


UW-Madison ILL Lending (GZM)
728 State Street / Madison, WI 53706
Email: gzmlend@wils.wisc.edu



GZM TN: 1678046

Borrower: GDC
Lending String:
*GZM,UND,UUM,UUM,IUL
Patron: Amith, Jonathan
Journal Title: S.I.L. Mexico
workpapers.
Volume: 11 **Issue:**
Month/Year: 1995 **Pages:** 1-16
Article Author:
Article Title: Hollenbach, B; A
preliminary catalog of focus devices in
Mixtecan languages
OCLC Number: 3254715
ILL Number: 68452747



Location: mem
Call #: PM3001 S8
Request Date: 20100829
Need By:
Shipping Address:
Gettysburg College
Library
Interlibrary Loan
300 N. Washington St.
Gettysburg, PA 17325-1493
Fax: 717-337-7001
Ariel: 138.234.152.5

PDF: illform@gettysburg.edu
MaxCost: \$25IFM
Borrowing Notes: Borrowing Notes;
ariel.cc.gettysburg.edu or 138.234.152.5
Copyright Compliance: CCL

4M

ARIEL

Wisconsin Library Services (WiLS)

Please report all Document Delivery Problems within **48 hours** of receipt
Return this sheet via **ARIEL:** 144.92.126.152 or **EMAIL:** gzmlend@wils.wisc.edu

Briefly state the problem with the document:

A Preliminary Catalog Of Focus Devices In Mixtecan Languages¹

Barbara E. Hollenbach

1. Introduction

The Mixtecan language family is one of eight families in the Otomanguean stock. This family comprises three languages: Mixtec, Cuicatec, and Trique. Data for this paper were gathered by examining published material on sixteen varieties of Mixtec, two of Trique, and one of Cuicatec. These languages and the sources of data for each of them are listed in the summary of data given in the appendix.

As is typical for Otomanguean languages, all nineteen of the languages included in this study have VSO as their basic word order. In this paper I examine fronting to preverbal position, and the various ways in which simple fronting has been embellished. One way of embellishing it is to heighten the separation between the fronted element and the rest of the sentence, usually by adding pause or certain conjunctions. A second way of embellishing preverbal position is to make the fronted element more prominent by adding various words to it. These include two kinds of grammatical elements, affirmative markers and topic markers, and also the conventionalized use of ordinary words in the language. A third way of embellishing preverbal position is by the use of a cleft construction.

The paper closes with some questions about focus versus topic and about the historical development of new focus devices. A number of questions are raised for further research.

2. Simple fronting to preverbal position

All of the languages in the corpus permit one constituent of the clause to precede the verb. Because the first element of any list is perceptually salient, preverbal position tends to grant the item filling it some degree of highlighting. This position is therefore often used for constituents that a speaker wishes to focus in some way. The following sentences from Ayutla Mixtec show basic VSO order and four different constituents in preverbal focus position.²

- (1) xi'i' ri' tikui
drinks it(animal) water
'It (the animal) is drinking water.' (Hills 1990:12)

¹An earlier version of this paper, entitled "Focus devices in Mixtecan languages," was presented at the 47th International Congress of Americanists, 7-11 July 1991, in New Orleans, Louisiana. I am grateful to Eloise Jelinek and Elizabeth Willett for reading an earlier draft of this paper and making a number of helpful suggestions, many of which have been incorporated into the present version. I am also grateful to Thomas Willett for encouraging me to finish this revision.

²The examples in this paper are written using the Mixtec alphabet approved at the Tercer Encuentro de Escritores Mixtecos, held in Huajuapán de León in August 1994.

- (2) *mburu xi'i' tikui*
donkey drinks water
'The donkey is drinking water.' (Hills 1990:27)
- (3) *tikui xi'i' mburu*
water drinks donkey
'The donkey is drinking water.' (Hills 1990:28)
- (4) *nuu' ra sata' chi nuni'*
face his will:buy she corn
'She will buy corn from him.' (Hills 1990:28)
- (5) *iku ni xaa pegru*
yesterday arrived Peter
'Peter arrived yesterday.' (Hills 1990:30)

In some languages, for example, Coatzospan Mixtec (Small 1990:288), if the focussed element is the subject, a coreferential clitic pronoun in normal subject order must occur. In others, for example, Ayutla Mixtec (Hills 1990:27-28) and Copala Trique (Hollenbach 1992:206-207), coreferential clitic pronouns do not occur. In still other languages, like Ocotepéc Mixtec (Alexander 1988:172) and Jamiltepec Mixtec (Johnson 1988:31), they may occur. In Tezoatlán Mixtec, sentences with and without the pronoun are considered to belong to distinct constructions (Williams 1993:85).

