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1 Introduction

- In this presentation I explore the distinction between two markers of contrastive topic in Caquinte (Arawak, Peru),\(^1\) based on original fieldwork\(^2\)

- These markers are second-position clitics =mpani \(1\) and =\(ga\) \(2\)

\(1\) \[\#\] ESS, ptk, 2016, written, read, SCOIL 2014-13.029

a. Irira kiantyaonkani ikanari, “Pishekatari emooki aisa shimoto.”

\(\begin{array}{c}
\text{iri- ra kiantyaonki i- kan -i -ri pi sheka -a -ri emooki aisa shimoto} \\
3M- MED Giant.armadillo 3M- say -AR -3M 2- eat -MR -3M grub.sp. also grub.sp.
\end{array}\)

The giant armadillo said, “You eat emooki and also shimoto grubs.”

b. Irira Poshontyo Tsorintorpori ikanarit, “Jeeje, noshekatarem omooki, irirampani shimoto tee noshekatempari.”

\(\begin{array}{c}
\text{iri- ra Poshontyo Tsorintorpori jeeje no- sheka -a -ri emooki iri- ra =mpani} \\
3M- MED Old Axe yes 1- eat -MR -3M grub.sp. 3M- MED =CT
\end{array}\)

shimoto tee no- sheka -e -mpa -ri -ji

grub.sp. NEG 1- eat -IRR -MR -3M -NEG

Old Axe said, “Yes, I eat emooki grubs, but shimoto grubs I don’t eat.”

---


\(^2\)Data comes from elicitation and a corpus of approximately 9,500 lines developed by the author as part of ongoing fieldwork in the Caquinte community of Kitepamani begun in 2011. I thank speakers Antonina Salazar Torres (AST), Joy Salazar Torres (JST), Emilia Sergio Salazar (ESS), and Miguel Sergio Salazar (MSS) for their patience, generosity, willingness, and enthusiasm in sharing their language with me. Financial support for fieldwork has come from two Oswalt Endangered Language grants (2014, 2015) and an ELDP Individual Graduate Scholarship (2016-2018). Documentary materials are archived with the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages and available online: http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.7297/X24M92P6.

\(^3\)Epenthetic segments /t/ and /a/, which repair V and C hiatus, respectively, are not represented in the segmentation. Graphemes, in accordance with the official alphabet approved by the Ministry of Education in 2013, correspond to their IPA equivalents, with the exceptions of: <b> = [j]; <ch> = [tʃ]; <j> = [h]; <sh> = [ʃ]; <y> = [j]. Abbreviations: 1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person; A = applicable; ABL = ablative; ACT = active; ADJ = adjectivizer; AL = alienable; ALL = allative; ALT = alternative; AM = associated motion; AR = active realis; CAUS = causative; CE = counter-expectational; CL = classifier; CNGR = congruent; COP = copula; CQ = closed question; CT = contrastive topic; DIR = directional; DIST = distal demonstrative; DUR = durative; DSTR = distributive; EVID = evidential; EXST = existential; F = feminine; FOC = focus; FRST = frustrative; HES = hesitation particle; IDEO = ideophone; INCL = inclusive; INCNGR = incongruent; INDR = indirect applicative; INSTR = instrumental applicative; INTJ = interjection; IFFV = imperfective; IRR = irrealis; LOC = locative; M = masculine; MAL = malefactive applicable; MED = medial demonstrative; MID = middle; MIR = mirative; MOD = modal; MR = middle realis; NEG = negation; NOMZ = nominalizer; OST = ostensive; PFV = perfective; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; PP = propositional pro-form; PRES = preservative; PROX = proximal demonstrative; PURP = purpose (applicative); RD = reduplication; REC = recipient applicable; REG = regressive; REL = relativizer; TOP = topic.
a. Ari nochookataji notsipajiajaro iinani aisa aapani.
   
