

**ASAS**

**Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft**

**Nr. 12**



## **Studies in Clause Linkage**

**Papers from the First Köln-Zürich Workshop**

**Karen H. Ebert (ed.)**

**1993**

**Herausgeber der Reihe:**

**Seminar für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft  
Universität Zürich  
Plattenstr. 54  
CH 8032 Zürich**

**© copyright bei den Autoren**

# Belhare subordination and the theory of topic

Balthasar Bickel

Max-Planck-Forschungsgruppe Kognitive Anthropologie Nijmegen,  
Tribhuvan University Kāthmāṇḍū and Universität Zürich

## 1. Introduction

Since Marchese (1977) and Haiman (1978) it is known that there is a systematic relation between topics and some types of subordinate clauses. This relation is also captured by the notion of adsentential subordination, one of the universally recurrent clause linkage types postulated in Bickel (1991). Adsentential subordination combines nominal topics with clauses that are adjoined to another clause or sentence. The notion of 'topic' employed in these approaches refers to a formally, i.e. configurationally or morphologically marked constituent that provides "a spatial, temporal, or individual framework within which the main predication holds" (Chafe 1976: 50), "a framework which has been selected for the following discourse" (Haiman 1978: 585) or "the universe of discourse with respect to which the subsequent predication is presented as relevant" (Dik 1978: 19). Phenomena that more or less satisfy this characterisation include such diverse things as topics in Mandarin Chinese (1) (Li & Thompson 1976), *wa*-phrases in Japanese (2) (Hinds, Maynard & Iwasaki 1987), left-dislocations (3a) and quasi left-dislocations (3b) in English (Geluykens 1992), or preverbal (*Vorfeld*) constituents in German (4) (cf., for instance, König & van der Auwera 1988).

- (1) *nèi-chang huǒ xìngkuì xiǎofang-duì lái de kuài.*  
DEM-CLASS fire fortunate fire-brigade came STAT quick  
'That fire, fortunately the fire-brigade came quickly.'
- (2) *tōji no hōritsu de wa onna mo kubunden ga mora-e-ta.*  
that\_time ATTR law by TOP woman ADD land NOM receive-POT-PT  
'By the law of that time, women could also receive an allotment of land.'
- (3) a. *As for John*, he likes beans.  
b. *As for travelling*, I hate cars.
- (4) *Bei Regen geht 's ihm immer schlecht.*  
at rain go:3sNPT 3sN 3sM:DAT always bad  
'When it's raining he always feels bad.'

It is not a settled matter whether general grammar should recognise one single notion of 'topic' or whether such a notion should be replaced by a typology that captures both the differences between these phenomena as well as their communities. There have been different proposals on this issue. It is generally assumed that the 'framework' notion of topic is distinct from a notion that defines topic as the element that the clause 'is about' (e.g. Dik 1978, 1989). The 'aboutness' notion goes back to the Praguian concept of functional sentence perspective (e.g. Firbas 1966) and is usually explicated in terms of referential persistence, lookback, accessibility, etc. (e.g. Givón 1983, Iwasaki 1987, Geluykens 1992). As for distinctions within the 'framework' notion itself, the issue is more controversial, but most theories assume two different types of topics: e.g. 'left-detached position' vs. 'precore slot' in Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin 1993), extra-clausal 'Theme'<sup>1</sup> vs. clause-initial 'P1' in Functional Grammar (Dik 1989) or 'quasi-left-dislocations' vs. 'left-dislocations' in Geluykens (1992). X-bar theory usually assumes only one notion, viz. the 'specifier' of the 'complementizer phrase' (Chomsky 1986).

Particularly interesting data for this issue come from subordination that is marked by the same sign as nominal topics. The types of topic functions served by these subordinate clauses are potentially basic elements in a general typology of topic. In this essay I discuss topic marked subordination in Belhare (a Tibeto-Burman language of the Kiranti group spoken in Eastern Nepal) and its consequences for the theory and typology of topic.

After giving an overview of clause linkage in Belhare (section 2), I shall focus on the distinction between adsentential (or 'topical') and peripheral subordination (section 3). In section 4 I compare the syntactic properties of adsentential/topical clauses with topicalized constituents. The differences found there are then explored from a typological point of view (section 5). I will propose a three-way distinction of topics adjoined on the level of 'big sentences' ('detachment'), 'small sentences' ('topic proper') and clauses ('topicalization'). Section 6 summarizes the findings.

## 2. Clause linkage in Belhare

Clause linkage in Belhare is marked by clause-final morphemes. Since Belhare word order is basically SOV, they are suffixed or postposed to the verb. Only in looser types of sentence linkage, there are clause-initial or, more precisely, sentence-initial devices. They are all situation anaphors built on distal demonstratives, for instance *i-net-nahug* (DIST-LOC-ABL) 'then' (as in (52) below) or *i-khe-hug* (DIST-MOD-ABL) 'thus' (as in (45) below).<sup>2</sup>

Table 1 gives a synopsis on clause linkage. The distinction between suffixes (marked by a hyphen) and postpositions is based on whether there is morphophonological alternation or not. Some markers are added to finite verb forms, others, marked by '√', are suffixed to verbal roots. The classification of morphemes into syntactic slots or 'syntagmas' is grounded in configurational position, behaviour in focus constructions and compatibility with tense/aspect/mood markers. However, this is not the place to discuss all these analyses. I single out only those that establish the difference between what I call adsen-

tential and peripheral subordination, henceforth abbreviated as a-subordination and p-subordination.

syntagma	morpheme	reference tracking
<i>sequentialization</i>	<i>ki</i> ~ <i>kina</i> 'SEQ'	-
	∅ (verb compounding)	subject and TAM identity
<i>adsentential subordination</i>	<i>-na</i> 'TOP'	-
	<i>huŋ</i> 'COG'	-
	∅ ( <i>-cha</i> 'ADD')	-
<i>peripheral subordination</i>	<i>-lo(k)</i> 'COM'	-
	√ <i>-si</i> 'SUP'	subject and TAM identity
	√ <i>-sa</i> 'SS/T'	
	<i>miN-√</i> 'NEG'	-
<i>complementation</i>	<i>-kha(k)</i> 'NOML'	-
	∅ (reported speech)	-
<i>attribution (restrictive only)</i>	<i>-kha(k)</i> 'NOML'	-
	<i>-na</i> 'ART' <sup>3</sup>	-
	<i>ka-√</i> 'N_AG'	-

Tab. 1 Belhare clause linkage

### 3. Adsentential vs. peripheral subordination

There are two syntactic properties that distinguish adsentential from peripheral subordination: (i) distribution and (ii) scope effects with negation and illocution markers. The criteria are derived from the definition of the two subordination types in Bickel (1991).

#### 3.1 Distribution

P-subordinated clauses are constituents of a main clause and belong to its periphery in the sense defined in Role and Reference Grammar (Foley & Van Valin 1984, Van Valin 1993) and its predecessors such as Dependency Grammar (e.g. the *circonstant* in Tesnière 1959 or the *freie Angabe* in Helbig 1982). Usually, the same grammatical relation can also be borne by a nominal or adverbial constituent. This is the case with the comitative case suffix *-lok* (~ *-lo* word-finally or before vowel). The marker indicates a referent or situation that accompanies main clause referents (5a, b) or the main clause predication (5c – g), without being specific about the sense of this concomitance. It is the marker of a pure *circonstant* and covers manner adverbial (5c), adlative (5d), purposive (5e), simultaneous (5f) as well as explanative (5g) relationships.

- (5) a. pit-chi-lo ap-khat-ket. [N]  
 cow-ns-COM come\_ACR-go-ACT  
 'She is passing with the cows.'
- b. ŋka-lo saru?wa ŋ-wa-ni.  
 1s-COM money NEG-be-NEG  
 'I have no money with me.'
- c. lim-lo nam-yu. [G3,72b]  
 delicious-COM smell-NPT  
 'It smells delicious.'
- d. nam kus-a-lo mun dhupt-he-chi-ŋa. [N]  
 sun set-CONJ:PT-COM PREV converse-PT-d-e  
 'We<sup>de</sup> talked until evening.'
- e. tupt-u-ŋ-lo praŋsta ka-lur-a! [I,50]  
 understand-3U-1sA-COM clear 1sU-talk-IMP  
 'Talk clearly such that I can understand!'
- f. yeti yeti cok-yakt-a-ŋ-lo lak-khai?-ŋe. [N]  
 what what do-DISTR-CONJ:PT-e-COM boil-TEL-STAT  
 'Obviously [the milk] is boiled over when I was busy doing other things'
- g. jamma eghara, bara rupie jati tok-yakt-he-m-ma,  
 all\_together eleven twelve rupie about find-DISTR-PT-1pA-e  
 ŋru yu-lleŋ, yu-lleŋ kaŋ-ap n-li-lo. [IV, 128b]  
 other ACR-DIR ACR-DIR cut-INT 3nsS-AUX-COM  
 'All together we had about eleven, twelve rupies, with the rest going here and there.'

Apart from this clause building function, *-lok* also serves to co-ordinate nouns, e.g. *pit-lo saūa-lo* (cow-COM buffalo-COM) 'a cow and a buffalo' in (37b) below.

At first sight one might speculate that also the postposition *huŋ* serves a uniform circumstantial case function. The marker not only subordinates clauses but also indicates an ablative function of nominal and adverbial constituents. As a subordinator, *huŋ* is used for cognitive reasons and goals (*Handlungsbegründungen* as Ebert (1991: 88) notes for Turkish) rather than for physical causes or conditions. This implies that the subordinate clause is somebody's thought or speech, which can be marked by the quotative marker *mu* 'REP' (an allomorph of *-bu* ~ *-phu* triggered by *huŋ* that often contracts to [mʉŋ]):

- (6) a. jit-ap cog-u-ŋ mu huŋ-go ma?i-chi bhela cog-he-chi. [N]  
 win-INT AUX-3U-1sA REP COG-ASS human-ns together do-PT-nsU  
 'He called people together, hoping to win [in the coming elections.]'

b. ma-aŋ-ni-ni            mu huŋ-go    subhak-ŋa    tep-chinn-hat-yu.[s.v.tepma]  
 1sU-OPT:3nsA-see-NEG    REP    COG-ASS    blanket-INSTR    cover-REFL-TEL-NPT  
 'He covers himself with a blanket so that they don't see him.'

c. ta-yu    huŋ-do    yukg-ai?-t-u-ŋ.    <  
 come-NPT    COG-ID    keep\_for-serve-NPT-3U-1sA  
 'Since he is supposed to come, I shall keep [food] for him on an extra plate.'