The correlation between preverbal position and semantic focus seen in sentences (2)-(5) is obscured, however, by the fact that some clause constituents usually or always occur in preverbal position, even if the speaker does not want to focus them. Elements that characteristically occur there in many Mixtecan languages include: WH interrogative words and phrases, negative noun phrases, nominal complements of equative clauses, the object complement of the verb 'to do' used in the sense of 'to cause', certain temporal expressions, and heavy constituents. Certain fixed expressions, such as narrative and dialogue openers and closers, also have one constituent in preverbal position.

Two kinds of elements that are not clause constituents also occur in sentence-initial position. One is the manner constituent within the verb phrase, which can be expressed by open-class elements and phrases and sometimes precedes the verb. The second is discourse connectives like 'and then' and 'therefore', which often precede a clause constituent in preverbal position.

3. Embellishing preverbal position

Because the natural preverbal slot for focus in VSO languages is sometimes occupied by elements not in focus, there is a need for some other way of indicating that a word in preverbal position is indeed being focussed. In the material I examined I found seven different kinds of devices that embellish preverbal position in some way. Fourteen of the nineteen languages had from one to six of these devices, and three more showed at least some frozen phrases indicating one device. Only one language (Ayutla Mixtec) employed any other position in linear order, and that to a very limited degree (Hills 1990:29-30).

I strongly suspect, however, that devices for embellishing preverbal position exist in the five languages where I did not find any, and that further devices exist in most of the others. Any focus device that is relatively infrequent can easily be overlooked in writing a grammatical sketch, and probably did not occur in the sample of text I examined. Another reason for not including certain focus

devices in a grammatical sketch is that they do not seem to belong in syntax proper, but rather in a gray area between syntax and lexicon.

Many of these focus devices involve words that occur elsewhere in the language, but are conventionalized or even entirely grammaticalized in their use as focus markers. Certain lexical items from open classes seem to be especially apt candidates for being used in conventionalized ways, and eventually becoming grammaticalized into function words or affixes. In the process they become bleached of much of their lexical meaning, acquire new syntactic distributions, and often lose phrase stress and suffer phonological reduction. A classic example of grammaticalization is the development of the numeral one into the indefinite article a or an in English. In the focus devices which I describe in the rest of this study, the processes of conventionalization and grammaticalization are illustrated in various ways.

3.1. Heightening the separation of the preverbal constituent

Pause. One strategy for embellishing preverbal position is to separate it off from the rest of the sentence in some way. The simplest way to do this is by pausing slightly between the preverbal constituent and the verb constituent. This method is used in Yosondúa, San Miguel el Grande, and Diuxi-Tilantongo Mixtec, and also in Copala Trique. A solidus (/) marks pause.

(6) juáa / ta'u da ntuky
 John splits he firewood
 'As for John, he is splitting firewood.' (Yosondúa; Farris 1992:28)

(7) ne² sno⁵'o³² / na'vee³ kuxuman¹ ra⁴ zo'³ ... ma'³
 and man is:not:possible will:arrive inside he ... negative
 'As for the man, he can't believe [it].' (Copala; Hollenbach 1988:28)

Coordinate conjunctions. A stronger way to separate the focussed constituent from the rest of the sentence is by placing the coordinate conjunction 'and' between the preverbal constituent and the rest of the clause. Ten languages use this device: Ocotepec, Atlatluca, Yosondúa, San Miguel el Grande, Coatzospan, Ayutla, and Jamiltepec Mixtec; Copala and Chicahuaxtla Trique; and Cuicatec. Sometimes a pause occurs as well, usually before the conjunction, but in Coatzospan Mixtec it follows the conjunction.

(8) steen de kaji de nduja
 tomorrow and will:eat he hominy
 'He will eat hominy tomorrow.' (Ocotepec; Alexander 1988:174)

(9) vina njaa / te ka'i yo
 now precise and will:eat we
 'We'll eat [him] right now.' (San Miguel el Grande; Pike 1944:117-18)

(10) sa'an mi né din tavi di kuidádo di
 man that and will:do very you care you
 'You must be very careful of the man.' (Cuicatec; D. Bradley 1991:493)

(11) juán ne / kadiko na tuyn
 John and sells he charcoal
 'As for John, he sells charcoal.' (Coatzospan; Small 1990:291)

The use of 'and' is particularly common for focussed time elements, and in some languages it is used only for time.

