

Topicalization in Nambikuara

IVAN LOWE

This paper deals with marked topicalization in Nambikuara.¹ Topicalization needs to be considered in both its surface and its functional aspects; that is, both the surface devices that are used to topicalize and the effects that topicalization has on the meaning of the discourse merit study.²

An element in a Nambikuara clause can be topicalized by fronting or by left dislocation. Other topicalization processes exist but are not considered in this paper. Having arrived at the topicalized surface forms, the question remains 'What does the topic do to the meaning structure both of the clause that it is in and of the discourse that the clause is in?' This is the functional aspect of topicalization.

The question 'What is a clause about?' is the question that is answered by the topic of the clause and that unifies all the diverse surface topicalization processes such as fronting and left dislocation.³ Pursuing the same question we can extend the idea of topic to a span of discourse greater than that of clause and ask: 'Do there exist spans of consecutive clauses for which it is meaningful to ask the question "What is this clause span about?" ' If this question has an affirmative answer, we will call what the span is about the span topic or topic of the span, and the span itself we will call a topic span. The concept of a topic span is indispensable for the understanding of complete Nambikuara texts but could not have been reached with a strictly clause-bound approach to topicalization.

In this paper I show that both left dislocation and fronting define topic spans in Nambikuara, which I will call left dislocation spans and fronting spans respectively. Furthermore, left dislocation spans can embed fronting spans within them, but never vice versa.

Clearly, in order to establish a topic span we need to be able to recognize where it begins and where it ends. It will be shown that both left dislocation and fronting begin spans. These two kinds of span end, however, in different ways. A left dislocation span ends immediately before another left dislocation span begins, i.e. such a span runs right up to the next left dislocation span. Or a left dislocation span can end immediately before a clause with an informationally new time setting.

However, because a fronting span can be embedded within a left dislocation span, the ways that a fronting span can end are much more diverse. When a fronting span is not embedded in a larger span, it can run right up to the beginning of the next topic span whether the latter is a left dislocation span, as in examples 1 and 2, or another fronting span. On the other hand, when a fronting span is embedded in a larger span defined by left dislocation, its end can be indicated by an explicit return to the already defined left dislocation topic. In this case, the first nominal in the

first clause after the fronting span has lexical cohesion with the old left dislocation topic, and this tells us that there has been a return to that topic.

The idea of a span topic can be made more precise as follows.⁴ If left dislocation or fronting defines a span with topic T, and J is any clause within this span, then it should be possible to read J as 'concerning T, J'. The actual surface form in discourse is obtained from this by deleting the topic 'concerning T'. In other words, if the idea of a topic span is valid then every clause within the span with topic T should pass this criterion as a test and no clause in another span should pass it. The existence of such a hypothetical form finds confirmation in example 3, where the actual surface form of a clause shows a left dislocated topic followed by a fronted topic, and then the rest of the clause.

The question of how the topic system relates to the information distribution system⁵ has been discussed by Halliday (1967) and more recently by Gundel (1974). The latter sets out to show that topic is always given information. Every marked topic⁶ in the Nambikuara data has been checked for this, and it has been found that with the reasonable extensions made in sections 1 and 2 of the idea of 'given', all these topics confirm Gundel's proposal.

This paper therefore first deals in sections 1 and 2 with fronting and left dislocation and how the topic spans defined by these two processes relate to each other. In this discussion, I define carefully the ends as well as the beginnings of the spans and also examine each marked topic to see whether it is given or new information. Section 3 then deals with how topicalization is used in special ways to indicate titles and climaxes of myths.

1. FRONTING AND PSEUDOFrontING.

1.1. Fronting.

Fronting of a nominal clause constituent in Nambikuara topicalizes that constituent. Nambikuara clauses spoken in isolation characteristically have constituent orders TS(O)V or LS(O)V; fronting, therefore, takes a nominal constituent that is not leftmost, i.e. S or O in these isolation orders, and moves it to the first or leftmost position of the clause.

The fronted constituent is in every case what the clause is about. In each of the following examples I show that this is the case by giving an adequate amount of the context of the clause under study.

Except for story titles (section 3) the fronted element so topicalized is always given information. Various surface devices in the text show this. In some of the examples, the verb carries the collective verification set of suffixes, which have a meaning component 'information in this clause is known to both speaker and hearer'.⁷ In others, the fronted element is a pronoun which is given information, in others again the fronted element has been mentioned earlier in the story.

The fronted clause is always preceded in discourse by a conjunction, which connects it logically to what has preceded. The conjunctions, which can precede a fronted clause are⁸ -kxai²nān²tu³ 'conditional', -kxa²hax³ta³nān²ti³ 'concessional' and xyān¹ta¹

'adversative'. These are conjunctions, which are more often used between clauses and only occasionally between larger units, thus pointing to the tendency for fronted clause spans to be short. In contrast, the left dislocated clauses to be dealt with in section 2 must be preceded by one of a totally different set of conjunctions, which are mainly used between larger units.

