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LOGICAL RHETORICAL PREDICATES IN AMA DISCOURSE

Søren G. Årsjö

1. Introduction

The following definition of rhetorical predicates is found in Litteral (1977): 'Rhetorical predicates have propositions with either lexical or rhetorical predicates as their arguments and have as their function the organization of the discourse.'

This paper will cover Logical Rhetorical Predicates in Ama*discourse. It will include the different realizations and why the different realizations are used. A propositional display of a short discourse of each type (narrative, dialogue, procedural, descriptive and hortatory) will be attached. (See Årsjö, Britten 1978 and Årsjö, Søren 1978)

I have relied heavily on Litteral (1977) for the model and definitions for this paper. A further definition for this paper is that a rhetorical predicate, on the very lowest level, also may have specific items as its arguments.

*The Ama language is one of six languages in the Arai Family. They are Ama, Rocky Peak, Bo, Itari, Nimo, and Oviniga. Total number of speakers are approx. 1500. The Arai Family does not combine with other families. Laycock (1975) refers to the Arai Family as the LEFT MAY PHYLUM/Left May Stock/Arai Family.

The Ama area is south of the Sepik River and west of the May River in the far west of the East Sepik Province. There are 350 speakers in 7 villages and several one-house hamlets. All villages are within a radius of 20 miles.

Data was collected during field work under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics from 1973 through 1978 in the village of Kauvia. 1977 was spent away from the area. The data consist of many texts from all five discourse types. Several men from the village of Kauvia has helped with the texts.

The Ama language has 19 phonemes, 11 consonents and 8 vowels. They are: Consonents: p t k f s h m n l w y

Vowels: i u e ã oo

a aa
Logical Rhetorical Predicates with Implication

This group includes result, purpose and condition. These three are also called covariance by Grimes (1972). Response will also be included here, as that is considered a subtype of result. Implication can be symbolized by $A \rightarrow B$, meaning $B$, the consequent, is dependent on $A$, the antecedent.

2.1. Result

In the result rhetorical predicate, there is a time sequence between the antecedent and the consequent. Both these parts are also assumed to be real. The consequent argument is caused by the antecedent argument. Intention is not involved in result.

Result in Ama discourse can be expressed with either the realization of the antecedent or the realization of the consequent mentioned first. The order of the realizations of the arguments has to do with prominence falling on the first item used in a result construction.

Result will first be divided into direct result and response.

2.1.1. Direct Result

Direct result include either prominence on the antecedent or the consequent with different realizations of each possibility. There may be same or different agents for the realizations of the arguments in all realizations of direct result rhetorical predicate.

2.1.1.1. Prominence on the Antecedent

Three realizations of this are found. The realization of the antecedent is in this case the item mentioned first.

This may be realized by a free conjunction as connector and marker between the realizations of the arguments. This conjunction is nameneina - 'so'.
Example: (1) **Nâni maa pamukaa-sai, namenei-na**
Woman new prostitute-from, conj-dem
The woman was a prostitute, so

**tuklu-saa-sili-ki.**
kill-3p.sg.f.o.-throw-past
he killed her and threw her in the water.

(2) **Asa-maa nîsaani kwai-a,"Aluwou fuso t-ome-no."**
1p.sg.s-new there hear-past,"Dog pig-at pres-bark-3p.pl.s!**
There I heard," The dogs are barking at a pig."

**Namenei-na fuma-kna.**
Conj-dem run-down.
So I ran down.

(3) **Namenei-na-mo,** episode or paragraph resulting from
Conj-dem-new something mentioned at the end of the
So then preceding episode or paragraph.

The conjunction **nameneina** also has other functions, e.g. in Manner.
The arguments may be lexical propositions and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct result, realized like this, may also dominate larger portions of a discourse. (See example 3). This overt marking of result with prominence on the antecedent is used, when the relation would not be understood without the marking. The relation itself is also very prominent in this realization.