Jamiltepec Mixtec and Copala Trique also use 'but' following a focussed element.

- (12) ta r̄a xúvá / soko suchan r̄a
and he John but lazy he
'As for John, he is lazy.' (Jamiltepec: Johnson 1988:34)
- (13) nianj⁵ / tsaj² ne² do¹ man⁴ ze³² cha⁴ nianj⁵ nanj¹ a⁴
here but and little exist thing eat here indeed persuasive
'There's hardly any food here.' (Copala; Hollenbach 1988:71)

Even though conjunctions are already function words, there is a further degree of grammaticalization found in these uses because no conjoining nor contrast is involved; the conjunction serves only to mark a boundary. In many of these languages, conjunctions are also used to separate an initial subordinate clause from the following main clause.

Subordinate conjunctions. Still another way to embellish a focussed preverbal constituent is to use the subordinate conjunction 'because' following it, often with a preceding pause. The languages that use this are Ocoatepec, Atlatlahuca, Yosondúa, San Miguel el Grande, Diuxi-Tilantongo, Peñoles, and Jamiltepec Mixtec.

- (14) ñani da / chí sájniñu da vijna
brother his because works he now
'As for his brother, he is working now.' (Yosondúa; Farris 1992:27)
- (15) méé dá / chí ntvá'a dá
self my because become:good I
'As for me, I am indeed fine again.' (Diuxi-Tilantongo; Kuiper and Oram 1991:211)
- (16) soko yu'u / tyí kach-i tuya'a i'ya
but I because will:eat-I chili:plant this
'But as for me, I will eat these chili plants.' (Jamiltepec; Johnson 1988:144)

This use of 'because' is clearly grammaticalized because there is no causation involved. Farris says for Yosondúa that 'because' has the sense of 'indeed' when it is used as a focus device (1992:27); and Alexander says for Ocoatepec that the focus device uses chí 'indeed', a word distinct from 'because', but homophonous with it (1988:174-75, 271).

The conjunction 'because' may be used in Yosondúa for a pseudofronted topic, i.e., one that has no role in the following clause.³

³The term pseudofronting is taken from Lowe's description of Nambiquara, a language of Brazil (1986:131).

- (17) ko xara yúkán / chí ka saka tu ra chaa ún ntuchi syá'án
 but it that because planted truly he man that bean thus
 'But as for that guy, those men planted peas this way.' (Farris 1992:165)

In Jamiltepec Mixtec 'and', 'but', and 'because' are all used after a focussed preverbal element, but Johnson states (1988:34) that a conjunction also precedes the preverbal element, as seen in sentences (12) and (16). It seems likely, however, that the sentence-initial conjunction is not part of the focus device, but is simply a regular discourse connective.

3.2. Making the preverbal constituent more prominent

I turn now to a different major strategy for embellishing a focussed element, namely, adding some words to draw attention to it. This is different in principle from simply trying to separate the focussed element from the rest of the sentence.

The affirmative marker. One way of drawing attention to a focussed element is to use an affirmative construction, in which an affirmative marker precedes the fronted element. This device has been found in Ocotepéc, Diuxi-Tilantongo, and Alacatlalzala Mixtec, and in Copala Trique. In these four languages, the construction is analyzed as an affirmative noun phrase, which is restricted to sentence-initial position, rather than as a focus device. The affirmative construction frequently occurs as a positive response to a yes/no question.

- (18) suu to'o ntaatúnj
 affirmative authority commanded

'Yes, it was the authority who commanded [it].' (Ocotepéc; Alexander 1988:226)

- (19) sivi ta chíño kisa kuí'na ra ñoo yó'o
 affirmative he work does robbery he town this

'That very town authority robbed this town.' (Alacatlalzala; Zylstra 1991:78)

In Chicahuaxtla Trique there is a similar construction, which Longacre has analyzed as a defective verb. This verb occurs only in construction with another verb and a shared noun phrase between them (1966b:248).

