LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD
LANGUES DU MONDE
LENGUAS DEL MUNDO
SPRACHEN DER WELT

& linguistic news lines

in issue N°4

DYNAMICS OF ATTENTION FOCUS IN NARRATIVE DISCOURSE: THE PULAAR CASE by Andreij A. Kibrik (Moscow)

Attention focusing is one of the central cognitive mechanisms that govern discourse processng. The present paper has a twofold purpose. The theoretical purpose is to formulate deductively the major stages of attention focusing in narrative discourse. These staged, in the first place, include: introduction of a referent into attention focus (AF), maintenance of a referent in AF anf wiping it off from AF. The descriptive purpose is to apply the proposed approach to the data of a particular language, namely Pulaar (Atlantic family). Each stage of AF dynamics in discourse is served by the corresponding formal means. Attention dynamics processes in Pulaar are affected by the grammatical features of the language, especially the multi-noun-class system reflected in anaphoric pronouns. If there are several focal referents their coding varies depending on whether they belong to the same noun class or different ones.

FUNCTIONS OF EVENKI VERBAL SUFFIXES WITH VARIABLE MORPHEME ORDERING (with special reference to Evenki and comparative data from other languages) by I.V. Nedjalkov (St. Petersburg)

This paper investigates morphemic ordering principles of Evenki verbal suffixes with special reference to suffixes with varying position with respect to the verb stem and other morphemes. Semantic (and other) factors leading to the 'violation' of the canonical morphemic order are examined. The following related problems are discussed: (1) degree of fusion (inseparability) vs. movability of verbal suffixes depending on the meaning of the suffix and the verb stem; (2) combinability of verbal suffixes in Evenki, and their semantic scope of movable verbal suffixes;

NUMERALS AND RELATED WORDS IN PENUTIAN AND WAKASHAN by Stefan Liedtke (München)

In an unpublished paper the author presented several hundreds of cognate sets between Wakashan, Salishan, and Penutian. These sets cover all semantic ranges of the lexicon and show regular sound correspondences. Penutian includes, among others, not only the Mayan group of languages, but also the Quechua group of South America. Liedtke (1989) presented grammatical elements common to Penutian languages and Quechua. The present paper deals with numerals and related words in Wakashan and Penutian. For instance, Mayan *hun* 'one' finds its etymology as well as the numeral 'twenty' based on *win* 'person' in both Mayan and Californian Penutian.
Last, but not least, the *pen* (<*pal*) of 'Pen-utian' - the name for the family - was derived from two stems for 'two' - reoccurs in Northern Wakashan as *pal*, with a related meaning.

ARE PRONOUNS REALLY DIFFERENT FROM PRONOMINALS? by J. Gbenga Fagborun (Bradford; Ilé-Ife)

This comment (reacting to Adewole 1992) seeks to establish that the term pronominal, which in English includes 'personal pronouns', is a misnomer for some Yoruba language items that share basic features with both lexical NPs and 'personal pronouns'.

+ Linguistic News Lines

Short Reports: International Institute of Ethnological and Oriental Studies, an independent non-profit research and educational institution (A.F. Majewicz, Steszew); Arbeitsgruppe 'Bedrohte Sprachen' der DGfS; Yinka Dene Language Institute; Linguistic Society of the Philippines; Newcastle University Studies in Language and Speech (R. Lesser).

Computer Corner: The LINGUIST List (A. Aristar, Texas A&M University), Use of Computers in Comparative Linguistics (J. Gippert, Bamberg), The CTI Centre for Modern Languages (University of Hall, June Thompson).

T&U news (EUROTYP, adverbial relations; 5th Int Conf on Funct Grammar, Antwerpen)

& Calendar, news, information & linguistic advertising.

Dynamics of Attention Focus in Narrative Discourse: The Pulaar Case

by Andrej A. Kibrik (Moscow)

1. Pulaar

Pulaar is the Futa-Toro dialect of the Fula/Peul/Fulfulde language (Atlantic family: see Arnott 1970, Koval and Zubko 1987) spoken in Senegal.