The morpheme *huŋ* is also used with adverbial (clause peripheral) constituents. But in this function, the morpheme diverges from the subordinator *huŋ* both in meaning and form. Semantically, adverbial *huŋ* indicates an event ablative in the sense of 'having arranged things or having become so that the adverbial qualification holds.' It occurs with nominals in a locative case (7a) and with spatial (7b) or modal (7c) roots. Also temporal roots such as *hamba* 'today' co-occur with ablative *huŋ*: *hambahuŋ* 'from today on'. Formally, adverbial *huŋ* is different from the subordinator *huŋ* in several respects. First, adverbial *huŋ* has an allomorph *-nahuŋ* that is suffixed to the connective *ki* 'SEQ' as well as to locative cases (cf. 7a vs. 7b,c). This allomorphy suggests that adverbial *-huŋ* is an affix rather than an adposition. Second, subordinating *huŋ* can follow adverbial *-huŋ* as in the examples in (7). In this environment, adverbial *-huŋ* is realized as /hũ/ and often merges with the following initial resulting in a long breathy nasalized vowel.

- (7) a. Dhankuta-et-nahuŋ huŋ-cha    li-yu.  
 Dh.-LOC-ABL            COG-ADD    be-NPT  
 'That's okay also if [I can sit in the bus only] after Dhankuṭā.'
- b. thaŋma-huŋ huŋ-do liŋ-ma            khe-yu.  
 UP-ABL            COG-ID    move\_in-CIT    must-NPT  
 'In an upright position, that's how one has to move in [the bed through the door].'
- c. i-khe-huŋ            huŋ-do    chap-t-u-ŋ.  
 DIST-DEM-ABL    COG-ID    write-NPT-3U-1sA  
 'If this is the way you want it, I write like that.'

Third, in contrast to adverbial *-huŋ*, the subordinator *huŋ* never occurs without being qualified by a focus or report particle (e.g. *-cha* 'ADD' in (7a), *-to(k) ~ -do(k) ~ -ro(k)* 'ID' in (7b, c) or *mu* 'REP' in (6a, b)). Finally, with non-temporal roots, adverbial *huŋ* has a free allomorph *-gari* (borrowed from Nepali<sup>4</sup> *garī* 'having done', the 'absolute participle' of *garnu* 'to do' used in verb compounding): *emuhuŋ ~ emugari (~ emgari)* 'how', *ikhehuŋ ~ ikhegari* 'like that', *thaŋmahuŋ ~ thaŋmagari* 'upwards, uphill, upright' etc.

Although the two occurrences of *huŋ* may well have some supra-semantic relation or etymological connection,<sup>5</sup> they constitute different morphemes. Moreover, the possible co-occurrence in (7) shows that they are not fillers of one and the same syntactic function in a way that comitative *-lok* is the exponent of a uniform function. Whereas adverbial *huŋ* is a regular case marker that licences constituents in the clause periphery, subordina-

ting *huŋ* is indicative of adsentential subordination (6). This will be corroborated by its behaviour in illocution and negation scope (section 3.2).

Peripheral elements are adjoined to the relational core of a clause whereas adsentential clauses are adjoined to a bigger unit. A-subordinate clauses in *-na*,<sup>6</sup> *huŋ* and *-cha* are topics and provide the situational and referential framework for the subsequent piece of discourse. This piece is minimally a clause but can also be longer (cf. Iwasaki (1987: 133f) for a parallel remark on the Japanese topic marker *wa*). It can also be a compound sentence (8), a string of sequentialized clauses (9) or even a whole paragraph (10). This is not attested with p-subordinators such as *-lok*.

- (8) a. nis-u-cha-be ni-yakt-u-lok-to "n-niu-ʔ-na-n" lur-u-na-be  
 see-3U-ADD-IRR see-DISTR-3U-COM-ID NEG-see-NPT-1>2-NEG say-3U-TOP-IRR  
 hamba maŋ niu-t-u-m-be. [IV, 105a]  
 today deity see-NPT-3U-1pA-IRR  
 'If (*-na*) he, although (*-cha*) he did not see [the god], would have said 'I don't see you' at (*-lok*) his appearance, we<sup>i</sup> would see the god today.'
- b. na maŋ u-rakg-e lik-khaiʔ-ŋa-na ŋke-a satte  
 DEM deity 3sPOSS-interior-LOC enter-TEL-PERF-TOP 1pi-ERG truth  
 nakt-u-m-na satte ka-pi-yu i ka-piu-ʔ-ni i-no? [IV, 107]  
 ask\_for-3U-1pA-TOP truth iU-give-NPT Q iU-give-NPT-NEG Q-CONF  
 'Suppose (*-na*), this god has definitely gone into [the earth]: does he not give us<sup>i</sup> the truth when (*-na*) we<sup>i</sup> ask for the truth?' (i.e. 'if he has gone, how could he give us<sup>i</sup> the truth when we<sup>i</sup> ask for it.')
- c. ɣatlabu u-phaʔwa male-na-ŋa, jor-jor chukuma  
 banana 3sPOSS-leaf no-TOP-FOC pair-pair *Shorea\_robusta*  
 this-u-m-cha li-yu. [KP13a]  
 spread-3U-1pA-ADD be-NPT  
 'But if (*-na*) there are no banana leaves, it is also OK if (*-cha*) one spreads *chukuma*-leaves (*Shorea robusta*, Nep. *sāl*) in pairs.'
- (9) bheni pok-gak-na male, laŋ wat maʔa chir-a  
 morning rise-2-TOP no leg wash hand wash-IMP  
 kina-huŋ-go jaɸ cog-u! [KP4a]  
 SEQ-ABL-ASS brahmanic\_morning\_prayer do-IMP:3U  
 'Immediately after rising (*-na*), wash your legs and hands and do the *jaɸ* prayer!'
- (10) ɣ-kond-a-ch-u-lo ansar-ai bicar-ai cok-sa  
 3nsA-look\_for-CONJ:PT-d-3U-COM thought-EMPH opinion-EMPH do-SS/T  
 ɣ-khar-a-chi-na-ŋa: sadhu-rok-phu ta-he, sannesi ta-he,  
 3nsS-go-CONJ:PT-d-TOP-FOC pure-ID-REP come-PT ascetic come-PT



sitara teĩ-sa, kina, “ŋka-na jogi-ŋa, yaŋ nak-cai-ʔ-ŋa-ha”  
 guitar play-SS/T SEQ 1s-TOP mendicant-e DISTR ask\_for-eat-NPT-e-NOML  
 cek-sa, ki-nahuŋ-go. Ram Lachuman-chi-ŋaha un-chik-ŋaha khimm-e  
 say-SS/T SEQ-ABL-ASS R. L.-ns-GEN 3-ns-GEN house-LOC  
 mokka-et-tok-phu lig-he ki-nahuŋ-go... [KP59a]  
 veranda-LOC-ID-REP enter-PT SEQ-ABL-ASS

‘Thinking and considering, they<sup>d</sup> went looking for [Sītā]: (-na) may be it was a *sādhu* who came, or a *sannyāsi* came, playing the *sitār*. Then he said perhaps: “I am a *yogī*, I am one who asks everywhere for food and lives on that.” And then he probably went into the veranda at the house of Rām and Lakṣmaṇ [and Sītā] and ...’

Being topics, a-subordinated clauses are sentence or text constituents, whereas p-subordination generates clause constituents. With *-lok* this is immediately evidenced by the morpheme’s case function. With the other p-subordinators, viz. the same subject and same tense marker *-sa*, the negation prefix *miN-*, and the purpose indicating supine *-si*, their position in the clausal periphery is not so obvious. But paraphrase relations indicate that they too are fillers of a syntactic function in the clausal periphery.

A sentence like (11a) is ambiguous. According to Belhare consultants, it can be understood as a paraphrase of (11b) or as a sentence with two different subject<sup>7</sup> referents. Since (11b) is more straightforward if there is only one referent, the second reading of (11a) is somewhat more natural.

(11) a. u-ris kar-a-lo ratt-he.  
 3sPOSS-anger come\_UP-CONJ:PT-COM shout-PT  
 ‘He shouted and became more and more angry.’  
 or ‘He shouted when the other became angry.’

b. u-ris kas-sa ratt-he.  
 3sPOSS-anger come\_UP-SS/T shout-PT  
 ‘He shouted angrily.’

The paraphrase relation between (11b) and one reading of (11a) suggests that *-lok* and *-sa* fill the same syntactic position.

In the same substitution slot as *-lok* and *-sa*, there is also the negative prefix *miN-*. This is evidenced by the following. There is a focus marker (*-pa(k) ~ -ba(k)* ‘ASS’) that co-occurs with temporal roots (e.g. *khicci-ba* ‘soon’, *cho-ba* ‘later’) and the manner demonstrative *khe-*. It is also compatible with a small set of adverbial roots, e.g. *yoryoy* ‘unnoticed’ in example (21b) below, and with constituents marked by *-sa* as well as by *miN-* (12). As illustrated by (12), *miN-* and *-sa* can paraphrase each other if the main verb’s polarity is adjusted.

(12) a. yaŋ his-sa(-ba) la nŋ-um-ʔ-ni.  
 DISTR look-SS/T(-ASS) PREV NEG-wander-NPT-NEG  
 ‘He walked without looking around.’

- b. *yaŋ miŋ-hit(-pa) la um-yu.*  
 DISTR NEG-look(-ASS) PREV wander-NPT  
 'He walked without looking around.'

A further piece of evidence for *miN-* being a p-subordinator comes from morpheme borrowing. Belhare speakers are virtually all bilingual with Nepali, the national Indo-Aryan *lingua franca*. It is no surprise, then, that morphemes, even grammatical ones, are quite extensively borrowed, like, for instance, the ablative allomorph *-gari* discussed above. Another loan suffix is *-samma* ~ *-sam* from Nepali *-samma*. It is an adlative case marker indicating 'until, up to' and can be suffixed to a *miN-* marked verb stem. The suffix highlights the temporal relation (precession) but, as often happens with borrowed affixes,<sup>8</sup> it is not constitutive for such a meaning:

- (13) *un min-ta(-samma) khimm-e la ap-ma n-tou-ʔ-ni-ŋ* [N]  
 3s NEG-come(-ADL) house-LOC return come\_ACR-CIT NEG-find-NPT-NEG-e  
 'I cannot come home before he comes.'