- (20) ve⁴ xu³ nkaj³ yun⁴ a³'nko⁴ yuju³
 lo:there:is it lies again another place

'And there it was lying in another place.' (Chicahuaxtla; Longacre 1966b:248)

In support of Longacre's analysis there is some evidence in the other four languages that the words glossed 'affirmative' were originally verbs of existence.

The topic marker. Another way of drawing attention to a focussed element involves a special topic marker that follows it, and which is itself followed by pause. This has been found in only two languages, Ayutla Mixtec and Copala Trique. This device is especially common for subjects in Ayutla,

and it takes a coreferential pronoun for subject or object. In Copala it is used for all elements of the clause, and often does not take a coreferential pronoun or noun.

(21) mburu ntii / xi'i' ri' tikui
 donkey topic drinks it water
 'As for the donkey, it is drinking water.' (Ayutla; Hills 1990:30)

(22) tsaj² ne² maan³¹ ro'³ / ka'anj³² maan³¹ a³²
 but and rain topic went rain declarative
 'But as for the rain, it went away.' (Copala; Hollenbach 1988:10)

(23) xee⁵ zo'³ ro'³ / nauun³ koj³² xnee⁴ ... a³²
 sister:in:law his topic became plant bean ... declarative
 'As for his sister-in-law, she turned into the bean plant.' (Copala; Hollenbach 1988:48)

Ayutla ntii is also used alone (without a focussed element) in initial position as a pause form, but I am not aware of any etymology for it. Trique ro'³ also occurs following a fronted comparative clause, and it may be related historically to a subordinate conjunction meaning 'as' in Chichahuaxtla Trique.

Adding extra words. Still another way of drawing attention to a fronted constituent is to add words to it that are found elsewhere in the language, but which have a somewhat conventionalized use in fronted constituents.

Yosondúa Mixtec uses the complementizer (the word that functions like English that in I know that he came) preceding the focussed element, with an optional pause following it.

(24) ja ñuɣ yó ti xñuɣ / sá'a yó yajni u'ɣn óra
 that town our and Chalcatongo do we near five hour

'As for our town and Chalcatongo, we can go in about five hours.' (Farris 1992:28)

Alacatlazala Mixtec uses the preposition 'until', used in the sense of 'even', before the focussed item and 'just' following it.

(25) ntá ntiva'yí va ni nteta
 until coyote just completive leave
 'Just the coyote came out.' (Zylstra 1991:27)

This construction is highly conventionalized, but no grammaticalization has taken place. These words can occur in any noun phrase, but they are rare except in focussed phrases.

Tezoatlán Mixtec uses a variety of words to highlight a focussed constituent. They include 'even', 'self', and 'only' preceding the focussed element, and 'assertion', 'intensifier', and 'very' following it (Williams 1993:90, 99, 110).

- (26) tá tó'ón ntíqs yó'o va dána'a ntu'u
 and word God here assertion teach we
 'And we are *only* teaching *this word of God.*' (Williams 1993:100)
- (27) dá nta_a iinka ví kuy / dá ni sei-rián
 then until other intensifier day then completive eat-he:them
 'It wasn't until the next day that he ate them.' (Williams 1993:110)

It is possible to use more than one of these words in the same focussed element.

- (28) nta_a tó'ón séntico n_i ni'i-ntú
 even only *síndico* completive find-we
 'We found *only the "síndico."*' (Williams 1993:100)
- (29) ntaá mi va ñoó ...
 even self assertion she:that ...
 'even *she herself*' (Williams 1993:90)

Copala Trique uses the adverbial 'truly' preceding the focussed item, together with pause and tsaj² ne² 'but' following it.

- (30) xia'¹ tan'³ / tsaj² ne² kinavij³ tan'³ nanj¹ a⁴
 truly corn but and finished corn indeed persuasive
 'As for the ears of corn, they are really all gone.' (Hollenbach 1988:34)

This combination uses both the prominence and the separation strategies; 'truly' draws attention to the focussed element, while the pause and 'but' separate it from the rest of the sentence. Some degree of grammaticalization is involved in this use of 'truly' because it normally modifies verbs; it does not otherwise occur in construction with a noun.

3.3. The cleft construction

The third major strategy that I describe for embellishing the preverbal constituent is syntactically more complex. It employs a conventionalized equative structure with a relative clause in its nominal complement, and it is very similar to the English cleft construction (It is John who died). In this construction, the focussed element is followed by the equative verb 'to be' and a word that serves as both complementizer ('that') and relative-clause introducer ('the thing that'). This word is basically a third-person inanimate pronoun,⁴ but it does not agree in gender with the focussed element, indicating that the construction is grammaticalized. Note that the English cleft construction also shows a lack of gender agreement; we do not say '*He is John that died yesterday.'