This may also be realized by a conjoining affix **-menei** - 'because of' at the end of the realization of the antecedent argument.

Example: (1) **Ai-menei té-tumo, Kawiia-so.**
Sick-because of pres-come, Kawiia-to.
Because he was sick he came to Kawiia.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct result, realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger portions of a discourse. This realization does not give as much prominence to the relation as the previous one.

The third realization of result with prominence on the antecedent is expressed by juxtaposition.
Example: (1) Sa siai amu-knaa-ki, palulaa pa-tumo-kaa-ki-saa.
Rain big come-down-past, plane NG-come-refl-past-neg.
It rained hard, so the plane did not come.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct result realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger portions of a discourse. This realization of result with juxtaposition is used when the relation between the arguments is understood as result.

2.1.1.2 Prominence on the Consequent

Only one realization of this is found. The realization of the consequent is in this case the item mentioned first.

This is realized by a conjoining affix as marker at the end of the realization of the antecedent argument. The affix is -menei -'because of'. This means that the order is reversed of the realizations of the arguments of direct result in the second realization under 2.1.1.1.

Example: (1) Kawia-so ta-tumo, ai-menei.
Kawia-to pres-come, sick-because of.
He came to Kawia, because he was sick.

The conjoining affix -menei also has other functions, e.g. in purpose, see 2.2.1.1, where it joins on to the realization of the consequent. The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct result, realized like this, does not dominate larger portions of a discourse.

2.1.2 Response

Response can either be quoted speech in response to or as a result of an earlier quote by a different agent. (Example 1). It can also be an event or events in response to or as a result of an earlier quote or event. In both cases the realization of the antecedent is

*Response rhetorical predicate may in certain circumstances rather be classified as accomplished purpose. That is so, when a predicate indicating intention is added, implicitly or explicitly.
mentioned before the realization of the consequent. There are no obligatory markers, so it is realized by juxtaposition.

Example: (1) See display and text of Imaafa (narrative) where clauses 11, 12 are the antecedent argument, and clauses 13-15 the consequent argument.

(2) See display and text of Imaafa (narrative) where clauses 3, 4 (quote) are the realization of the antecedent argument, and clauses 5-8 (resultant events) are the realization of the consequent argument.

(3) See display and text of Lialini Imaa (dialogue), where each quote is a paragraph.

Response rhetorical predicate may have lexical and/or rhetorical propositions as its arguments. It may also dominate larger portions of a discourse. (See example 2 which forms a paragraph). This is also especially true in dialogue discourse, where each argument is a paragraph. (See example 3).

2.2. Purpose

In the purpose rhetorical predicate there is a time sequence between the antecedent and the consequent. Only the antecedent is assumed to be real, although in accomplished purpose the consequent is also assumed to be real. In purpose there is also an added predicate indicating intention, that is simultaneous with the antecedent and must have the same agent as the antecedent.

Purpose in Ama discourse can be expressed with either the realization of the antecedent or the realization of the consequent mentioned first. The order of these arguments has to do with prominence falling on the first item used in a purpose construction.

Purpose will first be divided into non-accomplished purpose and accomplished purpose.

2.2.1. Purpose, non-accomplished

Non-accomplished purpose includes either prominence on the antecedent
or consequent realized in different ways. The consequent is not
assumed to be real.

2.2.1.1. Prominence on the Antecedent

Two realizations of this is found. The realization of the antece-
dent is in this case the item mentioned first.

This may be realized by a conjoining affix as marker at the end
of the realization of the consequent argument. The affix is -menei -
'in order to'. This realization may take same or different agent for
the realizations of the two arguments. If there is a verb in the
realization of the consequent, that verb is of a non-indicative form
that does not take any tense.

Example: (1) Kawia-so tå-tumo, malasino-menei.
Kawia-to pres-come, medicin-in order to.
He came to Kawia in order to get medicin.