In the following five examples of fronting, the first three are from first person texts, the last two from myths. The subject is fronted in examples 1 to 4 and the object in example 5. The fronted element is always given information; in examples 1 and 2 it is the pronoun 'I', in example 3 its given status is shown by the collective verification suffixes on the verb, and in examples 4 and 5 its given status is shown by anaphoric reference suffixes on the fronted element. The end of the topic span is indicated by a topic change conjunction in examples 1, 2, and 4 and by an explicit return to the topic of the embedding span in example 3.

In all the examples in this paper, the data are presented in three subsections. Immediately following the number of the example, the Nambikuara is given, clause by clause, each clause being numbered by a lower case letter of the alphabet in parentheses so that consecutive letters of the alphabet indicate consecutive clauses in running text. Following the number of the example marked with a single prime, such as (1'), is the corresponding word-by-word gloss, and then following the number of the example with a double prime, such as (1''), is the free translation. When essential context precedes the example clauses, or follows them, or both, it is given within parentheses in the free translation.

In example 1, the preceding context talks about some people who are about to go off on a journey. The speaker then adds 'As for me, I am staying behind.' The implication is 'As for them, they'll probably go off on a trip but as for me, I'll not go.' He thus begins to talk about himself and what he will do. The topicalized clause (a) has constituent order SLV rather than the unmarked order LSV. Its topic is the fronted pronoun subject I, which is always given information. The span ends after one more clause at the conjunction *jut¹ta³la³ na¹ha²kxai³* 'major topic change', which introduces a new topic span.

- (1) (a) *nain¹kxa²hax³ta³nān²ti³ txai²li² yon³nān²ta³ sxa³na¹tū¹*
 (1') ((a) Even-though-they as-for-me behind I-will-stay)
 (1'') '(a) Even though they go off on a journey, as for me I am staying behind. (b) So you will come back and meet me here. (c) Major topic changer, as for my house ...)

In example 2, the preceding context talks about some people who are working in the fields. The speaker then begins to talk about himself and what he is going to do: 'As for me, I'll stay behind,' i.e. not join the others in their work on the fields. The topicalized clause has constituent order SLV rather than the unmarked order LSV, the topic being the fronted subject pronoun 'I' which is always given information'. Like example 1, the span ends immediately preceding the conjunction *jut¹ta³la³ na¹ha²kxai³* 'major topic change'. Unlike example 1, however, this span in example 2 extends over several pages of text.

- (2) (c) nain¹kxai²nān²tu³ txai²nān²tu³ yon³nān²ta³ sxa³na¹tū¹
 (2') ((c) Since-they-do as-for-me behind I-will-stay) u
 (2'') '((a) Now they are working in the fields (b) They are cutting the fields.) (c) Since they are, as for me, I will stay behind. ((d) I will go off hunting on another trail. ... Major topic changer, ...)'

In example 3, the subject 'rain' is fronted to give the constituent order STV in clause (c). This clause, then, tells us about the 'rain', that it usually falls nonstop at this time of the year.

In clause (a), which is two clauses before this fronted clause, the marked topic 'house' is introduced by left dislocation. This, as we shall see in example 14, defines a left dislocation span that embeds the span with topic 'rain'. The clause (b) that immediately precedes the clause with topic 'rain' is 'We are getting rained upon,' and this has no nominal constituent, the verb 'to be rained upon' being a state verb whose surface form bears no resemblance to the lexical noun root 'rain'.

This fronted span with topic 'rain' ends in an unusual way: by return to the major topic 'house' of the embedding span as follows:

The final clause (e) in the free translation 'thus my task, I will calmly work at,' shows us that the speaker has finished talking about 'rain' and has returned to talking about 'work on the house'. The beginning of this clause therefore, indicates the end of the topic span on 'rain' which began with the fronted clause (c).

- (3) (c) xyān¹ta¹ na¹jut³ta³la³ wě³hai²nān²tu³ hī¹ ta³te²la³
 ān³six³wi¹wi¹hxai²te¹ti²nhe³
 (3') ((c) but my-situation the-rain right-this-time-of-the-year usually-falls-nonstop-collective-verification)
 (3'') '((a) Concerning houses, the work on my house isn't finished. (b) We are getting rained upon.) (c) But in this matter, the rain usually comes down nonstop this time of the year as we all know. (d) But now it is not doing that any more. (e) Thus my task, I will calmly work at it.'

The next two examples, 4 and 5, have to do with fronting to topicalize participants in myths. Fronting of a participant in a clause within the body of a myth defines a topic span all of whose clauses say something about the topicalized participant. The topic or fronted element is given information since it carries the ending nū¹ta²kxai³lu² which in a myth marks a constituent which refers anaphorically to some preceding part of the context.

However, a fronted clause, which is the first clause of a story, is the verbal title of the story, and reports not the first event of the story but the most significant event. Verbal titles have a topic, which is new information. Such clauses will be treated in detail in section 3.