   
   ari no- chooka -aj -i no- tisipa -jig -aj -a -ro iinani aisa aapani

   PP 1- remain -REG -AR 1- be.with -PL -REG -MR -3F mother also father

   I remained with my mother and father.

b. Oraga nogetyotepae oaoaitanake aisa jaaiapae yoayoaitanake.

   o- ra =ga no- igetyo -te =pae Ø- og -oa -i -an -k -i aisa jaai =pae i- og
   3F- MED =CT 1- sister -POSS =PL 3F- go -RD -RD -ABL -PFV -AR also brother =PL 3M- go
   -yoa -i -an -k -i
   -RD -RD -ABL -PFV -AR

   My sisters, on the other hand, did go, and also my brothers went.

• I propose that the difference between these two markers lies in whether the contrasted object is constructed as already part of the interlocutors’ attentional space (=mpani) or not (=ga)
  
  – Similar notions such as common ground (Stalnaker 2002) or activation (e.g., as invoked in Gundel et al. 1993) may also be possible frameworks in which to describe this distinction

• I couch this description in approaches that treat contrastive topic (CT) as partially resolving a complex discourse question (Constant 2014) and as invoking a set of alternative questions (Büring 2016)

• This is a revision and update to O’Hagan (2017), where I preliminarily said:
  
  – “When a set of referents is introduced into the common ground, they may be differentiated between via the suffix -Npani”
  
  – “The suffix -ga attaches to the medial demonstrative ra and functions to bring a referent into the common ground”

• §2 language background; §3 CT background; §4 CT in Caquinte

2 Background on Caquinte Grammar

• Caquinte is polysynthetic, strongly head-marking, and largely agglutinative

• Obligatory verbal categories are subject agreement (§2.1), reality status (Michael 2014), and voice

  Reality status is a distinction between notionally realized and unrealized eventualities (e.g., negated clauses, those with future temporal reference, counterfactuals, etc.)
  
  – Realis is exponed fusionally with voice via the suffixes -i (active) or -a (middle)
  – Irrealis is exponed uniquely via -e, with middle voice exponed separately via -mpa
  – An additional irrealis prefix N-, an assimilating placeless nasal

• Other verbal categories include aspect, direction, associated motion, distributivity, pluractionality, participant number, and numerous adverbial categories, e.g., -aman ‘early in the morning’

• Other derivational categories include 11 applicatives, 3 causatives, an antipassive, and a reciprocal

• A large set of second position clitics express higher-level categories such as modality, evidentiality, interclausal relations, etc. (Rolle and O’Hagan to appear)

See Baier and O’Hagan (to appear) for an analysis of the interaction of these categories.
Table 1: Caquinte Reality Status Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REALIS</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Agreement and DP Arguments

- DP arguments can co-occur with subject and object agreement on the verb (Table 2)
  - Subject agreement is prefixal with transitive predicates, but follows a fluid distribution with intransitive predicates, alternating between prefixal and suffixal sets (O’Hagan 2015)
  - Object marking follows a differential pattern (4-6)

Table 2: Caquinte Person Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no-</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>-aji</td>
<td>-aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pi-</td>
<td>-mpi</td>
<td>-mpi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) **Irirakea shirampari yoanake ishiakotapojoiro inigankitejire.**

*iri- ra =kea shirampari i- og -an -k -i -i - shiako -apoj -i - ro i- nigankiteji -re 3M- MED =EVID man 3M- go -ABL -PFV -AR 3M- weed -ALL -AR -3F 3M- garden -POSS*

The man went and weeded his garden.