Consider the following two Copala Trique sentences, which are focus constructions with the complementizer. Sentence (32) has a coreferential pronoun, but (31) does not, which indicates that the pronoun is optional.

⁴A detailed treatment of this pronoun and its extensions, including its use as a complementizer, is given in Hollenbach (to appear).

- (31) ni³ka² so^{'3} me³ ze³² kuananj⁵ ... nanj¹ a⁴
 spouse his is that ran ... indeed persuasive
 'It is his wife who ran away.' (Hollenbach 1988:31)
- (32) guaa⁴ me³ ze³² kavi^{'3} so^{'3} kii³ a³²
 John is that died he yesterday declarative
 'It is John who died yesterday.' (Hollenbach, unpublished field notes)

Note the difference between sentence (33), which is a true equative construction, and (31) and (32). Sentence (33) has a focussed subject and a relative clause in the nominal complement; the pronoun that introduces the relative clause agrees in gender with the noun subject.

- (33) tinuu⁵ so^{'3} me³ zii⁵ kunuu³² niaan⁵ a³²
 brother his is he:who is:in Tlaxiaco declarative
 'The one in Tlaxiaco is his brother.' (Hollenbach 1988:67)

In addition to signaling focus, the cleft construction seems to function as a filler when the speaker is searching for what to say next.

Coatzospan Mixtec and Cuicatec also use a cleft construction as a focus device. Because the copula in equative sentences is regularly zero in these languages, the complementizer simply follows the preverbal constituent.

- (34) ju^aan é kaka[']an ná
 John that speaks he
 'It is John that is speaking.' (Coatzospan; Small 1990:288)
- (35) ankutá chi kadi nakentáa ti
 never that will:be:able will:escape it
 'It will never be able to escape.' (More literally: 'It is never that it will be able to escape.') (Cuicatec; D. Bradley 1991:429)

Even though the Cuicatec word *chi* is very close in form to Mixtec 'because', it is probably historically related to a third-person inanimate pronoun, like the complementizer in other Mixtecan languages. Note also that the cleft construction with no expressed verb in (34) and (35) is quite different in structure from sentence (24), in which the complementizer precedes the focussed element.

Tezoatlán Mixtec uses *kían*, a fused form of *kúú* 'be' plus the complementizer *ña*, to focus adverbs, especially 'now'.

- (36) viti kían ko'q vaá
 now is:that we:will:go assertion:we
 'Now let's go.' (Williams 1993:103)

All the forms using this cleft construction appear to be highly conventionalized. This construction is apparently not used, however, to focus nouns.

The cleft construction is probably used in at least some of the other languages too. Several languages use it in frozen interrogatives and/or discourse connectives. For example, Ocoatepec, Yosondúa, and Jicaltepec Mixtec use 'what is that' in WH questions to mean 'what?', and

Coatzacoapan and Diuxi-Tilantongo Mixtec use it to mean 'why?'. Also, some languages (including Diuxi-Tilantongo and San Rafael Mixtec and Copala Trique) have a conventionalized expression of the form 'that-thing is that' to mean 'after that' or 'and so it was that'.

4. Focus versus topic

When I began this study, I expected to find a clear distinction between a simple focus construction and one or more sentence topic constructions for each language. A focussed element would be considered part of its clause, while a topic would be loosely adjoined to it.

Aissen, writing from a formal perspective, found a clear distinction between focus and topic in Jacalteco and Tzotzil: focussed elements are part of the same intonation phrase as the following material, and are part of the sentence, while topics belong to separate intonation phrases and are outside of the sentence proper (1992:47-53).

Aissen also gives a simple functional difference between focus and topic. Focus contrasts the focussed element with other elements that might have occurred there but did not; she consistently translates focus by a cleft construction in English (p. 50). Topic turns the attention of the listener to a participant, i.e., it signals him to open a mental file on the participant (pp. 50, 77).

One hypothesis that fits the notion that focussed elements are part of their clause, while topics are not, concerns the degree of embellishment. Simple fronting should indicate focus, and the embellishments should signal topic. This is true to some extent. Simple fronting does seem to indicate focus, and many of the embellishments seem to indicate topic. Nevertheless, the cleft construction probably fits into focus, rather than topic (see Aissen, pp. 50-51). Clearly there is room for further study in this area.