Maintenance of reference in Pulaar sentence has been examined elsewhere (Kibrik 1987a, 1988:Ch. 4). Here I shall try to describe the dynamics of reference in Pulaar narrative discourse, viewed from the perspective of the speaker's attention distribution.

Several notes concerning the Pulaar grammar are due here. Pulaar is a mutli-noun-class language. There are 21 classes (see Sylla 1982), and the class membership of a noun determines its morphological, syntactic, and discourse properties. Every noun class is charactrized by an abstract noun class marker, say, O (human class), NGU, NDI, and so forth. There exists a postposed definite article that formally coincides with the marker, cf.: gorko o 'the$_2$ man$_1$', mbuubu ngu 'the$_2$ fly$_1$'. Every class determines a set of anaphoric pronouns - subjective, direct-objective, indirect-objective (including possessive), emphatic, and extended (unmarked for syntactic function). Along with the class anaphoric pronouns there are special syntactic pronouns that occur only within the same sentence with their antecedents. Cf.:

		S	DO	IO	Emphatic	Extended
Class		O	o	mo	makko	kanko	oon
		NGU	ngu		maggu	kanngu	nguun
		. .	. . . .	. . .	. . .	. . .
Syntactic		Ø	ɗum	muuɗum/mum	kañum	--

2. Terminological preliminaries

Among the cognitive regulators of discourse processing the distribution of the speaker's attention and especially the focus of attention play a crucial role. Focus of attention can be defined as a slot in the speaker's current memory that is filled at any given moment of disourse by one or a few referents spoken of (see Grosz 1977, ibrik 1987b). The focus of attention is permanently updated and its contents are subject to quick replacement. A referent participating in the events narrated can approach or move away from the focus of attention at different moments of discourse.

Speaking in tems of discourse constituents, current attention focus (AF) is the clause level notion. The corresponding notion of the level of paragraph or whole discourse can be called global focus of attention or focus pool (of a paragraph or of discourse). The focus pool (FP) consists of referents being the major protagonists of the paragraph or of attention focus in discourse. First, a referent can be introduced into AF, maintained therein, and eliminated from AF. Second, a new referent can be introduced into current AF alone, or into FP at the same time; moreover, it can be reintroduced into AF when it is already in FP. Third, AF can contain one referent or more than one at a time. All these parameters affect the choice of lnguistic devices coding the dynamics

of AF in discourse. The mechanisms of such choices used by Pulaar speakers will be shown below. The analysis is based on the published Pulaar texts verified with the help of my informant, and on a tale told to me by the informant himself.

3. Dynamics of AP in discourse

The first phrase of AF dynamics is AF formation, or the introduction of a referent into AF. This is done by the speaker with two or three full NP nominations of a referent. The standard sequence of nominations is as follows: full NP - full NP with a definite article - class anaphoric pronoun (not counting automatic syntactic pronouns),. Cf.:

(1) wonnoo do ko   mbuubu$_i$ ari, ϕ_i tawi   ngaari <...>
     'It:was so that [a] fly   came,   found [an] ox   <...>

     mbuubu ngu$_i$ sikki   maa taw ϕ_i teddi   no feewi
     The2 fly1   thought that (Ptc) it will:weigh much [sitting]

     e   dow   ngaari. ngu$_i$ wii   ngaari: ...
     on [the] top [of the] ox.   It   told [the] ox: ...'
                                                    (Meyer 1979:95)

Note that "the ox", not intended by the speaker to enter AF, is constantly coded with the unmarked full NPs.

In (1) the referent "the fly" is meant to enter not only AF but also FP. Referents entering only AF are usually introduced with a shorter sequence of nominations, not providing the persistent grounding of a referent:

(2) laamdo o   yetti   neddo$_i$ wii   dum$_i$:
     'The$_2$ king$_1$ took [a] man   [and] told him

     "yahanam   to dobbo o!"
     Go:on:my:behalf to this$_2$ woman$_1$!"

     o$_i$ yehi to debbo o ...
     He went to the$_2$ woman$_1$ ...' (Collectif... 1978:34)