The last member of the p-subordination slot is the supine in *-si*. This marker seems to be less integrated into the clause than the other p-subordinators. The focalizer *-pak* is incompatible with *-si* and there are no paraphrase relations between the supine and other p-subordinators. There is evidence, however, that *-si* is not an a-subordinator, since *-si* cannot introduce the topic for a stretch of discourse in the way known from English fronted *to*-clauses. In English, *to* marked clauses can serve as regular topics (cf. Thompson 1985: 64f)

- (14) To true a blade, hold the steel firmly in the left hand, thumbs on top of handle.  
 Hold the hand slightly away from the body... [follow eight more instructions]

The Belhare supine does not occur in such contexts. A string like *gundri ak-si-na* ('mat weave-SUP-TOP') 'to weave a mat' is not a possible start for the description of how to weave mats.

### 3. 2 Negation and illocution scope

It is remarkable that (12a), *yaŋ hissa la ngumʔni*, literally 'around looking he-doesn't-walk', does not mean 'when looking around he doesn't walk' but that it is the subordinate predicate that is being negated. It is a general rule in Belhare that subordinate clauses with *-sa* attract main verb negation. It is this obligatory 'negative transport' (see Horn (1989: Ch. 5.2) and references cited there) that makes the paraphrase relation in (12) possible. Another example of this phenomenon is (15).

- (15) "yu! kubin" *cek-sa chok-ma n-nui-ʔ-ni.* [IV, 121a]  
 ACR rainbow say-SS/T point-CIT NEG-allowed-NPT-NEG  
 'One must not point and say 'there! a rainbow!'  
 (Not: 'One must not point when one says...')

The motivation for this is the communicative value of peripheral constituents in *-sa*. These constituents convey concomitant information that elaborates on the main predication, i.e. rhematic information. As such, they are only used if they are relevant enough for their immediate clausal co-constituents. They are, therefore, likely to attract the scope of negation markers. This contrasts with adsentential or topical constituents, whose presence is required by more global discourse structures. They serve to keep the text coherent and intelligible and are not in an immediate relationship with the main predication. This makes them less susceptible of grammaticalizing negative transport.

Other p-subordinators do not trigger complete negation transport. Still, there is some negation attraction. With *-lok* main clause negation holds for the *-lok* relation, not the main predicate. Negation is to be understood as 's/he did it, but not under the circumstance expressed by the *-lok* clause':

- (16) a. *lim-lo n-nam-?-ni.*  
delicious-COM NEG-smell-NPT-NEG  
'It does not smell good' (i.e. 'it smells, but not in a way that is good.')
- b. *u-sak lus-a-lo cama n-ca-at-ni.*  
3sPOSS-hunger perceptible-CONJ:PT-COM food NEG-eat-PT-NEG  
'He did not eat before he was hungry.'  
(i.e. 'he ate, but not until he was hungry')
- c. *ta-a-lo kam n-cokg-att-u-n.*  
come-CONJ:PT-COM work NEG-do-PT-3U-NEG  
'He worked not until he came.'

With *-lok*, negation holds for the subordinate relation and not for its filler, i.e. the subordinate clause. This suggests that *-lok* is less integrated into the main clause than *-sa*. It is syntactically more distant from the core predication, in which negation is marked. The same goes for the negator *miN-*:

- (17) *Arko bihibar min-ta chutti pi-ma n-tou-?-ni-ŋ.* [N]  
other Thursday NEG-come holiday give-CIT NEG-find-NPT-NEG-1sA  
'I cannot give [school] holiday before next Thursday.'  
(i.e. 'I can, but not before Thursday.')

Even less integrated into the main clause is the supine *-si*. With this p-subordinator negation transport is optional. If negation is transported, however, the main predication also remains within the negation scope.

- (18) *wa-si ŋ-khatd-att-i-n-na.*  
stroll-SUP NEG-go-PT-1p-NEG-e  
'We<sup>e</sup> did not go for a stroll.'  
(i.e. 'we<sup>e</sup> went but not for strolling' or 'we<sup>e</sup> did not go at all.')

The gradual differences notwithstanding, p-subordination is characterized by attraction of negative scope by the subordinated constituent. This contrasts with a-subordination,

where negation attraction is optional if possible at all. Full-fledged negation transport does not occur and neither does large scope negation that extends over both clauses as in (18). What optionally does occur is relation negation. The examples in (19) illustrate a-subordination without negation attraction.

- (19) a. *cuj lu-na e?wa n-lui-?-ni-ŋ.*  
 cold perceptible-TOP PREV NEG-bathe-NPT-NEG-e  
 'If it is cold, I won't take a bath.'
- b. *ŋkechi tak ta-yu mu huŋ-go Bikate ŋ-khatd-at-chi-n.*  
 1diPOSS friend come-NPT REP COG-ASS B. NEG-go-PT-d-NEG  
 'We<sup>di</sup> didn't go to Bikāte, since our our<sup>di</sup> friend is supposed to come.'
- c. *ne-e yuŋ huŋ-cha i-ne-e ŋ-wa-ni.* [V,V4.7b]  
 DEM-LOC be COG-ADD DIST-DEM-LOC NEG-be-NEG  
 'Whereas there are [some nickels for the *pūjā*] here, there are none there.'

In the following examples, negation is attracted by the a-subordinator.

- (20) a. *u-lamma kar-a-na cama n-ca-at-ni.*  
 3sPOSS-appetite come\_UP-CONJ:PT-TOP food NEG-eat-PT-NEG  
 'He does not eat because he has appetite.' [but because he is hungry]
- b. *a-tak ta-yu huŋ-do Bikate ŋ-khai-?-ni-ŋ.*  
 1sPOSS-friend come-NPT COG-ID B. NEG-go-NPT-NEG-e  
 'I won't go to Bikāte because my friend is supposed to come.'  
 [but for another reason]

A similar distribution of a-subordinated and p-subordinated clauses is observed with illocution scope. P-subordination attracts illocutionary scope. In (21) the scope (in square brackets) extends over both the subordinate and the main clause.

- (21) a. [*his-sa his-sa khar-i-ga-tlo!*] [N]  
 look-SS/T look-SS/T go-2p-2-CP  
 'But do go carefully!'
- b. *la, na khatt-u kina, un-na miŋ-ni-ba — abo, miŋ-ni-ba*  
 ok DEM take-IMP:3U SEQ 3-ERG NEG-see-ASS now NEG-see-ASS  
*thaŋ-a, yoyyoy-ba thaŋ-a kina, [i-na siŋ chomm-e*  
 go\_UP-IMP unnoticed-ASS go\_UP-IMP SEQ DIST-DEM wood top-LOC  
*u-sirr-e att-u-lo na aŋguthik letd-att-u!]* [KP62b]  
 3sPOSS-head fall-3U-COM DEM finger\_ring leave-DOWN-IMP:3U  
 'Well, take this [finger ring], climb up without being seen by her, without being seen nor noticed climb up, and from the top of that tree let this finger ring fall down so that (-lo) it falls onto her head!'

In (22) it is the subordination relation that is being questioned in a way parallel with relation negation (cf. examples in (16) above.)

- (22) Hile yaḡ his-si khar-e-ga i?  
 H. DISTR look-SUP go-PT-2 Q  
 'Did you go to Hile in order to sight-see?'

This contrasts again with a-subordination, where illocution attraction is optional. In examples (23) illocution marking does not affect the subordinate clause.

- (23) a. Kathmandu khar-a-k-na yaḡ-cha hir-e-ga i? [N]  
 K. go-CONJ:PT-2-TOP DISTR-ADD look-PT:3U-2 Q  
 'When going to Kāthmāṇḍū, did you also do some sight-seeing?'
- b. Dhankuta khai-ka huḡ-do a-tak khabar pir-u ai!  
 Dh. go-NPT:2 COG-ID 1sPOSS-friend message give-IMP:3U ATTEN  
 'Since you go to Dhankutā, please give a message to my friend.'
- c. lulaḡ kat-cha-bu lulaḡ-cha ak-set-pir-u;  
 earthquake(R) come\_UP-ADD-REP earthquake(R)-ADD OPT-kill-BEN-3U  
 bajro uḡ-cha-bu bajro-cha ak-tom-bir-u! [V7,1.4]  
 thunderbolt come\_DOWN-ADD-REP thunderbolt-ADD OPT-keep\_above-BEN-3U  
 'Also when an earthquake comes, kill the earthquake for us;  
 also when a thunderbolt comes, kill the lightning for us!'

The following example illustrates optional illocution attraction:

- (24) rak-khar-a-na hab-he i?  
 get\_tired-TEL-CONJ:PT-TOP weep-PT Q  
 'Did he cry because he was tired?' or: 'When he was tired, did he cry?'

The subordinate clause in (24) is not necessarily affected by the interrogative marker in the main clause. A-subordination allows either the subordinate or the main clause to be in the scope of a main clause illocution marker, but never both at a time. I have called this rule Rubin effect (Bickel 1991: 48) because illocution attraction is conditioned by the subordinate clause being foregrounded. This is similar to the optical version of the Rubin effect (Figure 1). As with a-subordination, one of the information units (here a vase and two faces) is in the foreground, the other one in the background. It is, as in a-subordination, impossible for both units being foregrounded simultaneously. The same effect also underlies optional negation attraction as observed in (19) and (20) above.



Fig. 1 Rubin effect

The Rubin effect also distinguishes a-subordination from sequentialization. As in p-subordination, sequentialized clauses can all be within the scope of main clause illocution marking. This contrasts with a-subordination:

- (25) *cama ca-he ki khar-e i?*  
 food eat-PT SEQ go-PT Q  
 'Did he eat and go?' or 'Did he go after having eaten? [...or earlier?]'  
 or 'Did he go after having eaten? [...or did he stay?]

Notice that the scope extension is optional. This is in opposition to p-subordination, where it is compulsory. Another difference between sequentialization and p-subordination is that only the former allows illocution marking also within the 'subordinated' clause (cf. Bickel (1991: 10) for parallel examples from Papuan languages).

- (26) *laitar hene lept-he-ga ki salai am-t-u-ga?* [N]  
 lighter where throw-PT:3U-2 SEQ matches light-NPT-3U-2  
 'Where did you throw the lighter so that you [have to] use matches?'