One construction that does not seem to belong to either focus or topic is the affirmation marker. This construction occurs without resumptive pronouns, and it seems to have a third function, that of answering a yes/no question in the affirmative.

A second hypothesis about subject and topic concerns the use of pronouns (especially for subjects). If focussed elements are part of their clause, then resumptive pronouns should not occur with them. But if topics are not part of the clause, then a resumptive pronoun or other subject ought to be required, except in languages that have zero pronouns or that permit pronouns to be unexpressed.

This pronoun hypothesis seems to hold true for Tezoatlán Mixtec, in which subject fronting without a resumptive pronoun indicates focus, and subject fronting with a resumptive pronoun (called left detachment) indicates topic; see Williams 1993:85.

A survey of the examples cited in this paper shows that resumptive pronouns are more likely to occur when a focussed subject is embellished in some way, especially if there is a pause following it. In at least some languages, however, the situation does not appear to be quite as neat as it is in Tezoatlán Mixtec. In Copala Trique, for example, the use of resumptive pronouns seems to be optional with both the topic marker *ro'3*, which clearly marks topic, and with the cleft construction, which seems to mark focus. Further research is needed to know the relation between resumptive pronouns and the distinction between focus and topic in Mixtecan languages.

5. A diachronic perspective

From a diachronic perspective, it may be useful to look at the devices catalogued in this paper as devices that mark a cline of focus. Simple preverbal position is at one pole, and the different embellishments fall at various distances from it, depending on how much attention they draw to the fronted element.

This cline is, of course, something of an oversimplification, because it treats only one parameter (the degree of prominence), and the different highlighting devices have different uses in discourse, not merely a specific degree of prominence. Some hints of this have been given in the description of various devices, but much more work is needed.

Such a diachronic cline is open ended and constantly shifting. Focus devices tend to lose some of their semantic force over time, and then they are less useful to speakers. (In this respect focus devices behave much like euphemisms and new intensifiers.) Focus devices are also subject to another threat: they often lose their novelty and simply go out of style. To make up for this constant attrition, new focus devices are constantly being invented. Our human penchant for drama and hyperbole virtually insures the continuation of this process.

To illustrate the openendedness of focus constructions, consider the following devices that can precede a fronted item in English: with regard to, regarding, as regards, as for, concerning, with reference to, about, now about, and speaking of. The reader can probably think of more quite readily. Speakers of English differ in the way they make use of these devices; one person may use some with great frequency and never use others. And speakers would differ about which of these devices, if any, have been sufficiently conventionalized to merit inclusion in a reference grammar of English.

6. Questions for further research

The material presented in this study raises various questions that merit further research. One is the relation between specific focus devices and the discourse conditions that lead a speaker to highlight some element. As I worked on this paper, I noted a number of discourse functions of focussed elements. In addition to setting up a participant as the topic of a new section of the discourse (classic topic); and assenting to a proposal (discussed above as affirmation), I also noted: introducing a new participant, introducing a new episode by a change in setting, contrasting an element of one sentence with an element of another, and repetition with variation in form. There are surely others. Some focus devices are clearly preferred for certain functions, as noted above, but it is unlikely that there is a one-to-one correlation.

A second group of questions is about the relation between focus and the syntactic structure of the sentence. Are some sentence types more likely to have a focussed constituent than others? As I worked on this paper, I noted that sentences with position verbs like 'be in' or 'be standing' were more likely to have a focussed constituent (either subject or location) than sentences with active verbs. Are some focus devices more likely to be used in certain sentence types? Are the more elaborate focus devices especially frequent in sentences that already have other material in preverbal position?

Another set of questions concerns the parameter of definiteness in noun phrases. Are indefinite noun phrases less likely to be fronted than definite phrases, and are any of the embellishments described limited to definite phrases? Still another set of questions that could be raised concerns the

role of presupposition in various kinds of fronted elements.

**Appendix
Summary of the data**

Because Mixtec has more speakers and more internal variation than Cuicatec and Trique, I included sixteen varieties of Mixtec in the data base. This sample includes nine highland, five lowland, and two coastal varieties of Mixtec; it includes representatives from seven of Josserand's twelve major groupings (1983:470). The following summary lists all the languages included in the study, the focus devices found in each, and the published sources from which the data were gathered.