When AF is already filled with a referent, the referent often has to be maintained. The only means of long-term maintenance of focal referents are class anaphoric pronouns. If the referent is not forced out of AF by another referent, it can stay in AF for a relatively long time even without being mentioned:

(3) ngaari-jinne ndi$_i$, ganndal mum$_i$ hokki dum$_i$,
     'The$_2$ ox-jinn$_1$,   his$_2$ knowledge$_1$ gave him [=he felt],

     taw   ndi$_i$ telliima   hankadi,   to   ndi$_i$ wi'ata
     (Ptc) he   climbed:down then,   [and] when he   was:going (he)

     indi$_i$
     [to]

     jawloo pibol ngol   doo, taw   feetere   jeynge
     grab   the$_2$ amulet$_1$ (Ptc) (Ptc) [a] spark [of] fire

     diwi,   dakkii e pibol ngol   he , pibol ngol   tayii,
     jumped,   stuck to the$_2$ amulet$_1$ (Ptc), the$_2$ amulet$_1$ broke,

```
meemi          leydi,         ndi_i                maayi
touched [the] ground, [and] he [=the ox-jinn] died'
```
<div align="right">(Meyer 1979:101)</div>

The further stage of AF dynamics is the **elimination** of the focal referent from AF. In the following excerpt (it is the story told by the fly about events it witnessed) at the beginning there are two referents in AF - "the ox-jinn" and "the cows":

```
(4) so     weeeti,   ko    doon  ngaari-jinne ndi_i jippinta
    'When it:dawns, just there the_2 ox-jinn_1       drives:down

    na'i di_i,   di_i  ndura. so           jamma ari,  o_i safa
    the2 cows1, they graze. When [the] night comes, he draws

    di_i,   di_i njaha dow <...>        o_i fa'i e safde di_i,
    them, they go   up <...> [When] he bgan to draw them,

    njuuriimi        e nagge woote, min njehi,   mbaasmi
    I:flopped:down on one_2 cow_1,  we  started, I:didn't:have [to]

    yahde, njiirumi Kumba_k        gitam de    didi. o_k ari,
    walk,  I:saw    Kumba  [with] my:eyes (Art) (two). She came,

    omo_k           ɓira, mbii-mo(o)_k-mi : "Kumba!" o_k wii: ...
    She [began to] milk, I:told:her    :   "Kumba!" She told: ...
```
<div align="right">(Meyer 1979:99)</div>

In this example one can see two ways of wiping referents out of AF. The referent "the ox-jinn" is wiped off suddenly: it is no longer mentioned, and the narrated events do not imply it. The other referent, "the cows", is being wiped off gradually, it is extinguished little by lttle. The switch of attention onto a new referent "Kumba" is the signal of the completed updatedness of AF.

By the way, the easy introduction of the referent "Kimba" into AF is due to the fact that it is contained in the FP of the given text. That is, we here face not a mere introduction but a **return** of a referent into AF. The capacity of the multi-noun-class system sometimes makes it possible to return a referent into AF by using only an anaphoric pronoun. Thus in the following example the pronoun **mabbe** 'them' refers to the referent "the animals" that has not been mentioned for two pages but belongs to FP:

```
(5)     mbuubu naaraani          ngol                      jam,
    '[The ] fly   didn't:listen [to] that [=those words] quietly,

        mbuubu diwi,   yehi <...>            ari   e maɓɓe
    [the] fly   flew:up, flew:away <...> [and] arrived to them'
```
<div align="right">(Meyer 1979:97)</div>

(Note that in this example there is one more pronoun occurrence exhibiting a peculiarity of the multi-noun-class system: in the first class the antecedentless class pronoun *ngol* stands for the word *konngol* '(magic) words'. Such cases of anaphora with the choice of a pronoun on the basis of cultural knowledge are extensively examined in Koval 1987:214ff.)