(2) Nakaa tå-samukookaa, fu-menei, fu-vo
Man pres-watch, pig-because of, pig-prop
A man watches (his garden), in order to

nää-ka-tumaa-menei,
eat-3p.pl.o-come-because.
hinder pigs from coming to eat.

This is also displayed in Isi Isikaa Aino Imaafa,
clauses 13-15.

The conjoining affix -menei also has other functions, e.g. in result,
see 2.1.1.2., where it joins on to the realization of the antecedent.
The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Purpose,
realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger portions
of a discourse. This overt marking of purpose with prominence on the
antecedent is used, when the relation would not be understood without
the marking.

The second realization of non-accomplished purpose with prominence
on the antecedent is expressed by juxtaposition. This realization may
take same or different agent for the realizations of the two arguments.
The verb in the realization of the consequent is of non-indicative form.

Example: (1) Na tu-kunaa-nake, anu anu tuma-knaa-nake maa anu.
Theme pres-go down-1p.pl.ex.s., there come-down-1p.pl.s.
We (exc) went down, in order to come down there. new th.
This is also displayed in Imaafa, clauses 7,8.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Purpose, realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger portions of a discourse. This realization is used, when the relation between the arguments is understood as purpose without overt marking.

2.2.1.2. Prominence on the Consequent

Two realizations of this are found. The realization of the consequent is in this case the item mentioned first.

The realization of this takes place within a compound verb with the same agent for the two roots. There is also a conjoining affix\(_{(-a-)}\) 'in order to', in between the two roots.

Example: (1) Kalanus mano maa ke-a-tumaa-ki-nake.
Prison man new look-in order to-come-past-1p.pl.ex.s.
We (exc) came in order to see the prisoner.

(2) See also the display and text of Imaafa (narrative) in clauses 2, 9, 18, 20 and 21.

The arguments may only be lexical propositions in this case.

The second realization of non-accomplished purpose with prominence on the consequent may have different agents in the realizations of the two arguments. The order is reversed of the realizations of the arguments of the first realization under prominence on antecedent, see 2.2.1.1. The realization of the consequent will then be mentioned first and be marked by -menei -'in order to', and the realization of the antecedent will follow.
Example: (1) *Aino-menei samaiso mana-ki, denuai-so.*
*Pandanaa* in order to quickly go-past, Genewe-to.
In order to get some pandanas he quickly went to Genews.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Purpose, realized like this, has not been observed to dominate larger portions of a discourse. This realization makes the consequent more prominent.

2.2.2. Purpose, accomplished

Accomplished purpose may sometimes be difficult to detect in a text, as it is not marked in the surface structure as purpose. It may rather look like a conjunction rhetorical predicate with events in sequence. It seems to be accomplished purpose, if the events in the two arguments are related or are in the same script. Litteral (1977) mentions script with same agent and event sequence with same agent as a test for accomplished purpose. In Ama there can also be different agents for the realizations of the arguments in accomplished purpose.

Accomplished purpose include either prominence on the antecedent or the consequent. Both antecedent and consequent are in this case assumed to be real, and therefore the verbs in the realizations of both these arguments are of indicative form.

2.2.2.1. Prominence on the Antecedent.

There is only one realization of accomplished purpose with prominence on the antecedent, which is expressed by juxtaposition of the realizations two arguments. It can be either same or different agent for the realizations of the two arguments.

Example: (1) *Tali ta-yo, ti-fafumo.*
Light fire-prop, pres-burn.
He lights the fire; and it burns.

This is also displayed in Isi Isikaa Aino Imaafa, clause 7,8.
(2) *Sáleno na t-i-a-knaa, auto maa t-i-tipasa-fli.* (cut-throw. Sören theme pres-cut-in order to-go down, kvila new pres-
Sören went down to cut, and he cut and threw away the kvila.
This is also displayed in Imaafa, clauses 9, 10.