### 3.2 Summary: the integration continuum

The preceding data suggest that Belhare clause linkage includes sequentialization, ad-sentential and peripheral subordination in the sense defined by Bickel (1991). Ad-sentential and peripheral subordination are part of a continuum of relational integration (*op. cit.* 58).<sup>9</sup> We have seen that the parameter of negation attraction and distributional considerations imply that in Belhare *-sa* is most integrated into the main clause whereas the supine is least integrated. The other markers figure between these extremes. This allows us to order Belhare subordinators on a continuum (Figure 2). The positions on this continuum correlate with several functional properties.

core ←		→ margin	
peripheral subordination		adsentential subordination	
<i>-sa</i> 'SS/T'	<i>-lok</i> 'COM' <i>miN-</i> 'NEG'	<i>-si</i> 'SUP'	<i>-na</i> 'TOP' <i>huŋ</i> 'COG' $\emptyset$ ( <i>-cha</i> 'ADD')
clause constituent		sentence constituent	
neg. transport	relation negation	neg. transport or complete negation	Rubin effect
illocution attraction		Rubin effect	

Fig. 2 The integration continuum in Belhare

First, the less a clause is integrated, i.e. the more it is at the margin of the main clause, the more global is its discourse relevance. Whereas p-subordinated clauses are elaborations and enhancements of the main predication, a-subordinates function as topics or frameworks for larger discourse units. The topic function is illustrated by examples (8) through (10). The following example shows a *-lok*-clause providing information concomitant to the main predication. It is ungrammatical here to replace *-lok* by the topic marker *-na*, since the content of the subordinate clause is not an appropriate framework for the

validity of the main clause predication. (Removing the emphatic marker *-to* does not alter this finding.)

- (27)  $\eta$ -hit-yakt-u-chi-*lok-to*                      nadi u-rakg-e  
 3nsA-look-DISTR-3U-nsU-COM-ID river 3sPOSS-Interior-LOC  
 n-lik-khar-e-chi-bu. [IV,118a]  
 3nsS-enter-TEL-PT-d-REP  
 ‘While they were watching them, they<sup>d</sup> went into the river.’

Second, the more integrated a clause is, the more it modifies the main clause predication. This is the converse effect of the first mentioned functional correlate. The modifying function is salient, for instance in example (5e) *tuptuglo prasta kalura* ‘talk clearly so that (*-lo*) I can understand!’, or (11b) *uris kassa khatcahe* ‘he went away angrily (*-sa*) [visibly angry]’. The function is not universal in Belhare *-lok* or *-sa*, though. If it were so, one would expect these markers not to indicate p-subordination but ‘verbal attribution’. This is a different clause linkage type, which has grammaticalized in the Camling cognate of Belhare *-lok* (Bickel 1991: 73). This verbal attribute modifies the predicate just as an adjective modifies a noun. (It forms, in terms of Functional Grammar, a ‘level 1’ rather than a ‘level 2 satellite’, cf. Dik 1989: 192ff) Although in Belhare modification is more a contextual effect of p-subordination rather than a semantic property, it is still a feature that distinguishes the linkage type from a-subordination: modification is never observed with a-subordination.

Third, more integrated clauses tend to have a higher degree of communicative dynamism, which is defined as “the extent to which a sentence element contributes to the development of the communication, to which it ‘pushes the communication forward’, as it were.” (Firbas 1966: 270). This was illustrated by its effect on negation and illocution attraction. A peripheral constituent is relevant enough for the immediate discourse progression to attract main clause negation. The communicative dynamism can be very high with *-sa* clauses, the most integrated of the p-subordinates. In (28a), the information embedded in the *-sa* clause is crucial for the understanding of the subsequent story: the hero will bring the thigh to his wife and thereby undergo the test that he is to perform and that the story is all about. In (28b), the communicative value of the main clause is even lower than the one of the *-sa* clause.

- (28) a. “na  $\eta$ -khimta $\eta$ -ma kosel khutt-u ai” cek-sa  
 DEM 2sPOSS-spouse-F ritual\_present carry-IMP:3U ATTEN say-SS/T  
 i-gira u-phila-bu m-pheg-he. [IV,104b]  
 one-NHUM 3sPOSS-thigh-REP 3nsA-tear\_out-PT:3U  
 ‘Saying ‘Bring this as a *koseh* to your wife!’, they teared out one thigh [of the bird].’
- b. car khep lep-sa ai-sa lep-sa ai-sa met-ma khe-yu.  
 four times throw-SS/T fill\_in-SS/T throw-SS/T fill\_in-SS/T make-CIT must-NPT  
 ‘Four times one has to throw [away the cooling water] and to fill in [fresh water, when distillating *raks*].’ [G3,31b]

A high degree of communicative dynamism is generally observed with purpose clauses in *-si*, as illustrated by (22) above.

Although the subordinators can be arranged on a continuum, there is a clear-cut division between p-subordination and a-subordination. Formally, this is manifested by two properties. (i) A-subordination generates sentence (or paragraph, text) constituents whereas p-subordination creates clause constituents. (ii) P-subordinate clauses always attract both negation and illocution marking to some degree whereas a-subordination is subject to the Rubin effect. Functionally, a-subordinate clauses are topics and, therefore, provide a content framework for discourse units of different length. P-subordinate clauses, on the other hand, are locally relevant elaborations or enhancements of main clause predications.

This suggests that in Belhare p-subordination and a-subordination do not converge into a uniform clause linkage type, which can be called, in agreement with traditional terminology, 'adverbial clause'. Adverbial clauses are characteristic of European languages like Russian or German (Bickel 1991: 67f, 192).

### 3.4 Excursus: adverbial clauses in European languages

In German, the convergence of a-subordination and p-subordination is only weakly manifested, mainly by constituent order. Both preposition marked p-subordinates and conjunctive a-subordinates appear in the same clause positions (29) and trigger the same inversion effect ('V-2') if in initial position (29c).

- (29) a. Sie trägt            nie eine Brille             $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{beim Schwimmen.} \\ \text{at:DEF swim(INF)} \end{array} \right.$   
           3sF carry:3sNPT never INDEF spectacles
- b. Sie trägt  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{beim Schwimmen} \\ \text{wenn sie schwimmt} \end{array} \right\}$  nie eine Brille.
- c. Beim Schwimmen  $\left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \text{Wenn sie schwimmt} \end{array} \right\}$  trägt sie (\*sie trägt) nie eine Brille.

A stronger convergence can be observed in Russian. The same verb form, the so-called *deepričastie*, is used both in p-subordination and in a-subordination. The syntactic functions have different effects on illocutionary scope. As Rappaport (1984) has shown, a 'detached', i.e. adsentential *deepričastie* is outside the scope of main clause illocution whereas an 'integrated', i.e. p-subordinated form falls within the scope. As an effect, a p-subordinated *deepričastie* is ill-placed in a clause like (30c) whose predication reiterates and confirms the presuppositional part of a question (30a). (The symbol # indicates that the sentence is contextually inappropriate. Capitals signal emphatic stress.)



- (30) A: a. Kto vyšel ? [Rappaport 1984: 103]  
 who PFV:go\_out:PT  
 'Who left?'
- B: b. VANJA vyšel, zakonči-v kontrol'nuj-u.  
 V. PFV:go\_out:PT PFV:finish-SS controll(adj.)-ACCsF  
 'VANJA left, having finished the quiz.'
- B: c. #VANJA vyšel po-svist-yvaj-a.  
 V. PFV:go\_out:PT PUNCT-whistle-IPFV-SS  
 #'VANJA left whistling.'

Likewise, whereas an a-subordinated *deepričastie* is outside the scope of a main clause negator, it falls usually within this scope if it is p-subordinated.<sup>10</sup> This is why (31a) results in a contradiction whereas in (31b) it is only the subordinate clause that is being negated (Rappaport 1984: 114ff).

- (31) a. #Vitja stoit v koridor-e, a on ne stoit tam,  
 V. IPFV:stand:3sNPT in corridor-LOC but 3sM NEG IPFV:stand:3sNPT there  
 robej-a. [Rappaport 1984: 118]  
 IPFV:timid-SS  
 #'Vitja is standing in the corridor, but he is not standing there, feeling timid.'
- b. Vitja stoit v koridor-e, a on ne stoit tam  
 V. IPFV:stand:3sNPT in corridor-LOC but 3sM NEG IPFV:stand:3sNPT there  
 po-svist-yvaj-a. [Rappaport 1984: 119]  
 PUNCT-whistle-IPFV-SS  
 'Vitja is standing in the corridor, but he is not standing there whistling.'

The same distinction between detached/adsentential and non-detached/peripheral functions seems to hold for the English participle (Bickel 1991: 91, König 1993: 28f, Kortmann 1993: 16ff) and correlates with the distinction between initial and final purpose clauses marked by *to* or *in order to* (cf. example (14) above and Thompson 1985, Lehmann 1988: 187). Also Latin participles are used both in p-subordination and a-subordination (see Bickel (1991: 138ff) and references cited there). As a peripheral constituent the case of the participle fits into the relational structure of the main clause, whereas in a-subordination the participle functions as a *participium coniunctum* or *ablativus absolutus* and provides 'framework' information. The use of participles in both adsentential and peripheral functions is typical for European languages but the difference between the two subordination types is manifested to different degrees (see König (1993: 27ff) for further discussion).

#### 4. Topicalization and the adsentential topic function

At first sight one might think that also Belhare exhibits an adverbial clause, i.e. a convergence of p-subordination and a-subordination: the same markers that indicate a-subordination (*-na* 'TOP' and *huj* 'COG') also occur with clause constituents. In this

position, however, they have a different if related function. The markers do not indicate a-subordination or any other kind of subordination. Rather they signal that a p-subordinated (or complementing) constituent is topicalized. Topicalization does not change the type of subordination. It does not disintegrate constituents nor does it 'move' them into an adsentential topic position. This is evidenced by the following examples. The p-subordinators attract the scope of main clause negation although they are topicalized by *-na* or *huŋ*. (For reasons outlined in section 5, it is not possible to translate into English the topicalization effect as well as to imitate the original negation structure.)