In (4) we observed how AF is updated step by step. Now consider a case of **abrupt replacement** of a focal referent. In the following excerpt the contents of AP (=the focal referent "the hyena") are replaced by a new referent:

```
(6)       noon tan haa  o_i daanii,          o_i daanii
    '[It was] so   only until she fell:asleep, [as] she fell:asleep
```

```
tan          capaatel-ⱼ  Hammadi Manna ene    aynoyno,
(Ptc) [the]  small:moor  [of] Hammadi Manna [who] grazed [cows]

ø-ⱼ tan      nani         eɓe               njima, ø-ⱼ hooti,
just:as₂ he₁ heard [that] they [=someone] sing,  he returned,

ø-ⱼ haalni Manna.  o-ⱼ wi'i: ...
he told    Manna.  He said: ...  (Meyer 1979:191)
```

So far we have examined examples where AF contained no more than one referent at a time. What happens if a referent is **added** to AF without forcing out the prior focal referents? In the following extract (it immediately follows the woman's speech) in addition to the referent "the woman" (i) the referent "the lion" is introduced into AF.

```
(7) mbaroodi ndi-ⱼ   tan     yalti          nder          waande
    'The lion         (PTC) went:out [from] inside [the] termitary

    he;   o-ᵢ                wi'i                omo-ᵢ doga.
    (Ptc); she [=the woman] said [=was going to] (she) run:away.

    ndi-ⱼ wi'i : "alaa,    woto dog!..."
    It    said : "No,    [do] not run! ..."  (Meyer 1979:163)
```

The simultaneous presence of two referents in AF in (7) is possible due to the **class differentiation** between anaphoric pronouns. Cf. a case where the old referent ("the man" = j) and the new referent ("Faatumata") belong to **one and the same class**:

```
(8) Faatumata-ᵢ  so   ø-ᵢ  fini  subaka,                 ø-ⱼ fetta
    'Faatumata, when she awoke early:in:the:morning,      kicked

    mo-ᵢ   <...> haaktuu!  oon-ⱼ kadi haaktoo,      øj tutta e
    him    <...> Pah!      she   also expectorated,    spat (at)

    makko-ᵢ  (Meyer 1979:177)
    him'
```

Here the function of an extended class pronoun (*oon*) is salient: it codes the referent that entered AF last.

The following example shows how two referents of **different classes** can be **maintained** simultaneously through rather long stretches of discourses:

```
(9) ñande    kala,        mbaroodi-ⱼ yaha, ø-ⱼ wara          lella,   øj
    'Every₂ day₁ [the] lion          goes,     kills [an] antelope,

    addana         mo-ᵢ                    o-ᵢ           ñaama. so
    brings [it to] him [=the man] [for] he [could] eat.   When

    weeti,     ndi-ⱼ yaha kadi,  ndi-ⱼ jagga        lella     walla
    it:dawns, he    goes again, he    grabs [an] antelope or

    njawa,              ndi-ⱼ hela  koyɗe mum,  ndi-ⱼ roondoo,
    [a] red antelope, he    breaks its₂ legs₁, he    loads [it on his
                                                                  head],
    ndi-ⱼ addana         mo-ᵢ
    he    brings [it to] him [=the man]'  (Gaden 1913:174)
```

There are also cases where two referents of the **same class** are maintained together in AF. Cf.:

(10) bojel$_i$ anndi wonde ø$_i$ waawaa yaade kadi   ø$_i$ [to]
      'Small Hare knew that he cannot go   once:again

      ina ñamlitoo   ñiiwa   goddum.   dum wadi
      borrow   [from] Elephant something. That made [=that's
                                                        why

      o$_i$ felliti   yaade to ngabu$_j$.   ngabu$_j$
      he decided [to] go   to Hyppopotamus. Hyppopotamus

      noon, kañum$_j$ laama   maayo. o$_j$ yotti   o$_j$
      (Ptc), he   reigned [over][the] river. He came [and] he

      wii mo$_i$: ...
      told him: ... (Usman Ka, p.c.)

