC [o   mamayuk   diti   tanak]_SUBJ.
       2SG.NOM FOC   NOM AV:TR:baby.swing   this   child
       '(Now) you be the one to rock/swing the baby.'
       (i.e., 'Now it is your turn to…')

(9) **Exclusive focus**:

[I=iyay *nopo*]_{FOC} ot obibingkad do mongoy id=tabang]_{SUBJ}.
NOM=mother ONLY NOM sent.out COMP AV.go LOC=work.group
'It is only mother who will go out to join the *tabang* (cooperative labor exchange).'

(10) **Counter-expectation focus**:

[It=gampa *nogi*]_{FOC} [ot pinomutus dialo di=tanak do=punti]_{SUBJ}.
NOM=bush.knife FOC NOM IV:TR:extract 3SG ACC=child GEN=banana
'It was the bush knife that he used to dig out the banana stump that had sprouted.' (unexpected, because a bush knife is too small to dig out a banana stump)

(11) **Contrastive/emphatic focus**:

Sobito nopo dogon, [yoku=i']_{FOC} [ot palapos]_{SUBJ}.
sickle.OV only 1sg.DAT 1sg.NOM.EMPH=VERUM NOM AV.beat
'You just cut (the rice stalks) for me; *I* will be the one to thresh it (by beating).'

(12) **Corrective focus**

Okon.ko' yoku po ot pataakan do=siin,
NEG 1sg.NOM.EMPH FOC NOM give.DV ACC=money
I=Jim *nóono* (ot pataakan).
NOM=Jim EMPH NOM give.DV
'*I* am not the one you should give money too, *Jim* is the one.'

3. Exhaustive vs. non-exhaustive focus

Basic contrast in positive contexts:

(13) a. I=Jim *no* o minanakaw di=karabaw nu.
NOM=Jim FOC NOM AV:PAST:steal ACC=buffalo 2SG.GEN
'It was Jim (and no one else) who stole your buffalo(es).'

   b. I=Jim *po* o minanakaw di=karabaw nu.
NOM=Jim FOC NOM AV:PAST:steal ACC=buffalo 2SG.GEN
'Jim was among those who stole your buffalo(es).'

(14) Kanas   *no* ot   kokogop   dot logop ot=niyuw;
     wild.pig FOC NOM can.crunch ACC old   NOM=coconut
     #It=badak   nga' kokogop=i'.
     NOM=rhinoceros also can.crunch=VERUM
     'It is only wild pigs that can bite open a dry coconut; #rhinoceros can do it too.' [20-Oct-07]

3.1 Interpretation under negation

(Non-)exhaustivity falls under the scope of "==external==" negation:

(15) a. Okon.ko' i=Jim   *no* o   minanakaw   di=karabaw nu.
        NEG   NOM=Jim   FOC NOM AV:PAST:steal ACC=buffalo 2SG.GEN
        'It wasn't only Jim who stole your buffalo(es).'
        [Jim did steal, but he wasn't the only one]

     b. Okon.ko' i=Jim   *po* o   minanakaw   di=karabaw nu.
        NEG   NOM=Jim   FOC NOM AV:PAST:steal ACC=buffalo 2SG.GEN
        'It wasn't Jim who stole your buffalo(es).'
        [Jim did not steal, it was someone else]

(16) a. Okon.ko' kanas   *no* ot   kokogop   dot logop ot=niyuw;
        NEG   wild.pig FOC NOM can.crunch ACC old   NOM=coconut
        it=badak   nga' kokogop=i'.
        NOM=rhinoceros also can.crunch=VERUM
        'It isn't only wild pigs that can bite open a dry coconut; rhinoceros can do it too.' [27-Oct-07]

Most negated clefts contain the non-exhaustive focus particle *po*:

(17) Mutas-utas   mâantad i   kayu diri,
     IMPERF-cut.through already NOM tree ANAPH
     ==okon.ko' yoku   *po*   ot   minanagad==.
     NEG   1SG.NOM.EMPH FOC   NOM AV:PAST:chop.down
     'The tree was already chopped completely through, it wasn't me who cut it down.'