In example 4, the subject 'mother' is fronted so that the constituent order STV departs from the unmarked order TSV. Thus the 'mother' is the topic of this clause and remains the topic for the whole of the following span given until the switch conjunction signals a topic change. The fronted clause in this example is not a title but reports the first event in the sequence.

(4) (a) $\tilde{a}^2 h\tilde{a}x^3 k\tilde{a}^3 nu^2 n\tilde{u}^1 ta^2 kxai^3$ $kx\tilde{a}^3 na^3 ha^2 ta^3 a^2$ $t\tilde{a}^2 te^3 lh\tilde{x}\tilde{a}^3$
 $xai^3 t\tilde{a}u^3 \tilde{a}n^2 t\tilde{u}^3$

(4') ((a) mother-anaphoric-reference the-morrow in-order-to-defecate while-going)

(4'') '(a) Then the mother, on the morrow, while going out to relieve herself, (b) saw cutter ants bearing manioc leaves. And she said in wonder, "Look! Cutter ants have cut up manioc leaves and are coming." Switch conjunction then indicates topic change.)'

In example 5, the object constituent 'child' is fronted⁹ from the unmarked clause order SOV. Thus 'child' is the topic of this clause and remains the topic for the whole of the following context given. This fronted clause is not the first clause in the story, so it is not a title, but rather reports the first event in a long sequence.

(5) (a) $te^3 nah^1 lxi^1$ (b) $w\tilde{e}^3 sa^3 n\tilde{u}^1 ta^2 kxai^3 lu^2$ $w\tilde{e}^3 sa^3 n\tilde{u}^1 t\tilde{a}^2$
 $\tilde{a}^2 w\tilde{i}^3 nu^2 su^2$ $te^2 kxai^3 lu^2$ $t\tilde{e}^3 sx\tilde{a}^3$ $xai^3 ta^1 hxai^2 h\tilde{e}^1 ra^2$

(5') ((a) this-is-how (b) child the-child's father this-one took-and went)

(5'') '(a) This is how (b) Concerning the child, the child's father led him. (c) And the father went in front and the child came along behind. And ...)'

1.2. Fronting near the beginning of a text.

All fronted topics treated so far have been given information, and we expect every fronted topic to be given information. We have seen in section 1.1 that the use of pronouns, collective verification and mention in preceding context are ways of indicating that information is given. However, if the fronted clause is the first clause in the discourse that has a marked topic, then one way to make sure that the topic will be given information is to have an introductory stretch of discourse where the topic referent can be introduced before it gets topicalized. This introductory section is essentially a device for introducing the referent that is to be made the marked topic later and for making a few incidental remarks about it. Such a section has its own topic, which is usually, but not necessarily, co-referential with what will be the marked topic. Immediately after the introductory section comes the clause with a topic marked by fronting, and this clause can be regarded as initiating the first main argument of the text.

The following two examples, 6 and 7, both commence with a section which introduces and gives past time information on the items 'house rafters' and 'manioc shoots' respectively. The fronted elements in the clauses designated (c), both of which have marked topics, refer

anaphorically back to the previously mentioned items, introducing them as marked topics for the text span to follow, which tells the hearer what the speaker intends to do with these items.

The first clauses of the introductory sections of examples 6 and 7 introduce their own unmarked topics in different ways. Example 6 introduces 'house rafters' in clause (a) with a verb in collective verification, but the nominal itself has no verification suffix. Example 7, on the other hand, introduces 'manioc shoots' in clause (a) with collective verification suffixes on the nominal itself, showing it clearly to be given information. On the other hand, the verb itself is suffixed for individual verification so it is new information. It could be argued, but in my opinion less convincingly, that the topic for the introductory sections was the time setting itself, i.e. 'this morning' and 'today' respectively for examples 6 and 7. This possible indeterminacy does not affect the topic of the main argument, which is selected unambiguously by the fronted element in the first clause with marked topic.

Thus in example 6, the first constituent 'these my rafters therefore' of clause (c) refers back anaphorically to 'house rafters' of clause (a) and is the fronted topic for the whole of clause (c).

(6) (a) kxã³na³ha²ta³na² sxi²ha²ni³ta² yo³te³lhxã³ xai³na¹-
ten¹tu³wa² (b) xyã¹ta¹ yo³a¹ra² ã²yut³ta² yo³ã¹a¹ra²
(c) na¹ta³ni³tai²na²sa²kxai²lu² kxã³na³ha²tai²nã²ta³
hãi¹xã³na¹a¹kax³tu³ sa³so¹xi²sxã³ hãi¹sxã³ sa²tait³ta²
jut¹tai²na² so¹li³ na¹tũ¹xã¹ na¹hẽ²ra²

(6') ((a) this-morning house-rafters in-order-to-cut I-went-collective-verification (b) but I-cut-them valley-I-cut-left (c) these-my-rafters-therefore tomorrow I'll-leave I-gather just tie-up this-only I-future I-intend)

(6'') '(a) This morning, I went to cut rafters for the house. (b) And I actually cut them too. I cut them and left them in the valley. (c) These my rafters, therefore, I'll leave them tomorrow - that is to say, all I intend to do is to gather them and tie them up.'