Here not only the non-focal referent "Elephant" does not prevent the further pronominalization of the referent "Small Hare", but two focal referents - "Small Hare" and "Hippopotamus" - are pronominalized interchangeably. (They are personified and hence coded with the O class pronouns.) However, these two referents are not equal in their focality and pronominalizability. "Small Hare" is contained not only in AF but also in FP. That is why in the last sentence of (10) it is coded by autonomously referring pronouns in the subject position. "Hippopotamus", on the contrary, having just entered AF, is coded by an objective pronoun that has non-autonomous, dependent, reference. Cf. also the following example where two lions participate, the first being the hero of the tale, and the second appearing for the first time:

(11) ndeke   mbaroodi$_i$ dariima to,   taw   ndiya mbaroodi$_j$
      'Then [the] lion   stood   there, (Ptc) another lion

      giddi,   di$_{i+j}$ mbiindiri   garaas!
      rushed [to him], they   told:each:other bang! [=interlaced],

              cegeneeji ene kaba,   ndi$_i$
      [their] claws   tore   [themselves], he [=the first lion]

      roondii ndi$_j$,   ndi$_i$ tappi ndi$_j$
      lifted him [=the second lion] [up],   he   struck him

      e   leydi ... (Meyer 1979:99-101)
      upon [the] ground ...

The reference of subjective pronouns in the two last clauses caused no doubts in my informant. Apparently, "the first lion", being a member of FP, favors the autonomously referring pronominalization.

Cases are frequent when two or three referents of the same class (usually the O class) are present in AF simultaneously, being equal in their relation to FP. For a subgroup of this group of cases there exists a special and extremely salient **convention**. I mean the retold dialogues where the roles of interlocutors constantly interchange. Any of the interlocutors is typically coded by the plain O class pronouns and such nominations can be repeated with variable reference as long as necessary. For the sake of space economy I will not cite long chains such as: o$_i$ wii 'he said': "..." o$_j$ wii: "..." o$_i$ wii: o$_j$ wii: "..." The phrase *o wii* has practically become an indivisible signal of the speaker shift. There are even cases when non-O-class referents (speaking animals) are coded by the O pronoun precisely in the contexts of the phrase *o wii*.

This convention is effective and distinctive when there are two interlocutors. It is hard to explain why it is retained when three interlocutors participate in a retold conversation. At the beginning of the following excerpt a single referent is in AF and then two more referents join him:

(12) o_i yettii   tan, o_i hokki   ɓinngel$_j$
      'He came   only [=as soon as he came], he gave [the] son

              debbo$_k$ menkelde   kanne. debbo o_k
      [of] [the] woman [the] pieces [of] gold. The$_2$ woman$_1$

      wii mo$_j$: "hol dokkuɗo ma   ɗum?" o_j wii :   "oo
      told him [=the son] : "Who gave you that?" He said: "That

      da". o_i wii : "miin   de   njiɗmi ko
      over:there" He [=the man] said: "As:for:me (Ptc) I:want (Ptc)

              yarde". o_k wii: "yarnu   mo!" o_i
      [to] drink". She said: "Give:[some]drink [to] him!" He

      yarni   mo$_j$ (Collectif... 1978:34)
      gave:[some]drink [to] him'.

Here the last three boldfaced nominations are rather peculiar in the sense that they require for their interpetation prior understanding of the succeeding direct speech. My informant encounted great difficulties in analyzing this text. Apparently, the *O Wii* convention has become relatively independent of the pragmatic sources that produced it.

I have to mention two remaining types of AF dynamics that I was able to discover in Pulaar narrative discourses. The first of these is the **union** of focal referents. If there are, say, two referents in AF, and a complex referent consisting of these two referents participants in an event, this complex referent can be readily pronominalized. In the following excerpt the two interlocutors are "the man" and "the woman".

(13) o_i wii : "<...> njiɗmi tan ko   ndogden
      'He said : "<...> I:want only that we:run:away:together,

      njaaden". o_j wii: "njehen!"
      we:go:away:together". She said: "Let's go!"