- (32) a. wa-si-na      ŋ-khatd-att-i-n-na. (cf. (18))  
 stroll-SUP-TOP NEG-go-PT-1p-NEG-e  
 'We<sup>e</sup> didn't go for a stroll.'  
 (i.e. 'we<sup>e</sup> went but not for strolling' or 'we<sup>e</sup> did not go at all.')
- b. min-ta-na      n-liu-?-ni. [KP61b]  
 NEG-come-TOP NEG-be-NPT-NEG  
 'It doesn't work before he comes.' (i.e. it works only with his help)
- c. bahira      im-yakt-a-ŋ-lok-na      cuŋ-ŋa      mai-tatd-at-ni.  
 outdoors      sleep-DISTR-CONJ:PT-e-COM-TOP      fever-ERG      1sU-bring-PT-NEG  
 'I didn't get fever sleeping outdoors.'
- d. im-sa      huŋ-go      cama      n-cai-?-ni-ŋ.  
 lie\_down-SS/T COG-ASS food NEG-eat-NPT-NEG-e  
 'I don't eat lying down!' [contrary to what you might think of me]

Notice that, as shown in section 3.2, the same morphemes *-na* and *huŋ* produce a Rubin effect if used as subordinators. The difference between topicalizing *-na* and a-subordinating *-na* is most evident in a minimal pair like (33). The accidental fact that the prevocalic stem of *luma* 'to sing' ends in /s/ gives rise to two ways of parsing the same string, once (33a) as a p-subordination and once (33b) as an a-subordination.

- (33) a. chem lu-sa-na      la      nŋ-ui-?-ni.  
 PREV sing-SS/T-TOP PREV NEG-dance-NPT-NEG  
 'He doesn't dance without singing [at the same time]'
- b. chem lus-a-na      la      nŋ-ui-?-ni.  
 PREV sing-CONJ:PT-TOP PREV NEG-dance-NPT-NEG  
 'When singing he doesn't dance' or 'He doesn't dance when singing.'

In (33a) the scope of negation unambiguously extends over the subordinated clause, whereas the a-subordinated clause of (33b) is either within the scope or outside it.

Also with respect to illocution, topicalization does not change the syntactic function of subordinate clauses. The subordinate clause in (34) remains in the scope of the rhetorical question marked by the interrogative sign *-i* and the counter-expectative marker *-ndo*.

- (34) chem lu-sa-na wa-goī-yakt-he i-ndo?  
 PREV sing-SS/T-TOP stroll-AMB-DISTR-PT Q-CE  
 'But certainly he walked around singing?'

Sentence (35) follows a description of the complete darkness that encompassed the world in its origin. The modality operator *parne* for exigency (from Nepali *parne*) extends its scope over the topicalized *-sa* clauses (the present tense is historical):

- (35) kamm-e ŋ-khat-yu. yaŋ-bu mi-ŋ-niu-ʔ-ni. sop-sa  
 work-LOC 3nsS-go-NPT DISTR-REP 3nsS-NEG-see-NPT-NEG grope-SS/T  
 mes-sa huŋ-cha-bu kam cok-ca-ma parne. [KP8a]  
 make-SS/T COG-ADD-REP work do-eat-CIT EXIG  
 'They went to work. They couldn't see anything. Even groping one's way one had to do work and eat.'

Occasionally both topicalizing *-na* and subordinating *-na* co-occur in one sentence:

- (36) satte nak-t-u-m-na, satte-na ka-pi-yu. [IV, 107b]  
 truth ask\_for-NPT-3U-1pA-TOP truth-TOP iU-give-NPT  
 'If we<sup>i</sup> ask for the truth, he gives us<sup>i</sup> the truth.'

This confirms from a structural point of view that the functions are syntactically different.

Topicalization in Belhare is an operation to modify the information value of a clause constituent. It does not signal a topic in the sense of an independent syntactic function, viz. a function that projects the framework for a discourse unit of variable length. Rather, topicalization clarifies which element the sentence 'is about'. This means either that a referent is re-instantiated (37a) or selected (37b).

- (37) a. maŋ-chi i? abo imbi-bi ŋ-u-yakt-he? imbi-bi  
 deity-ns Q now how\_much-RED 3ns-3D-DISTR-PT how\_much-RED  
 ŋ-u-yakt-he-no? barobara-ro ŋ-u-yakt-he-ha mu  
 nsS-3D-DISTR-PT-CONF equal-ID nsS-3D-DISTR-PT-NOML OBV  
 hola-no. manua-lo maŋ-na barobar mun dhub-yakt-he [IV, 104a]  
 probably-CONF human(R)-COM deity-TOP equal PREV talk-DISTR-PT  
 'The gods (= ancestors)? Well, how small they were? Probably they were EQUAL [to the humans]. The gods (*-na*) talked with the humans on an equal basis.'
- b. pit-lo saŋa-lo rommu rommu piŋ-sa ŋ-khat-yakt-he-chi.  
 cow-COM buffalo-COM together together run-SS/T 3ns-go-DISTR-PT-d  
 saŋa-na ko-si-he.  
 buffalo-TOP fall-die-PT  
 'A cow and a buffalo were running together. The buffalo (*-na*) fell and died.'

Shortly after the explanation (37a), the narrator goes back to the main story and picks up one of the main participants. This participant is taken as the viewpoint from which the subsequent events are reported.

- (38) i-na maŋ-ha u-cha-na-bu yu-ba u-khimm-ep-phu  
 DIST-DEM deity-GEN 3sPOSS-child-TOP-REP ACR-LOC 3sPOSS-house-LOC-REP  
 theta theŋuŋtheŋ akg-het-phu. [IV, 104b]  
 loom IDEOPH weave-ACT-REP  
 ‘That child of a god was weaving ‘theŋuŋtheŋ’ at home over there.’ [...and then  
 came her husband and threw a bird’s thigh at her so that her leg broke.]

Topicalization can have a contrastive effect but, in opposition to contrastive focalization, it concerns given referents, which are contrastively selected from the universe of discourse:

- (39) u-rakg-ep-phu n-sok-teŋ-se-ch-u, un-chik-ŋa-na.  
 3sPOSS-interior-LOC-REP 3nsA-put\_away-TEL-STAT-d-3U 3-ns-ERG-TOP  
 un-na-na cand-he. [KP2b]  
 3s-ERG-TOP eat\_up-PT:3U  
 ‘They<sup>d</sup> have put [the meat] away into [the earth]. But he ate it up.’

Topicalization is an operation that belongs to the same functional domain as focalization, viz. to the domain in which the ‘information structure’ (Van Valin 1993: 22ff) or the ‘functional sentence perspective’ (Firbas 1966) is modified. This is corroborated by a look at the syntax of topicalized nominals.

With nominals the markers *-na* and *huŋ* behave as with p-subordinate clauses. Rather than licensing syntactic functions they topicalize clause constituents. This is evidenced by the fact that the markers do not replace ordinary case marking but that they are added to case marking. We have already seen examples of the topicalizer *huŋ* with the ablative case *-huŋ* ~ *-nahuŋ* in (7). In (40) *-na* topicalizes a locative (40a) and a comparative phrase (40b).

- (40) a. paŋrika-et-na uchoŋat samacar ŋ-wat-he-ni.  
 newspaper-LOC-TOP new news NEG-be-PT-NEG  
 ‘In the newspaper there wasn’t anything new.’  
 b. Bharaṭ bhāṇḍa-na Nepal cig u-yu.  
 India COMP-TOP N. small 3D-NPT  
 ‘Nepal is smaller than India.’

Notice that it is not grammatical to remove case marking since the topicalizer cannot signal a syntactic relation by itself. The clauses in (40) could not be started with *paŋrika-na* (‘newspaper-TOP’) or *Bharaṭ-na* (‘India-TOP’), respectively. Example (41a) is only an apparent counter-example. As illustrated by (41b), nominal attributes do not obligatorily require genitive marking. The phenomenon is not contingent on topicalization.

- (41) a. haŋi-na u-nari e pheŋ-yu.  
 elephant-TOP 3sPOSS-nose big 1D-NPT  
 ‘The elephant as a long nose.’  
 b. haŋi unari... haŋi-ha unari... haŋi-hak-na unari...  
 elephant elephant elephant-GEN elephant-GEN-TOP elephant

The only case where *-na* can replace case marking and where it appears to indicate a syntactic function by itself, is the ergative case. In (42a), the ergative can be removed without affecting grammaticality. In (42b) the same actor referent appears first as a topicalized constituent without case and later with ergative marking as *na-ŋa* 'DEM-ERG'. (42c) illustrates a case-less actor topicalized by *huŋ*.

- (42) a. Maiti pa(-ŋa)-na lotliŋ kolo tai?-t-u-no!  
 M. father(-ERG)-TOP *daurā* CONTR bring-NPT-3U-CONF  
 'Maitipa,<sup>11</sup> however, brought him a new *daurā* (Nepalese-style shirt) [rather than a *saɬ*, i.e. a European-style shirt]'
- b. e, na-na u-jutho-ulo ka-cei?-kha raicha,  
 EXCL DEM-TOP 3sPOSS-impure-CONTR iU-feed-NPT:NOML DISC  
 na-ŋa u-jutho ka-cet-yuk-kha raicha. [KP24a]  
 DEM-ERG 3sPOSS-impure iU-feed-FUT-NOML DISC  
 'Oh it looks as if this one is going to give us<sup>i</sup> impure [food], obviously he will be going to give us<sup>i</sup> impure food.'
- c. Maiti pa huŋ-do ak-ten-u.  
 M. father COG-ID OPT-hit-3U  
 'I think Maitipa, he is the one who should hit him.'

The possible substitution of an ergative case by the topicalizer is motivated by the high degree of referential prominence associated with Belhare subjects (Bickel, forthcoming a). This is consistent with the discourse value of topicality, which is manifested by referential prominence, and the 'about' meaning of topicalized constituents. On the other hand, the restriction of the case/topicalizer alternation to subjects shows that topicalization is not a device for creating topic positions in the sense of a special syntactic function. For such functions it is generally the case that their fillers are syntactically independent of the main clause (Li & Thompson 1976). In particular, they are not subject to selectional restrictions but may play any kind of argument role. It is even possible that they do not play an argument role at all, as in the introductory Chinese example (1).

In Belhare, topics (in the sense of an independent syntactic function) may be realized only by potentially independent units. This is the same distribution rule as known for the topic marker *na* in Godié, the West African language for which subordinate clauses were first analysed as topics (Marchese 1977: 162f).<sup>12</sup> Belhare topics are finite clauses as illustrated in the preceding sections or the citation form in *-ma* and adverbials like *hale-na* 'before, earlier', *ikhe-na* 'like that', etc. All these units regularly constitute independent utterances. That this also holds for *-ma* is shown by (43). The potential independence of *-ma* is one of the reasons why I call the form 'citation form' and not 'infinitive' (as the Limbu equivalent in *-ma?* is labelled by van Driem [1987: 209]). The other reason is that the form inflects for number of undergoer: *hit-ma-chi* ('look-CIT-nsU') means 'to look at them'.