In example 7, the first constituent 'these my shoots therefore' of clause (c) refers back anaphorically to 'manioc shoots' of clause (a). 'These, my shoots therefore' is the fronted topic of clause (c).

(7) (a) hĩ¹na²su² wa³lin³sun³ti² ĩ³a¹ra² (b) xyã¹ta¹ su³ha¹li¹
ot³sxã³ ã³sĩ¹na¹ra² (c) na¹ta³su³ai²-na²sa²kxai³lu²
kxã³na³ha²tai²nã²ta³ te²yãx¹ne²
ĩ³a¹tũ¹xã¹ na¹hẽ²ra²

(7') ((a) today manioc-shoot-we've-seen I-planted (b) but some-shoots left-over we-left (c) these-my-shoots-therefore tomorrow in-the-same-way I-plant-intend I-subjective)

(7'') '(a) Today I planted manioc shoots, (b) but we left with some shoots still unplanted. (c) These my shoots, I intend to plant tomorrow.'

However, after an item has been introduced in a first clause, the argument concerning it which follows need not necessarily start with a fronted anaphoric element. After a first clause introduction, the item can be referred to by zero in the following clause. When zero anaphora is used however, there must be time continuity between the first and second clauses so that if, for instance, the first clause deals with a future time event so must the second. Thus see example 8 where the item 'bamboo' introduced in the first clause is referred to by zero in the second clause rather than by a fronted anaphoric element. The clauses (a) and (b) form a short span with unmarked topic 'bamboo'. The span is embedded in a larger span with topic 'baskets' which was introduced by fronting, and immediately after clause (b) there is a return to the topic of the embedding span. Unlike the topics in examples 6 and 7, the topic 'bamboo' of example 8 never gets fronted. Both the verb 'see' of clause (a) and 'show' of clause (b) in example 8 refer to future events so the time continuity requirement is satisfied. This is in contrast to the time orientation shifts in examples 6 and 7 where the events in the introduction are past events but the events in the argument that follows are future events.

(8) (a) ax³lu³kwhi³la² e³kxain¹to³jut³tait³ta³li²
 i²na¹hxã³nhi² na¹hẽ²ra² (b) jã¹xne³sxã³
 xwã²nãu³ũ¹sain¹na³na¹ (c) na¹kxai²nãn²tu³

(8') ((a) bamboo that-they-talked-about I-see-desiderative I-subjective (b) and-so if-they show-me (c) then-I'll ...)

(8'') '(a) I want to see the bamboo they talked about. (b) If they show it to me. (c) (then I'll weave baskets ...)'

1.3. Pseudofronting.

Sometimes a clause has what looks like a fronted element yet this element does not fit into the clause in any definable role at all. In other words it is not possible to match it to a well-formed unfronted clause. I call this pseudofronting because although the result sounds superficially like a fronted clause, in fact an extraneous element has been added to the front of the clause.

Pseudofronting, however, functions in the same way as fronting because this extraneous element, like the fronted element in a regularly fronted clause, is the topic for a whole clause span beginning with the first clause.

Thus in example 9, the word hi³a² 'poles' at the very beginning of the first clause is a pseudofronted element. A literal translation of the first clause by itself, 'poles, we were staying at the Fox headwaters', makes poor sense at best, and it is impossible to assign a role to 'poles' in that clause. However, if we take the next clause as well, then 'poles' fits very well as what is being talked about for the span consisting of both clauses. 'Poles' is given information, having been mentioned previously in the text. The topic span so defined is just two clauses long. A new span, preceded by xyã¹ta¹ 'adversative' and introducing the next topic, follows immediately.

- (9) (a) xne³kxai³nān²tu³ hi³a² yax³wa³la³ne³ki³a²
 ā³xyau³sain¹na²hē³ra² (b) ya³sai¹nha²kxai³ 'hi³a²
 i³hax³ja³san¹lxi³hē¹ri¹, 'nai¹na¹hē²ra²
- (9') ((a) thus poles headwaters-called-Fox we-were-staying-at (b) at-that-time poles let's-make-a-bridge I-to-them)
- (9'') '(a) Thus, concerning the poles, we were staying at the Fox headwaters (b) and I said to them, "Let's build a bridge with these poles."'

2. LEFT DISLOCATION.

Left dislocation also topicalizes a Nambikuara clause. This section shows how left dislocation topicalizes, how left dislocation topic spans are set up and how such spans can have topic spans that are defined by fronting embedded within them.