      ɓe$_{i+j}$ njaadi (Collectif... 1978:34)
      They went:together'

In the following text the complex referent i+j functions as a whole entity through a long chain of clauses. Then one more referent, "the husband" (=k) enters AF. Furthermore, the complex referent i+j undergoes **fragmentation**: the referent "the man" is isolated. This is done through a trivial device: the full nomination is used (with succeeding pronominalization). Then a new referent union is created:

(14) omo$_k$ ridda   ɓe$_{i+j}$ haa   weeti,   do o_k laarata
      'He pursued them until it:was:dawn, when he was:looking

              hebtaade ɓe$_{i+j}$ do,
      [to] run:down them [=almost ran them down] (Ptc),

      o_k felli, o_k woofi, gorko o_i diwi
      he shot [and] (he) missed, the man jumped:down [from]

```
ngelooba mum_i.  ɓe_{i+k} pottii,                          o_i
his_2 camel_1.   They encountered [one another],          he

libi     mo_k ... (Collectif... 1978:34-35)
[=the man] downed him...'
```

In the last clause of this extract the i+k union breaks up. The referent "the man" is a member of FP and hence can be easily pronominalized in the autonomously referential position of the subject. The second focal referent is pronominalized in the nonautonomously referential objective position.

4. Conclusion

We have reviewed the major stages of the dynamics of attention focus in Pulaar narrative discourse. Among these stages are: introduction of a referent into AF, maintenance of a referent in AF and deleting it out of AF. Referents that only enter current AF are processed and coded differently from those that enter or are present in the focus pool of a paragraph or a whole discourse. Furthermore, AF can contain one referent or more than one referent at a time. This distinction affects strategies of processing and coding of focal referents. A relevant factor is also the difference vs. identity of the class membership of the simultaneously focal referents reflected in the choice of anaphoric pronouns.

Focal referents can coalecse together into a single whole; plural focal referents may undergo fragmentation.

Linguistic devices used for coding AF dynamics include, in the first place, various types of numerals full of NPs with or without definite articles, plain and extended class anaphoric pronouns), and minor conventions, such as autonomous referentiality of the subject position or nearly obligatory pronominalization applied to the author of the reported speech.

There are reasons to believe that when the cognitive perspective on language is generally accepted in linguistic studies, a description of devices used for coding the dynamics of attention focus in discourse will become an obligatory part of a full grammar of any language.

Footnotes:

1. In the examples, the functions of the words of the Pulaar text that are not required in good English translations are indicated in parentheses. Elements of glosses having no counterparts in the original text but necessary for the intelligibility of the translation are indicated in square brackets. In the glosses a colon is used if more than one English word corresponds to a single Pulaar word. Subscript number indices are used in the glosses if the order of words in a phrase or a clause differs from that in the Pulaar text.

2. Names of the referents, that is, their most neutral descriptive nominations, are indicated in double quotes.

Abbreviations in glosses: Art article, Ptc particle

Acknowledgements

References

Arnott, David W. 1970. *The Nominal and Verbal Systems of Fula*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Collectif de recherches sur l'enseignement des/ en langues nationales au Sénégal. 1978, N 4. Sereer - Pulaar - Mande. Recueil de textes.
Gaden, Henri. 1913. *Le Pulaar. Dialecte peul du Fouta Sénégalais. T. 1. Étude morphologique*. Textes. Paris: Leroux.
Grosz, Barbara. 1977. The representation and use of focus in a system for understanding dialogues. *Proceedings of the 5th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Cambridge, pp. 67-76.

Kibrik, Andreij A. 1987a. Anafora v polipredikativnyx konstrukcijax c pular. *Jazyk v Afrike: lingvistitsheskie problemy sovremennoj afrikanistiki*. Moscow: Institut Afriki AN SSSR, pp. 146-153.

-- 1987b. Fokusirovanie vnimanija i mestoimenno-anaforitsheskaja nominacija. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, N 3:79-90.

-- 1988. *Tipologija sredstv oformlenija anaforitsheskix svjazej*. Unpubl. diss. Moscow: Institut jazykoznanija AN SSSR.

Koval, Antonina I. 1987. *O nekotoryx osobennostjax pokazaelja klassa v fula. mennye klassy v jazykax Afriki*, pp. 204-215. Moscow: Nauka.

Koval, Antonina I. & Galina V. Zubko. 1987. *Jazyk fula*. Moscow: Nauka.

Meyer, Gerard. 1979. *Paroles du soir. Contes toucouleurs du Sénégal oriental*. N.I.

Sylla, Yèro. 1982. *Grammaire moderne du pulaar*. Dakar.