[JST, has, 2015, written, read, SCOIL 2014-13.017]

(4) “**Naatimpa tee nametempa nontsipatempari shirampari.**”

*naatimpa tee no- ame -e -mpa no- N- tsipa -e -mpa -ri shirampari 1.TOP NEG 1- be.used.to -IRR -MID 1- IRR- be.with -IRR -MID -3M man*

“I’m not used to being with men.” [says a mythical female cannibal]

[AST, ank, 2017, written]

(5) **Ontaniki ojaakiniki namenakeri shirampari, mabite ikaratate.**

*ontaniki ojaaki no- amen -k -i -ri shirampari mabite i- kara -ak -i over a at.the.river 1- see -PFV -AR -3M man two 3M- number -PFV -AR*

Over there at the river I saw a man, there were two of them.

[ESS, ptk, 2016, written, read, SCOIL 2014-13.029]
When I turned 15 years old, I met a man.

[JST, tsh, 2014, written]

- There are distinct series of pronouns and a copula (Table 3)

  - “atimpa” pronouns denote given referents and usually co-occur with agreement = TOPIC
  - “ro” pronouns obligatorily suppress agreement = FOCUS

Table 3: Caquinte Pronouns & Copula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>FOC</th>
<th>COP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>naatimpa</td>
<td>naro</td>
<td>naagenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>aatimpa</td>
<td>aro</td>
<td>aagenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>abiatimpa</td>
<td>abiro</td>
<td>abigenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>iriatimpa</td>
<td>iro</td>
<td>irigenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>irotimpa</td>
<td>iro</td>
<td>irogenti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement is suppressed with focus pronouns, wh-questions, and relative clauses, a sort of anti-agreement (AA) (Baier 2018).
“...I’m going to eat you.”
[AST, ank, 2017, written]

• The copula co-occurs with DPs and atimpa pronouns (11-12), but not ro pronouns (13)

(11) **Irira masasaro** irigenti tsimeri, koramani mana ikakintetake.

```
iri- ra masasaro irigenti tsimeri koramani mana i- kakinte-ak -i
3-M- MED bird.sp. COP.3M songbird long.ago ALT 3M- person -PFV -AR
```

*Masasaro* is a bird, but long ago he was a person.
[AST, pam, 2015, written]

(12) **Iriatimpa** irigenti pabantagarimajaka.

```
iriatimpa irigenti pabantagari -majaka
3M.TOP COP.3M shaman -true
```

He was a true shaman.
[AST, kap, 2016, written]

(13) “**Iriokampa aapani, arikampa yomposaka...**”

```
irio =ka =mpa aapani ari =ka =mpa i- ompos -k -a
3M.FOC =MOD =INCNDR father PP =MOD =INCNDR 3M- fall -PFV -MR
```

“Maybe it’s my father, maybe he fell...”
[AST, kap, 2016, written]

• The copula may also occur without an overt argument (14)

(14) ...”Ooo, irigentisakanika katsikeri.”

```
ooo irigenti =sakanika katsike -ri
IDEO COP.3M =MIR clear(.land) -NOMZ
```

...“Ooo, he’s a [skilled] gardener.”
[AST, shm, 2015, written]

• Three demonstratives, proximal, medial, and distal ka, ra, and nta, respectively, may precede a noun, inflecting for the gender of that noun – ra behaves like a familiar definite

2.2 Word Order

• Caquinte word order exhibits all logically possible orderings of subject, object, and verb

• Word order is VSO (15) when no topicalization or focus occurs (e.g., in “out-of-the-blue” contexts)

(15) Ari otiakero Shomoshiki inkomerikanate...

```
o- tig -k -i -ro Shomoshiki Ø- inkomerikanaka -te
3F- cook -PFV -AR -3F Shomoshiki 3F- pepper -poss
```

The orders argument-predicate and predicate-argument are both possible in constructions with the overt copula.