- (43) a. na yeti? — sabun. nabhak chi-ma. [N]  
 DEM what soap face wash-CIT  
 'What's that? — Soap. [I am going to go to] wash my face.'
- b. male, bēsi miḡ-khat-ma, kubaḡ so-si miḡ-khat-ma i? [N]  
 INIT wet\_field NEG-go-CIT monkey wait-SUP NEG-go-CIT Q  
 'Wait a minute! you don't want to go to the paddy fields, you don't want to go to watch for the monkeys?!'

Topicalized citation forms are illustrated by the following examples.

- (44) a. bhari miḡ-khu-ma-na ika nḡ-ab-he-chi-ndo? [IV,1]  
 load NEG-carry-CIT-TOP why 3nsS-come\_ACR-PT-d-CE  
 'Why did they<sup>d</sup> come at all, since they didn't carry a load?'
- b. kon-ma-na kond-he-ga? [K1.98] c. yuḡ-ḡa, yuḡ-ma-na! [N]  
 search-CIT-TOP search-PT-2 be-ACT be-CIT-TOP  
 'But you did look for him?' 'There is beer [if you want that].'

Also pro-sentences like *male* 'no' are potential fillers of the topic function:

- (45) khol-ap maʔi-cog-he. i-khe-huḡ abo hon-ma tog-he-m-ma.  
 open-INT eU-AUX-PT DIST-MOD-ABL now appear-CIT find-PT-1pA-e  
 male-na Japan-naha u-hawa-jaj-chi n-ta-yu, gururua  
 no-TOP J.-GEN 3sPOSS-air-ship-ns 3nsS-come-NPT IDEOPH  
 n-ta-yu... [IV,126a]  
 3nsS-come-NPT  
 'They opened us<sup>e</sup> a way out [from the siege] so that we<sup>e</sup> could get out. If [they did] not [have done that], the Japanese air planes would have come, 'gururua' they would have come...'

This concludes the range of elements that may serve as topics. Belhare topics project frameworks for a discourse unit of variable length. In agreement with Li & Thompson's definition of topics (Li & Thompson 1976: 463f), this function is also consistent across fillers and sentence types.

In some cases, however, also case marked constituents seem to form the 'framework' for a complex discourse unit. In (46) such a unit is a clause sequence. Notice that the instrumental constituent is an argument of the last clause and does not play a role in the first clause.

- (46) ani i-na pit chala-ḡa khar-a kina khalati cog-u! [KP4a]  
 then DIST-DEM cow leather-INST go-IMP SEQ bellows do-IMP:3U  
 'Go and make bellows from that cow-leather!'

Such examples are rare in natural discourse but they are well judged as grammatical. They represent probably a different operation, which one might call 'constituent anticipation'. Consonant with such an analysis is the fact that topicalization marking with *-na* is

independent from anticipation. Thus, if the discourse context would be appropriate, e.g. if there were a list of different items in the preceding universe of discourse, *ina pit chalaga* 'with this cow leather' could be topicalized by *-na*. This does not affect the position nor the syntactic function of the constituent.

## 5. The theory of topic positions and clause linkage

The preceding sections suggest a distinction between topic and topicalization. Topic refers to a function in the syntax of sentence building and introduces the framework for a subsequent text unit. Topicalization is an operation in the syntax of information structuring and indicates which constituent the clause is about. I shall now discuss this distinction against a typological and theoretical background.

### 5.1 Topic and detachment

It is well known that in many languages there is a syntactic position outside the clause (cf., for instance, Dik 1989, Van Valin 1993). Following Russian tradition this position is often called 'detached' (Russ. *obosoblennyj*, cf. Rappaport 1984) and exemplified by constructions like (30b) and (31a) above. Another example is (47), where a detached *deepričastie* (*rasserdivšis'* 'having become angry') projects the framework for a complex sentence containing a non-detached, p-subordinated *deepričastie* (*droža...* 'trembling...').

- (47) rasserdi-vši-s', ona bystro za-govoril-a drož-a  
 PFV:angry-SS-REFL 3sF quickly PFV-speak:PT-sF IPFV:tremble-SS  
 vsem tel-om. [Rappaport 1984: 159]  
 all:INSTRsN body-INSTRs  
 'Having become angry, she began to speak quickly, trembling over her entire body.'

Similar detachment phenomena are disintegrated adverbial clauses in a range of Germanic languages (König & van der Auwera 1988, Bickel 1991: 88f). In German, detachment is signalled by the fact that the *Vorfeld*, i.e. the 'topic' position in front of the finite verb, is filled by another constituent (48a). This contrasts with the non-detached structure, where the adverbial clause itself is in the *Vorfeld* (48b). (Capitals indicate emphatic stress.)

- (48) a. Wenn du mit-kommen willst, ICH habe nichts da-gegen.  
 if 2s with-come want:2sNPT 1s have:1sNPT nothing DEM-against  
 'If you want to come with [us], that's OK with me.'
- b. Wenn du mit-kommen willst, freue ich mich.  
 if 2s with-come want:2sNPT pleased:1sNPT 1s 1sACC  
 'If you want to come with [us], I am pleased.'

Another case of detachment is the so-called conditional topic in Japanese, a complex *wa*-marked noun phrase at the left margin of a sentence (see Tateishi 1990 and references cited there).

In all these cases, subordinate clauses are analysed as adjoined to a sentence, i.e. ad-sentential. Therefore one could also think of ad-sentential (topical) subordinates in Belhare to fill the same position. There are, however, arguments against such a view. Russian detached participles are always outside the scope of main clause illocution and negation, whereas Belhare a-subordination shows a Rubín effect. As has been shown in section 3.2, a Belhare *-na* or *hug* clause can optionally fall within the scope of main clause operators. This is not possible with Russian detachment (Rappaport 1984: 117ff) nor with disintegrated adverbial clauses in German. One of the main triggers of detachment or disintegration in German is the unconditioned assertability of an apodosis (König & van der Auwera 1988). This assertability is reflected by the typical verb-second word order in the main clause (48a). The protasis is never affected by this illocutionary status. Also negation does not extend to a detached subordinate clause (49a). The general rule is rather that it is the *Vorfeld* phrase that is focused and attracts negation. This can be the subject if the subordinate clause is detached (49a) or the subordinate clause itself if it is not detached (49b).

- (49) a. Wenn er weiter so redet, ICH höre nicht zu.  
           if 3s further so talk:3sNPT 1s listen NEG PREV  
           ‘If he continues speaking like that, — I just don’t listen.’
- b. Wenn es regnet, gehe ich nicht raus.  
           if 3sN rain:3sNPT go:1sNPT 1s NEG out  
           ‘If it rains I don’t go out.’

Similarly, English detached *to*-clauses are outside the scope of main clause illocution, as can be seen from example (14) above, repeated here for convenience as (50a). The same seems to hold for detached participles (50b), which resemble in this respect the Russian *deepričastie*, and it is true, as shown by Van Valin (1993: 13), for other constituents (50c) as well.

- (50) a. To true a blade, hold the steel firmly in the left hand, thumbs on top of handle.  
           Hold the hand slightly away from the body... [follow eight more instructions]
- b. Looking back to your time in Paris, do you think you changed a lot?
- c. Yesterday, did you see Bill at the beach?

This again contrasts with Belhare a-subordination where the subordinate clause can be within the scope of main clause operators.

Another argument against the identity of detachment and Belhare a-subordination comes from focalization. Detached positions are usually assumed to be outside the domain of potential focus marking (cf. Van Valin 1993: 30). Rappaport (1984: 120) cites this finding as a well-known phenomenon in Russian. Only a non-detached (p-subordinated) *deepričastie* can be prosodically specified as the focus of its sentence (cf. Kortmann (1993: 18) for English parallels):



- (51) a. Alik xodit po ulic-e SPOTYKAJ-A-S'.  
 A. IPFV:go:3sNPT at street-LOC IPFV:stumble-SS-REFL  
 'Alik is walking along the street stumbling.'
- b. #Vitja stoit v koridor-e, ROBEJ-A.  
 V. IPFV:stand:3sNPT in coridor-LOC IPFV:timid-SS  
 'Vitja is standing in the coridor, feeling timid.'

In contrast to this, adsentential subordinates in Belhare can be focused. In examples (6c) and (23b) the a-subordinator *huj* is suffixed by the focus marker *-to(k) ~ -do(k) ~ ro(k)*. This particle identifies a referent and or a proposition with something in the universe of discourse in a way similar to cleft constructions. The restrictive focus particle *-ga* emphasises a subordinate clause in *-na*, meaning 'just, only, but.' It occurs in examples (8c) and (10). Further illustrations are (52). Also notice in (52a) the use of *-ro* 'ID' to signal that *ʃarkari* 'vegetable' is the thing that the people (farmers on a study tour) are supposed to see in the first place (rather than the sight-seeing in Kāthmāṇḍū).

- (52) a. i-net-nahuj Kathmandu khar-e-i-ga. Kathmandu khar-i-ŋ-na-ga  
 DIST-LOC-ABL K. go-PT-1p-e K. go-1p-e-TOP-FOC  
 i-na Mākanpur jilla-e pheri ʃarkari-ro his-si khar-e-i-ga. [ST4]  
 DIST-DEM M. district-LOC again vegetable-ID look-SUP go-PT-1p-e  
 'From there we<sup>e</sup> went to Kāthmāṇḍū. Only after we<sup>e</sup> have gone to Kāthmāṇḍū  
 were there again vegetable [fields] that we<sup>e</sup> went to see in Makvānpur district.'
- b. i-na khe phur-u-m-na-ga  
 DIST-DEM MOD pull\_out-3U-1pA-TOP-FOC  
 tuaktuak sat-tet-yu-klo. (< *kolo*) [KP19b]  
 IDEOPH take\_out-POT-NPT-CONTR  
 'If we just pull like this, it comes out 'tuaktuak'.' [a straw-like grass]

Sometimes *-ga* is added only to indicate that the subordinate clause is meant as a narrower specification of the framework in which the main clause holds:

- (53) i-na-cha thop-khat-yu; aṅsi ta-yak-na-ga ika  
 DIST-DEM-ADD hide-TEL-NPT new\_moon come-DISTR-TOP-FOC why  
 thop-yu — un-na asen-do har-ap cou-se. [KP9a]  
 hide-NPT 3s-ERG before-ID loose-INT AUX-STAT:3U  
 '[The moon] also hides itself; when the new moon night comes, why does  
 it hide itself? — A long time ago, he lost [in a competition with the sun].'