(3) *Tá-kiaa-saa-nake, funa na t-ulu-a-knaa.* (3p.pl.o-go down.
Pres-move-3p.sg.f.o.-1p.pl.ex.s., feet theme pres-wash-
We (excl) moved out of her way, and she went down to wash.
This is also displayed in Imaafa, clauses 17, 18.

The arguments of accomplished purpose may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Accomplished purpose, realized like this, is not observed to dominate larger portions of a discourse.

2.2.2.2. Prominence on the Consequent

There is only one realization of accomplished purpose with prominence on the consequent, which is expressed by marking the realization of the antecedent as an instrument with *-vo,* if within that instrument there is some reference to an event. It may be same or different agents for the realizations of the arguments. The following English example may help clarify what is meant: He changed the world by his love.

Example: (1) *Applafamo vali maa Kana asi-so nu-ki, Kootom ni imaa-vo.*
Abraham line new Kana ground-to go past, God-poss talk-inst.
Abraham and his line went to Kana because of God's talk.

(2) Discourse, episode or paragraph. *Namenei-na Yaa-ki,*
That-dem do-past,
That is what he did,

*Kooto-ni imaa-vo.*
God-poss talk-instr.
according to God's talk.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Purpose, realized like this, may also dominate larger portions of a discourse. (See example 2). This realization is used, when emphasis is wanted on the instrumental act of the antecedent to cause the consequent, which still is prominent.
The arguments of direct condition may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct condition, realized like this, is very common in descriptive discourse, but it does not dominate larger portions of the discourse.

The second realization of direct condition is expressed by juxtaposition of the realizations of the arguments. In this realization in Ama both arguments of the rhetorical predicate are assumed to be real, as the verb forms used in the realizations of the two arguments are of indicative forms and take tense. It may also take the form of a negative condition with the normal negative pa–saa on the verb of the realization of the antecedent.

Example: (1) Ulaa maa waliôc na tî–wi, nia tî–nu–kne.
Sun new alright theme pres–clear, theme pres–go–1p.pl.in.s.
If it clears we will go.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Direct condition, realized like this, is not found to dominate a larger portion of a discourse. This is used where the condition is understood without the overt marking as in the first realization.

2.3.2. **Contrary to Fact Condition**

Only one realization of this is found. The implicit alternative to a contrary to fact condition has arguments, which are real.

Contrary to fact condition is expressed by marking the verb of the realization of the antecedent with pâ–mo – 'cond–dep', and the verb of the realization of the consequent with pâ– 'cond'. Both these verbs are of a non-indicative form, as they are assumed not to be real. It may take the form of a negative contrary to fact condition when the marker pâ–mo is replaced with simesaamo –'without'. There would still be non-indicative verb forms in the realizations of both arguments.
Example: (1) Sa-vo tumo sámesaamó, na pi-tumo.
Rain-prop come without, theme cond-come.
If it had not rained, I would have come.

(2) Ifaa-wei Atamo-wei-vo a wamo nää-kaa sámesaamó,
Eve-and Adam-and-prop tree fruit eat-3p.pl.o. without,
If Adam and Eve had not eaten the fruit,
mälaa kayaa pu-pi-tanamaa-kne-saa,
road bad neg-cond-follow-1p.pl.in.s-neg,
we would not have followed a bad way,
waliip na pi-si-kne, mölaa itauni amo-so,
allright theme cond-sit-1p.pl.in.s, road good-at.
but we would have sat alright on the good road.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Condition, realized like this, is not found to dominate larger portions of a discourse. The implicit alternative to the above example would be:

It did rain, I did not come.

2.3.3. Temporal Condition

Only one realization of this is found. It is expressed by marking the verb of the realization of the antecedent with -aki--mo -- 'time cond.-(dep)'. In this case it seems like the verb of the realization of the antecedent is not assumed to be real and a non-indicative form is used, but the verb of the realization of the consequent is assumed to be real and an indicative verb form is used.