6The orders argument-predicate and predicate-argument are both possible in constructions with the overt copula.
Shomoshiki cooked her peppers.
[AST, naa, 2014, written]

- Subjects and objects occur preverbally when topicalized or focused
- Unlike the postverbal zone, two preverbal arguments are possible only when one is a focus
  - Relatedly, arguments may be realized only as verbal agreement markers
- Topicalization (Gregory and Michaelis 2001; Prince 1981) expresses changes in aboutness topic (17)

(16) [AST, okp, 2014, written]

a. ...yamenakotajiro irimankigare, **iroatimp**a tee onkenkejajeri.
   
i- amen -ako -aj -i -ro iri- mankidigare irotimp a tee o- n- kenkej -aj -e -ri
3M- watch -INDR -REG -AR -3F 3M- spouse 3F.TOP NEG 3F- IRR- think -REG -IRR -3M

He watched his wife [from nearby], but she did not think about him.

b. Osheki okatsimatanakeri, tee kapichaji onkatsimateriji.
   
osheki o- katsima -an -k -i -ri tee kapichaji o- N- katsima -e -ri -ji
much 3F- hate -ABL -PFV -AR -3M NEG little 3F- IRR- hate -IRR -3M -NEG

She came to hate him a lot, it was not [only] a little that she hated him.

c. **Iriatimp**a osheki ipintatakaro.
   
iriatimp a osheki i- pintsa -ak -a -ro
3M.TOP much 3M- love -PFV -MR -3F

But he loved her very much.

(17) "...Tee irio piraapanite, **iriratar i piraapanite** imetojakeri."

**tee irio pir- aapani -te iri- ra =tari pir- aapani -te i- metoj -k -i -ri
NEG 3M.FOC 2- father -POSS 3M- MED =CNGR 2- father -POSS 3M- kill -PFV -AR -3M

..."He [Kamotsontopari] is not your father, he killed your father."
[AST, ttk, 2014, written]

- Focus in the sense here is identificational (Kiss 1998), i.e., exhaustive (18-21)

(18) "**Irio** asookipinite ankoraketegeti."

**irio a- sooki -pini -e a- N- korake -e =geti
3M.FOC 1INCL- visit XXX IRR 1INCL- IRR- come -IRR =when

"We’ll visit them each time we come."
[AST, gtk, 2017, written]

- Unlike topicalized nouns, focused nouns often remain postverbal while a coreferential ro pronoun occurs in preverbal position (19) – the same pattern is also found with atimp a pronouns (20)

(19) "**Irio**, nompeanakempa **ashibanti.**"

**irio no- N- peg -an -k -e -mpa ashibanti
3M.FOC 1- IRR- transform -ABL -PFV -IRR -MID caracara.sp."
"I’ll transform into a caracara bird."
[AST, okp, 2014, written]

(20) ..."Abirompa, miratsine abiatimpa, abirotari tee pinojateji."

\( \text{abi} \quad \text{mpa} \quad \text{mir} \quad \text{ats} \quad \text{-i} \quad \text{-ne} \quad \text{abiatimpa} \quad \text{abi} \quad \text{tari} \quad \text{tee} \quad \text{pi-noja} \quad \text{-e} \quad \text{-ji} \\
2.\text{FOC} = \text{INCNGR drink} \quad \text{-IPFV} \quad \text{-AR} \quad \text{-IRR} \quad \text{TOP} \\
2.\text{FOC} = \text{CNGR NEG 2- chew} \quad \text{-IRR} \quad \text{-NEG} \\
\)

..."But you [should] drink it because you didn’t chew [it]."
[JST, sis, 2014, written]

- A focused noun may only occur preverbally if accompanied by a coreferential ro pronoun (21)

(21) Arikea ipantsapantsatakero irokea, matinkori, ajirikabakero.