Existential presupposition is preserved under negation, regardless of focus particle:

(18) #Okon.ko' i=Jim *po/no* o minanakaw di=karabaw nu,
    NEG   NOM=Jim FOC   NOM AV:PAST:steal ACC=buffalo 2SG.GEN
    amu=i'   natakaw.
    NEG=FOC NVOL:OV:PAST:steal
    #'It wasn't Jim who stole your buffaloes; they weren't even stolen.'

3.2 Non-exhaustive focus vs. contrastive topic

Grammatical marking for non-exhaustive focus seems to be relatively rare cross-linguistically. (One possible example: *in situ* focus in Hungarian; Wedgwood 2005, Matić & Wedgwood 2013.) Might "non-exhaustive focus" be similar to contrastive topic? Both non-exhaustive focus and contrastive topic contribute a partial answer to the current Question Under Discussion (QUD), but do this via different strategies. Contrastive topics answer the current QUD by breaking it down into sub-questions, organized around a relevant set of potential topics. Non-exhaustive focus offers just one answer to the QUD as a whole, but indicates that this answer may not be unique. See Appendix B for examples.

4. Aspectual *no* vs. *po*

(19) *No* vs. *po* in various contexts:

CONTEXT/FUNCTION	*no*	*po*
ASPECT	Completive / 'already'	Continuative / 'still'
FOCUS	exhaustive	inclusive/non-exhaustive
NARRATIVE	"narrative tense"	prior sequential action
IMPERATIVE	command	invitation
LEAVE-TAKING	announcing	asking permission

Olsson (2013: 4): "**For the purposes of this work, the newly coined term <mark>iamitive</mark> (from Latin *iam* 'already') is used as a cover term for more or less grammaticalized markers that have functions shared by 'already' and the perfect.**"

(20) **_po_** 'CONTINUATIVE'
Selectional restriction: base proposition _p_ describes an atelic situation
Assertion: _p_ is true at Topic Time
Presuppositions: (i) _p_ was true before Topic Time
                              (ii) ??the possibility of (_not p_) is currently salient

(21) **_no_** 'COMPLETIVE': perfect of continuing result (Comrie 1976)
Selectional restriction: base proposition _p_ describes a telic event
Assertion: run time of event that _p_ describes is prior to Topic Time
        (TSit<TT) and result state of that event is true at Topic Time

4.1 Coercion effects

The aspectual use of _no_ is similar in many ways to that of Mandarin sentence-final _le_, as described by Soh & Gao (2006), Soh (2009). One of the most striking of these similarities is the way in which _no_ coerces an inchoative reading when combined with stative and other atelic predicates. (In English, the "perfect of continuing result" reading is not available with atelic predicates, including statives.)

(22) a. Aso   weeg.
         NEG.EXIST   water
         'There is no water' or 'We have no water'

   b. Aso _no_ weeg.
       'We have run out of water' (relatively recently)

The reduplicated form of the adjective in example (23) is most naturally interpreted as a comparative form. Without special context, the change of state reading is not readily available when _no_ is not present.

(23) O<lo>lomu   ??(_no_)   ilo' boli.
       DUP-fat   COMPL   that   barrow
       'That barrow (castrated boar) has gotten a little fatter (than he was before).'

Examples (24a-b) involve descriptions of ability and habitual action, respectively, both of which have the aspectual properties of states.

(24) a. Keemot-imot   no   saabat   yalo   tu',
     ABLE.see-DUP   COMPL   little.bit 3SG.NOM   because
     lumingos   no   it=mato   yo.
     AV.heal   COMPL   NOM=eye   3SG.GEN
     'He is able to see a little bit now, because his eyes are beginning to heal.'

   b. Mii-sikuul   no   it=tanak   ku.
     AV.HAB-school COMPL   NOM=child   1SG.GEN
     'My child goes to school now/has started attending school.'

When *no* combines with activity predicates, the result is often an inceptive ('begin to') reading, as illustrated in (25b); also see 2nd clause of (24a).

(25)   Dumarun.
     'It is raining.'

   b. Dumarun no.
     'It has started raining.'