Example: (1) Kooto-ni mölaa-so aluai-aki-kne-mo,
God-poss road-at follow-cond-1p.pl.in.s-dep,
If (or when) we follow God's road,

maa-pi.naakaa itauni na si-menei.
1p.pl.in.s-new man good theme sit-1p.pl.in.s.fut.
we (incl) will sit like good men.

This is also displayed in Paipoolo Imaa Paluawiwo, clause 7, 8.

(2) Kooto, tao mölaa-so aluai-aki-kne, ulei mleak?
God, 3p.sg.-poss road-at follow-cond-1p.pl.in.s, again how?
If (or when) we follow God's road, what will happen?

Mai-maa kumaki-so na nu-menei, plese itauni amo-so.
1p.pl.in.s-new heaven-to theme go-1p.pl.in.s.fut, place,
We (incl) will go to heaven, to the good place. /good-to. /
The negative realization of this relation is not found, but it could probably be expressed by using sîmësaamo on the realization of the antecedent. The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Condition, realized like this, has not been found to dominate larger portions of a discourse.

3. Logical Rhetorical Predicates without Implication

This group includes adverstive, alternative and conjunction. The two arguments are of equal standing (one is not dependent on the other) in these three. The two arguments are not called antecedent and consequent when no implication is involved.

3.1. Adversative

Adversative rhetorical predicate focuses on contrast. It has only two arguments, and have two elements in each argument that is in contrast. Both arguments are assumed to be real, and they may be simultaneous or in sequence. The time may be one of the two contrasts.

In Ama discourse it seems to be motivated to first divide the adverstive rhetorical predicate into direct adversative and frustrated intention.

3.1.1. Direct Adversative

Two realizations of this are found.

One realization is expressed by marking the NPs of the realization of the second argument with -soo - 'exclusion marker'.

Example: (1) Ta-maa pa-të-tumo-saa, asa-soo tê-tumo. He-new neg-pres-come-neg, 1p.sg.s.-exclusion pres-come. He did not come, but I came.

(2) Ya-maa ausaani pëmaiso mana-ki, tata-soo sëmaiso mana-ki, 1p.sg.s-new there slowly go-past, 3p.sg.s-exclusion quickly I went there slowly, but he went quickly. \(\text{go-past}\).

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Adversa-
Five, realized like this, is not found to dominate larger portions of a discourse. With this marker the prominence is on the relation.

The second realization is expressed by juxtaposition of the realizations of the arguments.

Example: (1) Mali-maa, malaal kayau-so alua-mo, wiaau ti-yaamu.
I p.pl.in.s.-new road bad-at follow-dep, no pres-say.
I do not like that we (incl) follow a bad road,

Malaal itauinam-so alua maa walioc.
Road good-at follow new alright.
but to follow a good road is alright.
This is also displayed in Paipooolo Imaa Paluaio, clause 2-4.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Adversative, realized like this, is not found to dominate larger portions of a discourse, although it does play an important role in the hortatory discourse, where adversative is used to contrast bad and good. The relation is understood without marking:

3.1.2. Frustrated Intention

This realization is expressed by using the particle lauwa in the verb phrase of the realization of the first argument.

Example: (1) Palulaa maa lauwa ti-tum-o-kaa, ifau.
Plane new adversative pres-come-refl, back.
The plane wanted to come, but it turned back.

(2) See display and text of Imaafa (narrative), where clause 1 is the realization of one argument and clauses 2-21 the realization of the second argument.

The event marked by lauwa may also actually take place, but it did not turn out as expected. The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Adversative, realized like this, is also found to dominate a whole narrative discourse, (See example 2).

3.2. Alternative

The alternative rhetorical predicate assumes that only one argument
is real, and it is not limited to two arguments. It focuses upon only one difference between the arguments. The time for the arguments are usually identical, unless time is the difference between the arguments.