\( \text{ari} \quad \text{-ke} \quad \text{i-} \quad \text{pantsapantsaa} \quad \text{-ak} \quad \text{-i} \quad \text{-ro} \quad \text{iro} \quad \text{-ke} \quad \text{matinkori} \quad \text{ajirik} \quad \text{ab} \quad \text{-k} \quad \text{-i} \quad \text{-ro} \\
\text{PP} = \text{EVID 3M- pull.taught} \quad \text{-PFV} \quad \text{-AR} \quad \text{-3F} \quad \text{3F.FOC} = \text{EVID lizard.sp. hold} \quad \text{-DIR} \quad \text{-PFV} \quad \text{-AR} \quad \text{-3F} \\
\)

Then he pulled it taught while the matinkori lizard held it.
[AST, ank, 2017, written]

- A longer textual excerpt from the story Kebetsi ('River Monster') is in (22)

(22) [ESS, kev, 2015, written, read, SCOIL 2014-13.018]

a. "Jame antampishijianake anoshikakoterita kebetsi."  
"Let’s be strong to pull the river monster."

b. "Ashiajanakegeti, irira kebetsi ishirontimentakena oshekini, inkante, ‘Ooo, oratika kabori tee ontampishiteji.’"
"If we run away, the river monster will laugh at me a lot, saying, ‘Ooo, the tortoise isn’t strong.’"

c. Irosati inoshikajianake chonchokoronti aisa kiima aisati kabori.  
Afterwards they pulled the deer and also the rabbit and the tortoise.

d. Aparo yoakotakeri kebetsi noshik.  
They did it to the river monster with one pull noshik.

e. Itimatimabetanaka, imagotanake kebetsi.  
He resisted again and again, but the river monster became tired.

f. Yogataitsitari jenoki, okajemanake kabori, okanti, "Pintampishitanake, chonchokoroniti!"  
They placed him high up, and the tortoise shouted, saying, “Be strong, deer!”

g. Irira chonchokoronti itampishibetanaka, otsnakapojiri inchatopoa taan sopik isontekiki, imetojanake metok.  
The deer was strong, but it wasn’t enough, a tree crushed him taan and his eye popped out sopik and he died metok.

h. Oratika kabori onoshikitari kebetsi, okantiri. “Jero nagabejakempi, jaai.”  
The tortoise pulled the river monster, saying to him, “See, brother, I’ve defeated you.”

i. "Kero okokani tee pintampishitajeji?"  
"Why were you not strong?"

j. Oshirontimentsitari kiikikiki kiikiki.  
She laughted at him kiikikiki kiikiki.
k. Aitsitari, otsatsitari jenoki inchatopoaki, irira kebetsi imetojanake. [SV]
   She grabbed him and tied him up high on the tree trunk, and the river monster died.

l. Ari osookibetari chonchokoronti metojake. [VO]
   Then she saw that the deer was dead.

m. Oshiitsitanaka, osookipojiri irira shintsiri, okantiri, “Pintankorejanaje.” [VO]
   She ran away, and at a different place saw the tapir, saying to him, “Wake up.”

n. "Iririra jaai aabetakempika nagabejakeri." [OV]
   "My brother who had taken you, I’ve defeated him."

o. "Pamenerija inchatopoaki tsatankitsika." [OV]
   "Just look at him tied up on the tree trunk."

p. Irira tampishinari inchikiojisano ipityakirejanaji, ikantiro kabori, “Iririra anianishi chonchokoronti, kero ijatakeni?” [SV, VS]
   The tapir opened his eyes slowly, saying to the tortoise, “My brother-in-law the deer, where did he go?”

q. Oroeatimpa okanti, “Metojake, ometojanakeri inchatopoa.” [SV, VS]
   She said, “He’s dead, a tree killed him.”

r. Ari itinajanaja irira tampishinari. [VS]
   Then the tapir got up.

s. Oshekini ishinebaeka itsipatanajaro kabori irisati kiima. [VO]
   He was very happy to be with the tortoise and rabbit again.

t. Ari oteronkapojaka notsabetankeri kebetsi teron. [VO]

2.3 Focus

- Exhaustive focus is expressed by the “ro” pronouns, as in (23), in which instructions are given:

  (23) [AST, kap, 2016, written]  
  a. "Abiro aashirekitenarine naatimpa.”  
     abiro ag -shire -ki -e -na -ri -ne naatimpa  
     2.FOC take -soul -AM -IRR -1 -3M -IRR 1.TOP  
     “You will take his soul for me and come back.”

  b. “Narokea aanakerine ontaniki Tsonkatagaroniki.”  
     naro =kea ag -an -k -e -ri -ne ontaniki Tsonkatagaroni =ki  
     1.FOC =EVID take -ABL -PPFV -IRR -3M -IRR there Tsonkatagaroni =LOC  
     “[While you do that] I’ll take him away to Tsonkatagaroni.”