Other coercion effects with non-past events are possible, including imminent occurrence ('about to x'; 26), and change of intention ('have decided to'; 27).

(26)   Monusu   no   it=sawo   yo.
     AV:give.birth   COMPL   NOM=spouse 3SG.GEN
     'His wife is about to give birth.' (context: 'Call the midwife, because…')

(27)   "Kada   ko   susa,   uli   no,
     NEG.IMPER   2SG.NOM   difficult   return.IMPER   COMPL
     ilo'   sawo   nu   poolion   ya   no,"
     that   spouse   3SG.GEN CAUS:return:OV   3SG.GEN   COMPL
     ka   di   tongo tulun   siri.
     say   GEN   PL   person   there
     ' "Don't worry, go home now, we have decided to send your wife back,"
     said the people there.'

   Context: from a creation myth concerning the rock formations on top of Mt. Kinabalu. Majabow has climbed up Mt. Kinabalu to bring back his wife's soul from the land of the dead. In response to Majabow's threats, the guardian spirits have decided to release the woman's soul. They report this change of heart in the third clause of this sentence using a simple statement of a non-past event ('cause to return') marked with *no*. (The *no* in the second clause is an example of the imperative function mentioned in table 19.)

4.2 Evidence for a perfect analysis of *no*

A. Incompatible with adverbial of specific past time:

(28) It=wulan nakatalib, minonusu (*no) it=sawo dialo.
   NOM=month passed AV:PST:give.birth CMPL NOM=spouse 3SG
   'Last month, his wife gave birth to a child.'

(29) Ginaras   no dialo ilo' karabaw (#dit wulan nakatalib).
   PST:slaughter:OV COMPL 3SG that.NOM buffalo (last month)
   'He has slaughtered that buffalo (#last month).'

B. Implies "current relevance" (TT = now):

(30) Tiya dot okodok oku po,
   time LNK small 1SG.NOM CONT
   minatay (??no) it=tidi   om tama ku.
   AV:PST:die COMPL NOM=mother and father 1SG.GEN
   'When I was still small, my mother and father died/??have died.'

(31) Q: Songkuro no koleed yalo sumakit?
     how.much COMPL long.time 3SG.NOM AV:sick
   'How long has he been sick?' (implies still living and still sick)

   A: Apat taddaw no yalo sumakit.
     four day COMPL 3SG.NOM AV:sick
   'He has been sick for 4 days.' (implies still living and still sick)

If the patient is already dead, only the focus reading is available:

(32) Apat taddaw no yalo sumakit.
   four day FOC 3SG.NOM AV:sick
   'He was sick for only 4 days.' (e.g., he died on the fifth day)

C. Allows pluperfect or anterior (relative past tense) interpretation:

(33) Nengkulupan   ??(no) it=bangkay di=iyay
   NVOL:PST:shroud:DV COMPL NOM=corpse GEN=mother
   tiya dit nokorikot   okoy.
   time LNK NVOL:PST:arrive 1PL.EX.NOM
   'Mother's corpse had already been shrouded by the time we arrived.'
   (very unnatural if *no* is omitted)

5. Deriving (non-)exhaustive focus in clefts

Aspectual meanings (repeated):

(34)   ***po*** 'CONTINUATIVE'
     Selectional restriction: base proposition p describes an atelic situation
     Assertion: p is true at Topic Time
     Presuppositions: (i) p was true before Topic Time
                             (ii) ??the possibility of *not p* is currently salient

(35)   ***no*** 'COMPLETIVE': perfect of continuing result
     Selectional restriction: base proposition p describes a telic event
     Assertion: run time of event that p describes is prior to Topic Time
          (TSit<TT) and result state of that event is true at Topic Time

When these particles take scope over the predicate NP of a cleft, a referring expression, no aspectual coercion effect can produce a telic interpretation and the possibility of *not p* cannot be currently salient. I suggest that a kind of pragmatic coercion allows these particles to be interpreted as modifying the utterance itself.