Focusability is sometimes seen as a distinctive criterion for subordination (Tikkanen, forthcoming, Haspelmath 1993). The preceding discussion, however, suggests that it is distinctive only for non-detached adsentential subordination. Moreover, the criterion should be narrowed down to restrictive focus types. Additive focus is compatible with detachment. In Dutch and German, disintegration of conditionals is even favoured if "a series of antecedents is specified by a focus particle" (König & van der Auwera 1988: 121):

- (54) Ook als Fred vaak iets langzaam is, hij is in de  
 ADD if F. often something slow is 3sM is in DEF  
 grond zeer intelligent.  
 ground very intelligent  
 'Even if Fred is often a little slow, he is basically very intelligent.'

In French *gérondif* constructions non-additive focus seems to preclude detachment (55a, b) (cf. König 1993: 28) whereas additive focus is perfectly compatible with detachment (55c).

- (55) a. C'est en la voyant qu'il a rougi. [König 1993: 28]  
 'It was when he saw her that he blushed.'
- b. Je ne pouvais plus m'en sauver qu'en renversant la situation. [König 1993: 18]  
 'I could not save myself any more except by reversing the situation.'
- c. Même en n'y faisant pas attention, il se disait "tiens". [König 1993: 18]  
 'Even though he did not pay attention to it, he said to himself "Wait a minute".'

Notice that the scalar additive marker *même* yields a concessive (or concessive conditional) interpretation and that the restrictive *ne...que* 'only' in (55b) tends to lead to a "instrumental adverbial" reading (König 1993: 18).

Restrictive focus is compatible with a-subordination in Belhare and p-subordination in European languages. It is impossible with detachment.

## 5.2 Topic and topicalized clause constituents

In (49b) above we could observe that German adverbial clauses can attract main clause negation if they fill the *Vorfeld* position, i.e. if they are not detached. This suggests that the Belhare topic position of a-subordinates is more similar to the German *Vorfeld*. The same position, which I shall label here 'topic' in distinction from 'detachment', seems to be prevalent in Japanese. As Ōta & Katō (1986) and McGloin (1987) have shown, *wa*-phrases can be inside or outside the scope of main clause negation. This is the same Rubin effect that was observed with Belhare a-subordination. The *wa*-phrase falls within the scope if it contains contrastive information and potentially carries emphatic stress (56a). It is outside the scope if the information is identifiable, whence 'given' (56b).

- (56) a. ōzei no hito wa kimas-en-deshita. [McGloin 1987: 173]  
 many ATTR person TOP come-NEG-PT  
 'Not many people came.'
- b. osaifu wa dokonimo mie-na-katta. [McGloin 1987: 174]  
 wallet TOP nowhere seen-NEG-PT  
 'The wallet could not be seen anywhere.'

This distribution is remarkably similar to the behaviour of the German *Vorfeld*, which also produces a Rubin effect. Emphatic stress attracts the function of an interrogative intonation in the matrix (57a) and a rising intonation contour puts the *Vorfeld* in (58a) into the scope of the main clause negator *nicht* (cf. Jacobs 1982). The phrases can also be outside the scope. In this case they may not be stressed (57b) nor may they have a separate intonation contour (58b).

(57) a. Beim FERNSEHEN schlief er ein?  
 at:DEF watch\_TV sleep:3sNPT 3sM PREV  
 'Was it when watching TV that he fell asleep?'

b. Beim Fernsehen schlief er ein?  
 'When watching TV, did he fall asleep?'

(58) a. Beim Fernsehen schlief er NICHT ein

'It was not when watching TV that he fell asleep.'

b. Beim Fernsehen schlief er nicht ein.  
 'When watching TV, he did not fall asleep.'

In Japanese and German, the Rubin effect manifests itself in form of an amphiboly. The readings are disambiguated by intonation or stress. This does not seem to be the case in Belhare, where the effect is manifested by plain ambiguity.

Examples (56) through (58) also show that the topic position can be focused. In the preceding section we saw that also Belhare a-subordinates can be marked as the restrictive focus of a sentence. This confirms the claim that a-subordination attaches clauses at the same configurational position where topics are.

Notice that in German (57) and (58) as well as in Japanese (59), the topic phrase can have adpositions that specify its function in the matrix. McGloin (1987: 175) notes that in an unmarked reading of (59), the *wa*-phrase is outside the main clause negation scope. It seems to be also possible, however, to get a contrastive reading with a negated topic phrase.

(59) Yōko-san ni wa purezento o age-na-katta. [McGloin 1987: 175]  
 Y. DAT TOP present ACC give-NEG-PT  
 'I did not give a present to Yōko.'

In German and Japanese, topic marking puts clause constituents into the structural topic position. The constituents are disintegrated to the degree that they manifest a Rubin effect in illocution and negation. This also holds for English constituent fronting, where *beans* is inside or outside the negation scope depending on the stress pattern.

(60) Beans John does not like.

These constituents fill, in other words, the same topic slot as Belhare a-subordinated clauses. However, the Belhare topic position can be filled only by finite clauses, i.e.

citation forms, some adverbials and pro-sentences, and not by regular clause constituents (see section 4). Apart from this, there is a distinct operation, called 'topicalization', which indicates the information value of clause constituents. In stark contrast to Japanese, German and English, Belhare topicalization does not disintegrate constituents. Accordingly, they do not produce a Rubin effect in the way topicalized constituents do in Japanese (56) and (59) or in German (57) – (58) and English (60). This typological difference is the reason why it is hardly possible to imitate the original information and scope structure in English translations of Belhare (see section 4). The distinction between topic and topicalized constituents is neutralized in German, English and Japanese but present in Belhare. On the basis of MacDonald (1988), I have postulated a similar distinction in Tauya, a Papuan language of New Guinea (Bickel 1991: 92f).

### 5.3 Level-specific topics and subordination

The preceding sections suggest that at least three notions of topic must be kept apart: detachment, topic and topicalization. Detachment position and topic are both grammatical representations of discourse 'frameworks'. The former is less integrated into another text unit (a sentence or a clause) than the latter. Topicalization is the grammatical marking of what a sentence or clause 'is about'. The difference between detachment and topic seems to be very close to the distinction between 'left-detached position' and 'pre-core slot' in Role and Reference Grammar or between 'Theme' and 'P1' in Functional Grammar. However, neither theory provides a term for topicalization as distinct from topic.

In many languages, and prominently in the better known European languages, topic and topicalization converge to a strong degree.<sup>13</sup> Even in Belhare the two operations converge insofar as they are signalled by the same morphemes *-na* and *huj*. The markers, however, occur in two clearly distinct syntagmas. In European languages and also in Japanese, the two operations converge much more. In German, for instance, the *Vorfeld* is representative of both topics with a 'framework' meaning and topicalized constituents with an 'about' meaning. The former is typical if the *Vorfeld* is filled with a propositional constituent (61a = 4), the latter if it is referential (61b).

- (61) a *Bei Regen* geht's ihm immer schlecht.  
       'When it's raining he always feels bad.'
- b. *Ihm* geht's immer schlecht.  
       'He always feels bad.'

For Japanese, Iwasaki (1987) proposes that the 'aboutness' meaning of *wa*-topics is possibly a derivative of a more general *Gesamtbedeutung* of 'scope-setting'. This is Iwasaki's term for a function that "sets the scope (or demarcates a domain) to which a predication or predications are supplied" (*op. cit.* 130), i.e. the 'framework' function. As in German, non-specific referents and postpositional phrases are typical in this function (62a) whereas 'more concrete, more definite' phrases and 'higher categorial nouns' (in the sense of Hopper & Thompson 1984) seem to yield a notion of 'aboutness' (62b = 56b). The two functions of *wa* phrases seem to depend, in other words, on what Seiler

calls the gradual difference between 'predicativity' and 'indicativity' (cf., for instance, Seiler 1986)

- (62) a. yo-nin gurai made wa sumeru rashii desu ne. [Iwasaki 1987: 129]  
 four-CLASS about up\_to TOP can-reside seem COP EXCL  
 'It seems that up to four people can live here.'
- b. osaifu wa dokonimo mie-na-katta.  
 wallet TOP nowhere seen-NEG-PT  
 'The wallet could not be seen anywhere.'

This correlation of the 'about' meaning with a higher degree of nominality or referentiality ('indicativity') and of the 'framework' meaning with more propositional characteristics ('predicativity') motivates the grammatical distribution of topic marking in Belhare and Godié. In both languages, true topics (in the sense of a separate syntactic function with a 'framework' meaning), are restricted to potentially independent units (cf. section 4) such as finite clauses, citation forms, some adverbials and pro-sentences. (Incidentally, this is the only reason why we speak of (adsentential) subordination rather than of plain topic marking.) The subordinated units have more propositional than referential properties. Since in Belhare the distinction between topic and topicalization is fully grammaticalized (more precisely, 'syntacticized'), however, propositional units can also occur in topicalization. In contrast to German and Japanese, the distinction cannot be reduced to the semantic properties of the units involved in topic marking. Still it is more typical to find topicalization with definite referential noun phrases. This tendency motivates a syntactic phenomenon discussed in section 4. In Belhare only ergative nominals, which are typically definite human agents with a high degree of referential persistence, can occur with a topicalization marker instead of the regular case suffix. This is the first step in the development of a nominative 'pragmatic pivot' (or 'subject'), i.e. a constituent that the predication is about and that is primarily but not necessarily filled by actors or intransitive subjects (cf. Foley & Van Valin 1984: 134ff).

From a syntactic point of view, pivot is a clause building function. Topicalization in Belhare is a similar function but without in-built case marking. Whereas a nominative case creates the slot for a clause constituent, topicalization is added to something that is already a constituent (in whatever case role). This suggests that topicalization is the marking of topic on the clause level and contrasts with detachment and the framework type of topic, which are topics on a higher level.

It is not clear to me how these levels could be distinguished by traditionally accepted level notions such as 'sentence' and 'paragraph'. These notions capture the textual length of a unit as defined by finiteness, switch-reference etc. (cf. the parameter of *Textgliederung* in Bickel 1991: 28f). It does not correlate with the level to which a topic is adjoined or a-subordinated. A Belhare topic can form the framework for a sentence or a whole paragraph (see examples (8) through (10) above) although it is syntactically adjoined to a position that is more integrated into another sentence than a detached position is (cf. section 5.1). It is this degree of integration that determines the 'level' on which the topic is adjoined. I propose to reserve the notion of paragraph for aspects of text articulation and to split the notion of sentence into hierarchical units. One, say 'big sentence', is the



follow in this respect Role and Reference Grammar, where clause constituency and information structure are conceptualised as different projections of a syntactic unit.