I define the surface process of left dislocation in Nambikuara as that of adding to the beginning of a clause a nominal constituent with a close lexical relationship to a nominal already inside the clause, without deleting that old nominal. Although this looks very different from the original definition given by Ross (1967), which involved leaving a pronoun in the clause in place of the dislocated element, I shall show how similar the final results of the two processes are.

First, however, an example of how it works in Nambikuara. Were the Nambikuara process exactly reproducible in English, we might have something like 'work on my house, my house is not being built,' where the nominal 'work on my house' with a close lexical relationship to the in-clause nominal 'my house', is added at the front of the original clause 'my house is not being built.' The corresponding Nambikuara form is txa²sxi²hyut³tai²na² hai³txi³sxi²hai²nān²tu³ ton³nū³xn³ti²nhe³ (work-on-my-house negative this-house construct-negative-collective-verification) 'Concerning the work on my house, my house is not being built.'

Let us now look more closely at the lexical relationship between the dislocated element and its in-clause counterpart. This is sometimes a part-to-whole relationship and sometimes an activity-to-associated-item relationship.

As illustrations of the part-to-whole relationship, example 10 presents a dislocated element 'work on the fields' that bears a part-to-whole relationship to its in-clause counterpart 'manioc-shoots', and example 11 has a dislocated element 'the open country' that bears the same relationship to its in-clause counterpart 'the piece at the back of the little woods', this being clear to a hearer who knows the layout of the village being talked about.

As an illustration of the activity-to-associated-item relationship, in example 12 a dislocated element 'work on wood' is an activity, which has an associated item 'wood' which is its in-clause counterpart. In general the dislocated element describes an activity while its in-clause counterpart mentions some item, which is involved in that activity. Example 13 shows the same relationship between dislocated element and its in-clause counterpart. Example 14 also shows the

same relationship, but the order of the two elements has been reversed in surface structure, with dislocation of the item rather than the activity.

What I call left dislocation in Nambikuara differs in surface detail from the sense in which the term was introduced by Ross but the final result is similar in the two cases. In the original usage, a constituent was fronted but a pronoun was left in place of the former constituent in the clause, as for example in Gundel's example for English 'As for the proposal, Archie rejected it,' which is related to 'Archie rejected the proposal' by left dislocation. Thus there is referential identity between the dislocated element and its in-clause counterpart in English. In Nambikuara left dislocation as I have defined it, the relationship between the dislocated and in-clause elements is not one of referential identity but rather one of the two mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, either part-to-whole or activity-to-associated-item.

Left dislocation spans can have fronting spans embedded within them but the converse is not true. This does not lay down any limits on the number of clauses that either of these kinds of topic span can have. Although fronting spans typically tend to be just a few clauses long and left dislocation spans much longer, there are, in fact, examples of fronting spans that extend over most of a long text and also examples like 12 of a left dislocation span exactly one clause long.

All the following examples 10 to 14, show how left dislocation topicalizes and defines a topic span. The last examples 13 and 14, also show fronting spans embedded within left dislocation spans and how a fronting span so embedded can end.

Different examples illustrate different lexical relationships between the dislocated element and its in-clause counterpart.

The topic is always given information, but the givenness is rather subtle in two of the examples 11 and 12. Thus in example 11 the topic 'open country' is given information because it is a referential part of the topic 'all the land where we live' which was announced in the very first clause of the text by the speaker. In example 12 the topic 'work on wood' is given information because a lexically related activity 'house construction' has been discussed before in the same text. On the other hand, the left dislocated elements in examples 10, 11, and 14 are shown to be given information by the common device of suffixing the verb in the clause for collective verification, just as was done in example 3 on fronting.

As regards surface markers, the left dislocation span is always immediately preceded by one of three conjunctions, either $jut^1ta^3la^3$ $na^1ha^2kxai^3$ 'major topic change', or $na^1ha^2kxai^3$ 'similarly' or $hãun^2xwãn^3ta^3$ 'eventually'. These do not include any of the conjunctions that introduce the topic span for fronting, and the first two of these conjunctions here always connect large units in discourse.

The last word in the left dislocated constituent is almost always suffixed with either $-tu^3$ 'incomplete' or $-sa^1$ 'cataphoric', which tell the hearer to expect more information on the topic just announced.

In the example 10, left dislocation in the first clause defines a topic 'work on the fields' with a topic span extending over the two clauses given. The left dislocated element has a whole-

to-part relationship with its in-clause counterpart. Collective verification suffixes on the verbs show the topic to be given information. The topic span ends with the end of the story.

(10) (a) jut¹ta²la³-na¹ha³kxai³ hai³syut³tai²nān²tu³ wa³lin³su³-
ai²nān²tu³ ā³nī¹xn³nha²khi³ xne³kix³jau³su³ to³kix³tait¹-
ti²ti³ (b) xyān¹ta¹ su³ka³na³ku² ī³hxa³kix³tait¹ti²ti³

(10') ((a) major-topic-change work-on-fields these-manioc-shoots want-badly-to-plant
our-thoughts we-collective-verification (b) but a-few-shoots we-have-planted-
conective-verification)

(10'') '(a) Concerning work on the fields, we've been saying we very badly want to plant these
manioc shoots. (b) However, we have planted a few shoots as everyone knows!' (End of
story.)