The focus structure of the cleft identifies the utterance as being an answer to the current QUD. Roughly speaking, saying *p no* constitutes a claim that *p* is a complete answer to the QUD. That is, once *p* has been asserted, the QUD has been answered (the event in the past) and is no longer under discussion (the continuing result). Saying *p po* indicates that in asserting *p*, the speaker participates in the activity of answering the QUD but the culmination of that speech act is not yet achieved, and so the same QUD is still available for discussion.

Appendix A: Relative ordering of Kimaragang 2nd position clitics

Obligatory 2P clitics			Optional 2P clitics		
GEN pron.	**NOM pron.**	**focus/aspect**	**mood**	**evaluative**	**solidarity**
ku '1sg' *nu* '2sg' *yo* '3sg' *to* '1du.incl' *ya* '1pl.excl' *duyu* '2pl'	*oku* '1sg' *ko* '2sg' *kito* '1du.incl' *tokow* '1pl.incl' *okoy* '1pl.excl' *kow* '2pl'	*=i'* 'verum' *no* 'iamitive' *po* 'continuative' *nogi* 'again' *nopo* 'only'	*ga(a)m* 'YNQ' *ma* 'rhet. Q' *pogi* 'forceful' *to* 'empathetic'	*bala' ~ bala'ay* 'mirative' *dara ~ dara'ay* 'frustrative' *gima* 'after all' *dati* 'likely' *toomod* 'likely' *mari* 'certainly' *katoy* 'counter-assertion' *ka* 'hearsay'	*obo* (man-to-man) *owo* (woman-to-woman)

Appendix B: Non-exhaustive focus vs. contrastive topic

Both non-exhaustive focus and contrastive topic contribute a partial answer to the current Question Under Discussion (QUD), but do this via different strategies. Contrastive topics answer the current QUD by breaking it down into sub-questions, organized around a relevant set of potential topics.

(36) Q: Nunu ot tonomon duyu sid tongo tana duyu?
'What crops do you (PL) plant on your land?'

Explicit QUD: "What crops do you (PL) plant on your land?"
Sub-question (a): What do you plant on the hillside?
Sub-question (b): What do you plant on the flat lowlands?

A1: Sid=tidong, mananom okoy   do=tampasuk om togilay;
    DAT=hill   AV.plant 1SG.EX.NOM ACC=cassava   and maize
    sid=napu,   mananom okoy   do=paray.
    DAT=plain   AV.plant 1SG.EX.NOM   ACC=cassava
    'In the hills we plant cassava and maize; in the lowlands we plant rice.'
    [Topicalization: appropriate answer] [27-Oct-07]

A2: #Sid=tidong okoy mananom do=tampasuk om togilay;
    DAT=hill   1SG.EX.NOM AV.plant   ACC=cassava and maize
    sid=napu okoy mananom do=paray.
    DAT=plain 1SG.EX.NOM AV.plant   ACC=cassava
    #'We plant cassava and maize *in the hills*; we plant rice *in the lowlands*.'
    [<mark>Focus Fronting</mark>: not an appropriate answer]   [27-Oct-07]

<mark>Non-exhaustive focus</mark> offers just one answer to the QUD as a whole, but indicates that this answer may not be unique.

(37)   Ikaw   *po*   kawo   ot   momiralan,
       2SG.NOM FOC   PRTCL NOM AV:coax
       kalu.ong miboboyo   do.yika.
       perhaps   AV:obey   2SG.ACC.EMPH
       '(Now) you be the one to coax him, maybe he will obey you.'
       (implies that speaker has been trying without success, e.g. to persuade a child to stop crying.)

Appendix C: "Duality" of *no* with *po*

Vander Klok and Matthewson (2015) propose a number of diagnostic properties that can be used to distinguish an adverb meaning 'already' from a perfect aspect marker. One of these is the DUALITY between *still* and *already* (Löbner 1989, 1999; König 1991; etc.). This term means that the external negation of *still* is truth-conditionally equivalent to the internal negation of *already*. They note that this kind of duality is typically not a property of perfect aspect. We can demonstrate this duality using answers to questions. A negative answer to a Yes-No question asserts the external negation of the base proposition of the question. The external negation *not* (*already p*) is equivalent to the internal negation *still* (*not p*), as illustrated in (38). The external negation *not* (*still p*) is equivalent to the internal negation *already* (*not p*), as illustrated in (39).