In European languages and Japanese the distinction between topicalization and topic proper is syntactically neutralized and can be reduced to semantic properties of the topic marked noun phrase. This neutralisation seems to correlate with a partial convergence of peripheral and adsentential subordination, which is manifested by the so-called 'adverbial clause' in European idioms. If subordinate clauses are not fully marked as either a-subordinated or p-subordinated, the morphological or configurational marking of these clauses as topics puts them into the position of a topic proper or a detached topic. Only if subordination types are strictly distinguished as in Belhare is it possible that the addition of a topic marker merely topicalizes a constituent without putting it into the position of a topic proper. Whether this correlation is indeed universal, however, must be left for future study.

### Abbreviations

ACR	across
ACT	Actualis
ADD	Additive
AMB	Ambulative
ASS	Assertive
ATTEN	Attenuative
CE	Counter-expectative
CIT	Citation form
COG	Cognitive topic
CONF	Confirmative
CONJ	Conjunctive
CONTR	Contrastive
CP	Counter-presuppositional
DIR	Directive
DISC	Discovery marker
DIST	Distal
DISTR	Distributive
EXIG	Exigency
ID	Identificator
INIT	Speech act initiator
INT	Integrator (of loan-words)
MOD	Modal demonstrative
NHUM	Non-human
OBV	Obvious
POT	Potential
PREV	Preverb
PUNCT	Punctual
QUANT	Quantitative

RESTR	Restrictive
SS/T	Same subject and tense
STAT	Stative
SUP	Supine
TEL	Telic

### Notes

This paper is a preliminary study of Belhare syntax and certainly needs additional discourse analysis. My warmest thanks go to Lekh Bahādur Rā, without whose insights into the subtle semantics of grammatical morphemes and whose interest into fine-grained ambiguities, this study would not have been possible. I also extend my thanks to William Foley and to the participants of the colloquium, especially Karen Ebert, for helpful comments.

The research reported here was sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft in 1991 and by the Max Planck Gesellschaft in 1992 and 1993.

<sup>1</sup>Notice that in Functional Grammar 'Theme' refers to the 'framework' notion of topic (Dik 1978: 140). A more elaborate theory on 'extra-clausal pragmatic functions' including 'Theme', 'Initiator', 'Address', etc. seems to be currently developed (Dik 1989: 265).

<sup>2</sup>I use <c> and <j> to represent /tʃ/ and /dʒ/ in Belhare. The phonologically unmarked retroflex consonants are written as <t, d, r> whereas their anterior counterparts in loanwords are marked by the subscript bridge. Data are mostly from conversational and narrative recordings ('N' refers to unsorted, loose note papers). Where there is no reference, the example was elicited or produced for the sake of illustration.

<sup>3</sup>The Belhare article ('ART') is reminiscent of the Ancient Greek *arthrón* ('linker', whence the Latin translation *articulum*) and links attributes to heads with specific reference.

<sup>4</sup>Nepali is transliterated following indological tradition except that, following van Driem (1987), mute *a* is not written even if it is not deleted by a *virām*.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Genetti (1986, 1991) for typological parallels.

<sup>6</sup>-*na* is sometimes replaced by *bhane*, a conjunction borrowed from Nepali.

<sup>7</sup>In the example the possessive functions as subject. This is a general property of the so-called possessive of experience (cf. Bickel, forthcoming b).

<sup>8</sup>Another example is the use of the Nepali dative *-lāi* to mark objects that are already cross-referenced in the verb. In contrast to other Kiranti languages *-lāi* is very seldom used in Belhare, though.

<sup>9</sup>A similar continuum is proposed by Lehmann (1988). It captures the syntactic level a subordinate clause belongs to. The levels are defined by constituent structure ranging from the word via the verb phrase to the sentence. Since the criteria discussed in the last sections monitor relationally defined units, the core-clause-sentence triad is more suitable for my analysis.

<sup>10</sup>Rappaport (1984) subsumes illocution, negation and much else beside under a general notion of 'P-function', a function that takes propositions as arguments. For the sake of cross-linguistic comparability, I stick to the lower-level notions.

<sup>11</sup>Proper names are teknonymic with the derivatives *pa* 'father' and *ma* 'mother' being morphologically separate words.

<sup>12</sup>Notice, however, that in the *Kagbā* dialect of Godié also nominals in topic function are marked by *na* (*op. cit.*). Godié is spoken in the Ivory Coast and belongs to the Kru family within Niger-Kongo.



<sup>13</sup>This non-distinction of 'topic' as a function in information structuring and in clause building seems to be the reason why claims about the topic status of some subordinate clauses (e.g. conditionals) include, besides the 'framework' notion, 'givenness', 'presuppositions' or 'shared knowledge' as defining features of 'topic' (cf. Haiman 1978). On such an account, the equation of 'topic' and 'conditional' is, as Jacobsen (1992) has recently pointed out, most problematic if controllable at all.

## References

- Bickel, Balthasar 1991. *Typologische Grundlagen der Satzverkettung*. Ein Beitrag zur Allgemeinen Grammatik der Satzverbindung und des Fährtenlegens. Zürich: Universität [ASAS. 9]
- Bickel, Balthasar, forthcoming a. In the vestibule of meaning: transitivity inversion as a morphological phenomenon. To appear in *Studies in Language*.
- Bickel, Balthasar, forthcoming b. The possessive of experience in Belhare. To appear in David Bradley [ed.] *Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayas*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Charles N. Li [ed.] *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic.
- Chomsky, Noam 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Dik, Simon C. 1978. *Functional grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Dik, Simon C. 1989. *The theory of functional grammar*. Part I: The structure of the clause. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Driem, George van 1987. *A grammar of Limbu*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ebert, Karen H. 1991. Vom *verbum dicendi* zur Konjunktion — ein Kapitel universaler Grammatikentwicklung. In Walter Bisang & Peter Rinderknecht [eds.] *Von Europa bis Ozeanien — von der Antonymie zum Relativsatz*. Gedenkschrift für Meinrad Scheller. Zürich: Universität [ASAS. 11]
- Firbas, Jan 1966. On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis. *Travaux Linguistique de Prague*. 1, 267 - 79.
- Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: University.
- Geluykens, Ronald 1992. *From discourse process to grammatical construction*. On left-dislocations in English. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Genetti, Carol 1986. The development of subordinators from postpositions in Bodic languages. *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*.
- Genetti, Carol 1991. From postposition to subordinator in Newari. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine [eds.] *Approaches to grammaticalization, Vol. II*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Givón, Talmy [ed.] 1983. *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Haiman, John 1978. Conditionals are topics. *Language*. 54, 564 - 89.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1993. The converb (adverbial participle, gerund) as a cross-linguistically valid category. In Ekkehard König & Martin Haspelmath [eds.] *Converbs*. Berlin: European Science Foundation [Eurotyp Working Paper V.7].

- Helbig, Gerhard 1982. *Valenz - Satzglieder - semantische Kasus - Satzmodelle*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.
- Hinds, John, Senko K. Maynard & Shoichi Iwasaki [eds.] 1987. *Perspectives on topicalization: the case of Japanese wa*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Hopper, Paul J. & Sandra A. Thompson 1984. The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language*. 60, 703 - 52.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi 1987. Identifiability, scope-setting, and the particle *wa*: a study of Japanese spoken expository discourse. In John Hinds, Senko K. Maynard & Shoichi Iwasaki [eds.] *Perspectives on topicalization: the case of Japanese wa*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Jacobs, Joachim 1982. *Syntax und Semantik der Negation im Deutschen*. München: Fink.
- Jacobsen, Wesley M. 1992. Are conditionals topics? — The Japanese case. In Diane Brentari, Gary N. Larson & Lynn A. Macleod [eds.] *The joy of grammar*. A Festschrift for James D. McCawley. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Jakobson, Roman 1936. Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus. In *Selected writings, Vol. 2*. The Hague: Mouton 1971.
- König, Ekkehard 1993. The meaning of converb constructions. In Ekkehard König & Martin Haspelmath [eds.] *Converbs*. Berlin: European Science Foundation. [*Eurotyp Working Papers*. V.7]
- König, Ekkehard & Johan van der Auwera 1988. Clause integration in German and Dutch conditionals, concessive conditionals, and concessives. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson [eds.] *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kortmann, Bernd 1993. Averbial participle clauses in English. In Ekkehard König & Martin Haspelmath [eds.] *Converbs*. Berlin: European Science Foundation. [*Eurotyp Working Papers*. V.7]
- Lehmann, Christian 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson [eds.] *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson 1976. Subject and topic: a new typology of language. In Charles N. Li [ed.] *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic.
- MacDonald, Lorna 1988. Subordination in Tauya. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson [eds.] *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Marchese, Lynell 1977. Subordinate clauses as topics in Godié. In Martin Mould & Thomas J. Hinnebusch [eds.] *Papers from the eighth conference on African linguistics*. UCLA, April, 1 - 3, 1977. Los Angeles: University [*Studies in African Linguistics Supplements*. 7]
- McGloin, Naomi Hanaoka 1987. The role of *wa* in negation. In John Hinds, Senko K. Maynard & Shoichi Iwasaki [eds.] *Perspectives on topicalization: the case of Japanese wa*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ōta, Akira & Yasuhiko Katō 1986. The relative scope of NEG and quantifiers in English and Japanese. *Sophia linguistica*. 20/21, 25 - 40.
- Rappaport, Gilbert C. 1984. *Grammatical function and syntactic structure: the adverbial participle of Russian*. Columbus: Slavica.
- Seiler, Hansjakob 1986. *Apprehension: language, object, order*. Part III: The universal dimension of apprehension. Tübingen: Narr.

- Tateishi, Koichi 1990. Syntax of the conditional topic construction in Japanese. *Proceedings of 20th Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Linguistic Society*.
- Tesnière, Lucien 1959. *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 1985. Grammar and written discourse: initial vs. final purpose clauses in English. *Text*. 5, 55 - 84.
- Tikkanen, Bertil, forthcoming. Burushaski converbs in their South and Central Asian context. To appear in Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König [eds.] *Converbs (adverbial participles, gerunds) in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1993. A synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar. In Robert D. Van Valin., Jr. [ed.] *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.