MIXTEC -- Western Alta

Ocotepec (Alexander 1988, Avendaño and Alexander 1970)

preverbal position alone
de 'and'
chi 'because (indeed)'
suu 'affirmative marker'
frozen phrases showing cleft structure

Atatlahuca (Alexander 1980)

preverbal position alone
te 'and'
chi 'because'
frozen phrases showing cleft structure

Yosondúa (Farris 1992)

preverbal position alone
pause
ti 'and'
chi 'because'
ja 'complementizer'
frozen phrases showing cleft structure

San Miguel el Grande (Dyk 1959, Dyk and Stoudt 1973, Pike 1944)

preverbal position alone
pause
te 'and'
chi 'because'
frozen phrases showing cleft structure

Chalcatongo (Macaulay 1987a, 1987b)

preverbal position alone

Molinos (Merrifield and Stoudt 1967)

preverbal position alone

MIXTEC -- Eastern Alta**Diuxi-Tilantongo** (Kuiper and Oram 1991)

preverbal position alone
 pause
 chí 'because'
 ná 'affirmative marker'
 frozen phrases showing cleft structure

Peñoles (Daly 1973, Daly and Holland de Daly 1977)

preverbal position alone
 chii 'because'

MIXTEC -- Northern Alta**Coatzospan** (Small 1990)

preverbal position alone
 ne 'and'
 é 'it' or 'complementizer' marking cleft construction and also
 frozen phrases showing cleft structure

MIXTEC -- Tezoatlán**Tezoatlán** (Williams 1993)

preverbal position alone
 ntaa 'even', mii 'self', tó'ón 'only' (preceding preverbal element);
 va 'assertion', ví 'intensifier', ntaho, ntava'o 'very'
 (following preverbal element)
 frozen phrases showing cleft structure

MIXTEC -- Southern Baja**Ayutla** (Hills 1990)

preverbal position alone
 te 'and'
 ntii / 'topic marker [pause]'

Silacayoapan (North and Shields 1980, Shields 1988)

preverbal position alone
 frozen phrases showing cleft structure

San Rafael (Hillman 1987)

preverbal position alone
 frozen phrases showing cleft structure

MIXTEC -- Guerrero

Alacatlalzala (Zylstra 1991)
 preverbal position alone
 sivi 'affirmative marker'
 ntá ... va 'until ... just'
 frozen phrases showing cleft structure

MIXTEC -- Coast

Jamiltepec (Johnson 1988)
 preverbal position alone
 ta 'and', soko 'but'
 tyí 'because'

Jicaltepec (C.H. Bradley 1970)
 preverbal position alone
 frozen phrases showing cleft structure

TRIQUE

Copala (Hollenbach 1988, 1992, Hollenbach and Hollenbach 1975)
 preverbal position alone
 pause
 ne² 'and', tsaj² ne² 'but'
 vee⁴ 'affirmative marker'
 ro³ / 'topic marker [pause]'
 xia¹ ... / tsaj² ne² 'truly ... [pause] but'
 me³ ze³² 'is that' marking cleft construction and also
 frozen phrases showing cleft structure

Chichahuaxtla (Longacre 1966a, 1966b)
 preverbal position alone
 ni² 'and'
 ve⁴ 'lo there is' used like an affirmative marker
 frozen phrases showing cleft structure

CUICATEC

Concepción Pápalo (Anderson and Concepción Roque 1983, D.P. Bradley 1991)
 preverbal position alone
 né 'and'
 chi 'complementizer' marking cleft construction