(38)	Q: Are you *already* vaccinated? A: No, I am *not already* vaccinated; = I am *still not* vaccinated. normal English: I am *not yet* vaccinated.	Is (*already p*) true? *not* (*already p*) = *still* (*not p*)

(39)	Q: Are you *still* angry?
	A: No, I am *not still* angry;
	    = I am *already not* angry.
	normal English: I am *no longer* angry /
	            I am *not* angry *any more*
		Is (*still p*) true?
		not (*still p*)
		= *already* (*not p*)

Kimaragang *no* and *po* are duals in this sense, so this is one respect in which *no* seems more similar to 'already' than to perfect aspect. The dual relation between *no* and *po* is illustrated in examples (40–41). For each question, the second column shows the normal answer using the internal negation (*amu'*) of the dual. The third second column shows an equivalent answer using the internal negation (*okon ko'*) of the original particle. Notice that whereas English replaces *still not* with *not yet* and *already not* with *no longer*, Kimaragang is "morphologically transparent": the same particles are used for both internal and external negation.

	QUESTION	NORMAL (INTERNAL)	EQUIVALENT (EXTERNAL)
(40)	Miyaw *po* it=tidi nu oy? live NOM=mother 2sg Q 'Is your mother still living?	Amu' *no*. 'No longer.'	Okon ko' miyaw *po* it tidi ku. 'It is not the case that my mother is still living.'
(41)	Kapanaw *no* it=tanak nu oy? able.walk NOM=child 2sg Q 'Can your child walk yet?'	Amu' *po*. 'Not yet.'	Okon ko' kapanaw *no* it tanak ku. 'It is not the case that my child can already walk.'

References

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge University Press.

Gillon, Carrie. 2015. Investigating D in languages with and without articles. In *Methodologies in Semantic Fieldwork*, edited by Ryan Bochnak & Lisa Matthewson, 175-203. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hasegawa, Akio. 2010. The semantics and pragmatics of Japanese focus particles. PhD dissertation, University at Buffalo.

Higgins, R. F. 1979. *The Pseudo-cleft Construction in English*. New York: Garland.

König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The meaning of focus particles: a comparative perspective*. London & New York: Routledge.

Löbner, Sebastian. 1989. German *schon – erst – noch*: An integrated analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12: 167–212.

Löbner, Sebastian. 1999. Why German *schon* and *noch* are still duals: A reply to van der Auwera. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22.1: 45–107.

Matić, Dejan & Daniel Wedgwood. 2013. The meanings of focus: The significance of an interpretation-based category in cross-linguistic analysis. *Journal of Linguistics* 49: 127-163.

Mikkelsen, Line. 2005. *Copular Clauses: Specification, Predication and Equation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mikkelsen, Line. 2008. Specification under discussion. BLS 34, vol. 1, p. 473-482. https://journals.linguisticsociety.org/proceedings/index.php/BLS/article/view/3591/3290

Olsson, Bruno. 2013. Iamitives: Perfects in Southeast Asia and beyond. Stockholm: Stockholm University M.A. Thesis. http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:633203/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Paul, Ileana. 2001. Concealed pseudo-clefts. *Lingua* 111.10: 707-727.

Soh, Hooi Ling, and Meijia Gao. 2006. Perfective aspect and transition in Mandarin Chinese: An analysis of double *–le* sentences. In *Proceedings of 2004 Texas Linguistics Society Conference: Issues at the semantics-pragmatics interface*, ed. Pascal Denis, Eric McCready, Alexis Palmer and Brian Reese, 107–122. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.

Soh, Hooi Ling. 2009. Speaker presupposition and Mandarin Chinese sentence final *–le*: A unified analysis of the "change of state" and the "contrary to expectation" reading. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27:623–657.

Vander Klok, Jozina & Lisa Matthewson. 2015. *Oceanic Linguistics* 54.1:172–205.

Wedgwood, Daniel. 2005. *Shifting the focus: From static structures to the dynamics of interpretation*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.