Example 11 comes out of a discourse in which an Indian is discussing the imminent coming of some surveyors who will measure his land, some of which may be taken away from him. He is spelling out what parts of the land he is willing to give up and what parts he wants to keep at any price. In the immediately preceding context he has been discussing the land 'near the village' and now he passes on to discuss the 'open country'.

(11) (a) na¹ha²kxai³ ha³lo²ai²na²sa¹ yu³sa³txi²ta³lo³kxa³tī³nha²
xyan¹txi²hax³tī³tī³nha² ha³lo²a² ā³ten³sa²tī³nāu¹la³
sa³ha²kxai³ xne³sa³nha²wa²

(11') ((a) similarly open-country the-piece-atthe-back-of-the-woods the-piece-over-yonder
place I-want to-me me-subjective)

(11'') '(a) In the same way, concerning the open country, I want the piece of land over yonder at
the back of the woods.'

The following example 12 again illustrates left dislocation with a whole-to-part relationship between the dislocated element and the in-clause element. It differs, however, from the other examples of this section in two important respects.

First, it illustrates how the topic can be given information without having been mentioned explicitly in the preceding context, provided that the context mentions something else, which is in a part-to-whole relationship with the element to be topicalized. Thus in this example, the topic 'work on wood' has not been explicitly mentioned in the previous context nor is the verb suffixed for collective verification. However, in the previous context 'house construction' has been discussed and 'house construction' includes work on getting wood for the house, which is the topic of the dislocated clause.

Second, it illustrates a topic span which is unusually short for one defined by left dislocation - only one clause long. Right after the end of the topicalized clause is the conjunction jut¹ta³la³-na¹ha²kxai³, which always announces a new topic.

- (12) (c) hãun²xwãn³ta³ hi³yut³tai²nãn²tu³ hi³nãn²ta³ ã³sa²-
so¹hxĩ³na¹xã¹ ye¹xna²ha¹wa² (d) jut¹ta³la³-na¹ha²kxai³
- (12') ((c) eventually work-on-wood wood I-will-probably-get I-to-you (d) major-topic-change)
- (12'') '... ((a) Tomorrow I'm thinking of nailing up the house. (b) But if I get hungry I'll go hunting and get some food. ... then) (c) eventually concerning work on the wood for the house, I'll probably get some wood, I'm saying to you. (d) (Change of topic ...)'

The following two examples, 13 and 14, illustrate how a span introduced by left dislocation can embed within it a span introduced by fronting. Both examples illustrate left dislocation topicalization with a whole-to-part relationship between the dislocated element and the in-clause counterpart. Note that in example 14 the order of these elements is the reverse of the normal. The topic is known to be given information because of collective verification suffixes on the verb.

In example 13, the left dislocated topic of clause (a) 'work on my house only' is the overall topic for clauses (a), (b), and (c). Then a further left dislocated clause (d) gives 'house' as overall topic for clauses (d) and (e). Clause (f) starts with a new setting 'some time later in the year' as topic and 'weather drying out' as comment, while clause (g) takes the comment of clause (f) and makes that its topic. Finally, clause (h) has fronted topic 'house' which is a return to the topic defined by left dislocation of clause (d).

- (13) (a) hãun²xwãn³ta³ txa²sxi²hyut³tai²na² so¹li³ hai³txi³
sxi²hai²nãn²tu³ ton³nũ³xn³ti²nhe³
- (13') ((a) eventually work-on-my-house only negative this-house construct-negative-collective-verification)
- (13'') '(a) Concerning work on my house, my house is not being built. (b) I don't want a big house, (c) just a smallish one so that I can keep dry do I intend to build. (d) But concerning the house, if only I'd got some thatch some time ago. (e) But now the weather is so unreliable. (f) Some time later in the year, the weather usually dries out. (g) It's about to happen now, I believe. (h) And so concerning the house at present, I'm not worried.'

In example 14, I give the whole span (a) to (g) of the topic 'houses' that is defined by left dislocation in clause (a). The span thus includes the span consisting of clauses (c) and (d) that is defined by fronting the span topic 'rain'. The 'rain' span ends with clause (d) since the first nominal in clause (e) is 'my task' which refers anaphorically to 'work on the house' and thus brings us back to the left dislocated topic 'houses'. The topic span defined by left dislocation in clause (a) ends at the new time setting 'now' given at the beginning of clause (h) and this clause and following clauses go on to talk about a completely new topic.