References

- Aissen, Judith L. 1992. Topic and focus in Mayan. *Language* 68:43-80.
- Alexander, Ruth Marfa. 1980. Gramática mixteca: mixteco de Atlatlahuca (Serie de Gramáticas de Lenguas Indígenas de México 2). Mexico City: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Alexander, Ruth Mary. 1988. A syntactic sketch of Ocotepéc Mixtec. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 1, pp. 151-304.
- Anderson, E. Richard, and Hilario Concepción Roque. 1983. Diccionario cuicateco (Serie de Vocabularios y Diccionarios Indígenas "Mariano Silva y Aceves" 26). Mexico City: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Avendaño J., Lucio, and Ruth Mary Alexander. 1970. Stories of a Mixteco town. *Tlalocan* 6:169-75.
- Bradley, C. Henry. 1970. A linguistic sketch of Jicaltepec Mixtec (Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields 25). Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.
- Bradley, C. Henry, and Barbara E. Hollenbach (eds.). 1988. Studies in the syntax of Mixtecan languages, Vol. 1 (Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics 83). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- . 1990. Studies in the syntax of Mixtecan languages, Vol. 2 (Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington Publications in Linguistics 90). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- . 1991. Studies in the syntax of Mixtecan languages, Vol. 3 (Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington Publications in Linguistics 105). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- . 1992. Studies in the syntax of Mixtecan languages, Vol. 4 (Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington Publications in Linguistics 111). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- Bradley, David P. 1991. A preliminary syntactic sketch of Concepción Pápalo Cuicatec. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 3, pp. 409-506.
- Daly, John P. 1973. A generative syntax of Peñoles Mixtec (Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields 42). Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.
- Daly, John, and Margarita Holland de Daly. 1977. Mixteco de Santa María Peñoles (Archivo de Lenguas Indígenas de México 3). Mexico City: El Colegio de México, Centro de Investigación para la Integración Social, and Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Dyk, Anne. 1959. Mixteco texts (Linguistics Series, Number 3). Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.

- Dyk, Anne, and Betty Stoudt. 1973. Vocabulario mixteco de San Miguel el Grande (Serie de Vocabularios Indígenas Mariano Silva y Aceves 12). Mexico City: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Farris, Edwin R. 1992. A syntactic sketch of Yosondúa Mixtec. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 4, pp. 1-171.
- Hillman W., George. 1987. Textos mixtecos de San Rafael, Guerrero. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Hills, Robert A. 1990. A syntactic sketch of Ayutla Mixtec. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 2, pp. 1-260.
- Hollenbach, Barbara E. 1988. Three Trique myths of San Juan Copala (Textos Folclóricos en Lenguas Indígenas 1). Mexico City: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- . 1992. A syntactic sketch of Copala Trique. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 4, pp. 173-431.
- Hollenbach, Elena E. de. To appear. Cuatro morfemas funcionales en las lenguas mixtecanas. In proceedings of the Segundo Coloquio Mauricio Swadesh, Mexico City, October 1990.
- Hollenbach, Fernando, and Elena E. de Hollenbach. 1975. Trique de San Juan Copala (Archivo de Lenguas Indígenas del Estado de Oaxaca 2). Mexico City: El Colegio de México, Instituto de Investigación e Integración Social del Estado de Oaxaca, and Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Johnson, Audrey F. 1988. A syntactic sketch of Jamiltepec Mixtec. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 1, pp. 11-150.
- Josserand, Judy Kathryn. 1983. Mixtec dialect history. Ph.D. dissertation, Tulane University.
- Kuiper, Albertha, and Joy Oram. 1991. A syntactic sketch of Diuxi-Tilantongo Mixtec. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 3, pp. 179-408.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1966a. The plumed serpent rescues a man. *Tlalocan* 5.2:114-18.
- . 1966b. Trique clause and sentence: a study in contrast, variation, and distribution. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 32:242-52.
- Lowe, Ivan. 1986. Topicalization in Nambiquara. In Joseph E. Grimes (ed.), *Sentence initial devices* (Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics 75). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington, pp. 131-47.
- Macaulay, Monica. 1987a. Morphology and cliticization in Chalcatongo Mixtec. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- . 1987b. Cliticization and the morphosyntax of Mixtec. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 53:119-35.
- Merrifield, William R., and Betty J. Stoudt. 1967. Molinos Mixtec clause structure. *Linguistics* 32:58-78.

- North, Joanne, and Jāna Shields. 1980. Lo que sucedió a los que fueron a Culiacán. *Tlalocan* 8:231-41.
- Pike, Kenneth L. 1944. Analysis of a Mixteco text. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 10:113-38.
- Shields, Jāna K. 1988. A syntactic sketch of Silacayoapan Mixtec. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 1, pp. 305-449.
- Small, Priscilla C. 1990. A syntactic sketch of Coatzospan Mixtec. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 2, pp. 261-479.
- Williams, Judith. 1993. The fronting of noun and adverb phrases in Mixtec of Tezoatlán. *S.I.L.-Mexico Workpapers* 10:85-111.
- Zylstra, Carol F. 1991. A syntactic sketch of Alacatlalzala Mixtec. In Bradley and Hollenbach (eds.), Vol. 3, pp. 1-177.