In Ama discourse two realizations of the alternative rhetorical predicate has been found.

One is expressed by the marker pei(mo) -'or' after each of the realizations of the arguments.

Example: (1) Ta-maa yasai tumo peimo, amai peimo.
He-new finished come alt, remain alt.
Has he come or not?

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Alternative, realized like this, is not found to dominate larger portions of a discourse.

The second realization is expressed by the marker se -'or' after each of the realizations of the arguments.

Example: (1) Ta-tuklaa-meno se, ta-maa-meno se, popcoa.
Will the spirit kill me or eat me?

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Adversative, realized like this, has not been found to dominate larger portions of a discourse. As peimo is the more common marker the use of se probably makes the relation more prominent.

3.3. Conjunction

Conjunction is the unmarked member of the logical rhetorical predicates. It is the surface features of several other logical predicates. It is the most common rhetorical predicate with few restrictions on its arguments. The components of the arguments must have some semantic similarity.

In Ama discourse there seems to be four realizations of conjunction.
They are: Phrase marker, juxtaposition, time conjunction and head-tail linkage.

3.3.1. Phrase Marker

This realization is marked by -wei - 'and' on the nouns of the realizations of the arguments that are conjoined.

Example: (1) Alu-wei tata-wei vau vau.
            Child and 3p.sg.s. and dead dead.
            She and the child are dead.

            This is also displayed in Hani Hani Au Au, clause 16.

            (2) See also display and text of Hani Hani Au Au (descr),
            where clauses 10 and 11 are joined by -wei on the nouns.

            The arguments may be lexical propositions and/or specific items. (See 1, Introduction).

3.3.2. Juxtaposition

This realization is expressed by juxtaposition of the realization of the arguments.

Example: (1) See clause 10 in display of Imaaafa (narrative). Compound vb.

            (2) See clauses 12/13-15 in display of Isi Isikaa Aino Imaaafa (procedural). Sentences.

            (3) See clause 15 in display of Hani Hani Au Au (descr).
                Specific items.

            (4) See clauses 2-4/5-8/9-14 in display of Hani Hani Au Au (discriptive). Paragraphs.

            The arguments may be specific items, lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. Conjunction, realized like this, seems to play and important role in the descriptive discourse and dialogue discourse. The conjoining relation is known without being overtly stated. The semantic context seems to decide if events are simultaneous or in sequence.

3.3.3. Time Conjunction

The time conjunction used to realize this realization is násai- -
'and then'.

Example: (1) See display and text of Imaafa,(narrative), clauses 16/17,18/19

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. The most common use is when conjunction, realized like this, dominates large portions of a discourse. This is especially true for a narrative discourse.

Nisai- 'and the then' has a double function. It gives the overt marking for conjunction, and it also gives the time setting for the following events. (See Årsjö, Britten, 1978(2)).

3.3.4. Head-Tail Linkage

This is realized by a head-tail linkage.

Example: (1) See display and text of Isi Isikaa Aino Imaafa (procedural), clauses 16/17.

The arguments may be lexical and/or rhetorical propositions. The most common use is when conjunction, realized like this, dominates large portions of a discourse, i.e. joining the sections the clauses are in. This marking is used if extra prominence is wanted on the time sequence.

Head-tail linkage also has a double function. It marks conjunction and gives the time for the following events. (See Årsjö, Britten 1978).

There may also be a combination of time conjunction and head-tail linkage as another realization of conjunction.

4. Conclusion

Condition had always been difficult to grasp. Especially the distinction between direct condition and contrary to fact. It now seems to be solved.

There has also been some problems in differentiating between result
and purpose. This is also much clearer now.

The non-indicative forms of verbs in the realization of arguments not assumed to be real has explained some of the problems experienced with tense.

It has been interesting to see that the realizations of arguments to a logical rhetorical predicate can span from large portions of a discourse down to specific items.

5. **Texts and Displays**