(14) (a) jut¹ta³la³-na¹ha²kxai³ sxi²hai²nān²tu³ txa²sxi²hyut³-
tai²nān²tu³ ta³lu²ni²kxi²nhū¹xn³ti²nhe³

(14') ((a) major-topic-change houses the-work-on-my-house not-yet-finished-collective-
verification)

(14'') '(a) Major topic change. Concerning houses, the work on my house isn't finished yet.
(b) We are getting rained on. (c) But in this matter, the rain usually comes down
nonstop this time of the year. (d) Now it doesn't. (e) Thus my task on the house I'll
calmly work away at (f) and when I finish the house, I'll leave it. (g) But this sickness has
disabled me so I have nothing to say. (h) But now the people who have gone off to hunt
the anteater ...)'

3. TOPICALIZATION IN MYTHS.

In myths, topicalization is used in two ways in which it is not normally used in non-mythical texts: in verbal titles and in indicating a climax.

Verbal titles are given as follows. The first nominal in a story is its topic. If the first nominal appears in an equative clause, then the subject of this clause is the topic; temporals and locatives are not counted as nominals in this reckoning. If the first nominal is in an active clause, whose time reference is later than the first event of the story, then this clause constitutes a verbal title and the topic of the story is the topic of this clause. If, in addition, the title clause is transitive and the story topic is its object, then this object has to be fronted to topicalize it.

In example 15, the object element 'the orphans' is fronted out of the unmarked clause order TSOV. Since this is the first clause of the text, 'the orphans' are the topic of the story. They are the main participants throughout the story and this story is referred to by all the Nambikuara as 'the story about the orphans'. Note that this clause does not report the first event of the story. The event of the devil eating up the Nambikuara is a very significant event in the story but it occurs quite a long way into the body of the story.

(15) sai³ki³nā³xā² kxā³nhī¹nū¹tai²na² six³whīn¹jah³la²
ho³hxa³ta¹hxai²hē¹ra² te³nah¹lxi¹

(15') (the-orphans long-time-ago the-devil ate-them-all-up this-is-how ...)

(15'') 'Concerning the orphans, the devil ate the people up a long time ago. This is how it was. '

The story titles that are fronted clauses are transitive clauses with fronted objects reporting a very significant event of the story. Intransitive clause titles reporting significant events like 'the old woman shed her skin' are not fronted. Other possible titles are equative clauses asserting the existence of the main character, like 'there was once an anteater'. These also are not fronted.

Retopicalization of the principal character by fronting is one of the ways of indicating a climax in myths. What is different in this use of topicalization is that the principal character is already the one being talked about in the part of the text just before the topicalization occurs, but right at the point of climax he is topicalized again for a very short span.

In example 16, the context is that Woodpecker Man, who is the principal character of the story, has previously been told that he must on no account open a certain box called the darkness box. His curiosity, however, gets the better of him and he decides to open the box, whereupon darkness descends upon him. The clause, which is topicalized, reports Woodpecker Man just at the point when he is about to open the box. The subject is fronted, thus clearly showing the Woodpecker Man to be the topic, i.e. he is the one to whom our attention is to be directed. The constituent order in this clause is STOV, the subject being followed by the time element 'at the time when he was about to be turned into a woodpecker (bird)'. The topic is given information because he was introduced in the first clause of the story.

Immediately after the fronted clause describing the climax, there is a change of topic to the topic of 'darkness'; in fact, the topic span at the climax is just one clause long.

(16) xne³jau³tu³ ut²jah³lo²nũ¹ta²kxai³ ut²tai²na² te²ut¹tai² na²
 wen¹te lhxã³ jut³tu¹tai²na² kxã³na³tẽ³nũ¹ta²kxai³lu² kxã³-
 na³hi² xne³jut¹jut¹tu¹tai²na² ă²ẽ¹nũ¹ta²kxai³lu¹
 sa²nẽ³tha²na¹tũ¹xũ³ xne³te²an¹tux³ti¹ hax³yãu³kwai³
 xne³te³xã³ kxã³-na³ti²tu wa² kxã³na³khaix³ne³ju³kxãi³
 kxã³na³ti²tu³wa² jã¹-xne³ti³ ti¹a²kxai³lu¹
 kxã³na³ye¹ta¹hxai²hẽ¹ra¹

(16') (with-these-thoughts the-Woodpecker-Man woodpecker this-one about-to-be-turned-into at-that-time the-darkness-box darkness matters-concerning the-box resolved-to-open-and-did just-when-he-did darkness-falling-ideophone that's-how it-gets-dark-as-we-all-know with-extreme-darkness it-gets-dark-as-we-all-know in-just-that-way it-got-dark-on-the-woodpecker)

(16'') 'And with these thoughts, the Woodpecker Man, just at the time when he was about to be turned into a woodpecker bird, resolved to open the box that had to do with darkness and did so. At that very moment when he did, wham! We all know that's how it gets dark. It gets dark with a really thick darkness. Well that was exactly what happened to the woodpecker.'

FOOTNOTES

1. Nambikuara was classified by McQuown and Greenberg (1960) as being in the Ge-Pano-Carib Phylum of languages. There are approximately 200 speakers of Nambikuara in northwestern Mato Grosso, Brazil. The number of dialect groups remains uncertain at present. The data for this paper comprise over 1000 pages of text that were gathered on field trips between 1960 and 1976, in accordance with contracts between the Summer Institute of Linguistics and the Museu Nacional do Rio de Janeiro and more recently between the Institute and the Fundação Nacional do Índio. The present paper was written under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics at a field workshop held at Porto Velho, Rondônia, Brazil in 1976 under the direction of Joseph E. Grimes. The author is indebted to the indigenous communities in the Nambikuara villages of Serra Azul and Camararé for help in learning to speak the language and in the explanation of the meanings of texts, and to Joseph E. Grimes and Robert A. Dooley for many helpful discussions and comments in the development of this paper.
2. Kroeker (1975) discusses another aspect of the topicalization problem in Nambikuara.
3. At the level of clause various authors, notably Halliday (1967) and Gundel (1974), have presented the idea of topic or theme as 'what the clause is about'. Thus Halliday (1967) defines the theme of a clause as 'what is being talked about' or 'point of departure for the message' and the rheme as 'what is said about the theme'. Gundel's topic is essentially the same as Halliday's theme except for her reservations, which are summarized in footnote 5.
4. This can be regarded as an extension applicable to higher level spans of Gundel's proposal for clauses: that all clauses have the left dislocated topicalized form as their underlying form and that the surface forms with unmarked topic are derived from these by topic deletion.
5. Halliday (1967) also introduces another system, that of information focus with the options 'given' and 'new', where 'given' is what is recoverable from the preceding discourse and 'new' is not. On the other hand, Gundel (1974) using the terms 'topic' and 'comment' to correspond to Halliday's 'theme' and 'rheme' sets out to show that 'topic' is no different from 'given' and 'comment' from 'new'. Thus if Gundel is right, there is only one system to deal with here, not two.
6. By marked topic is meant any topic defined by fronting or left dislocation.
7. All present and past verb forms in Nambikuara are obligatorily suffixed for verification, which can be either individual or collective. Individual verification means that all the information in the clause containing the verb is known only to the speaker with an exception to be noted below, while collective verification means that all the information in the clause is known to both speaker and hearer and hence is given information. Nominals, temporals and locationals can also be independently suffixed for collective verification. When a nominal, temporal, or locational is suffixed for collective verification, however, the verb is not information known to the hearer unless it is also suffixed for collective verification. Thus for a clause with the verb suffixed for individual verification and a nominal suffixed for collective verification, the nominal is information known to both speaker and hearer, but the verb is information known only to the speaker. This is the exception mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph.
8. The phonemes of Nambikuara are p, t, k, d (implosive alveolar stop), x (glottal stop), j (alveopalatal affricate), n (with six allophones: [m] after nasalized vowel glide $\tilde{a}u$, [bm] after oral vowel glide au , [gn] preceding a velar stop and following an oral vowel, [ŋ] preceding a velar stop and following a nasalized vowel, [dn] on all other occasions following oral vowels, and [n] on all other occasions following nasalized vowels; N (voiceless nasal); r (only in the final syllable of the independent verb), l ([ɬ] after front vowels, [l] after all other vowels), s, h, w, y. Vowels occur in oral and nasalized series (the latter written with a tilde \tilde{V}): i, e, a, o, u and two vowel glides $a\tilde{i}$ and ou . Both series of vowels also occur laryngealized, indicated by a [] underlining the vowel letter, (\underline{V}). There are three tones in Nambikuara indicated by raised numbers ¹ ² ³ at the end of every syllable. ¹ is a downglide, ² is an upglide, ³ is a low level tone.

9. This is indeed a case of fronting and not of left dislocation as might be thought. The endings $-k\chi a i^3 l u^2$ on the first occurrence of 'child' and on 'father' show that these are both clause level constituents, so that 'child' is object on its first occurrence and 'child's father' is subject so that the constituent order is OSV, showing that there has been a fronting from the unmarked order SOV.

REFERENCES

- GUNDEL, JEANETTE M. 1974. The role of topic and comment in linguistic theory. University of Texas doctoral dissertation.
- HALLIDAY, MICHAEL A. K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English, part 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3, 199-244.
- KROEKER, MENNO H. 1975. Thematic Linkage in Nambiquara. The thread of discourse by Joseph E. Grimes. The Hague, Mouton.
- LOWE, IVAN. 1972. On the relation of formal to sememic matrices with illustrations from Nambiquara. *Foundations of Language* 8, 360-390.
- McQUOWN, NORMAN and JOSEPH GREENBERG. 1960. In *Sol Tax: Aboriginal Languages of Native America*. *Current Anthropology* 1, 431-436.
- ROSS, JOHN R. 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. MIT doctoral dissertation.