- The same pronouns occur in so-called “listing focus” constructions:

  (24) [AST, gtk, 2017, written]  
  a. Irirakea Ken, iriotake, amakakena ontaniki biestaki yoajokabakokenani Joanka.  
     iri- ra =kea Ken irio -ak -i am -k -i -na =ka ontaniki biesta =ki i- ojok  
     3M - MED =EVID Ken 3M .FOC -PPFV -AR bring -PPFV -AR -1 =REL there party =LOC 3M - give  
     -bako -k -i -na -ri Joanka  
     -hand -PPFV -AR -1 -3M Joanka

7See also (18-21) above.
8Note the verbalized focus pronouns in (24), and the presence of an optional relativizer on some of the underlined verbs. These alternations are not yet well understood.
Ken, he was the one who brought me there to the party and gave my hand to Joanka.


   o- ra Joy iro -ak -i netsana -ak -i -na o- kitsa -ak -i -na kitsaa -re -ntsi
   3F- MED Joy 3F.FOC -PFV -AR arrange -PFV -AR -1 3F- dress -PFV -AR -1 dress -NOMZ -AL
   kitamaro -ankits -i =ka
   be.white -PFV -AR =REL

   Joy, she arranged me, she put a dress on me that was white.

c. **Irira Joanka**, [irio]_ aanakena ontaniki._

   iri- ra Joanka irio ag -an -k -i -na ontaniki
   3M- MED Joanka 3M.FOC take -ABL -PFV -AR -1 there

   Joanka, he took me there.

- They also occur in the negated clause preceding a correction (25) – the correction also contains a “focus,” expressed by the copula (26).

(25) Kotankitsi tee [irio]_ irimetojeji, irigenti, imetojake irigentijegite,._

   obj focus

   kotankitsi tee iro iri- metoj -e -ji irigenti i- metoj -k -i iri- igentijegi -te
   but NEG 3M.FOC 3M.MET -kill -IRR -NEG COP.3M 3M- kill -PFV -AR 3M- brother -POSS

   But they didn’t kill him [Taatakini], they killed his brother.
   [AST, ttk, 2014, written]

(26) Teekatsi chookatatsine, irigenti, chookatankitsi [Ishipiki], irisati Paribanti…

   subj focus

   teekatsi chooka -ats -i -ne irigenti chooka -ankits -i Ishipiki irisati Paribanti
   nobody EXST -IPFV -AR -IRR COP.3M EXST -PFV -AR Ishipiki and Paribanti

   Nobody was there, [only] Ishipiki and Paribanti were there.
   [AST, not, 2017, written]

- This seems to be an information focus, also attested (optionally) in the responses to questions (27), and also in declarative clauses that are not the responses to questions (28).

(27) [J]ST, has, 2015, written, read, SCOIL 2014-13.017

   a. ...“Taakea pobetsataka inkajaranki?”

      taa =kea pi- obetsa -ak -a inkajaranki
      WH =EVID 2- speak -PFV -MR previously

      ...“Who were you speaking to earlier?”

   b. Ikantiro, “[Irogenti], nobetsata jeento,”

      i- kan -i -ro irogenti no- obetsa -a jeento
      3M- say -AR -3F COP.3F 1- speak -MR ground.dove

      He said to her, “I was speaking to a ground dove.”

(28) [ESS, kam, 2015, written, read, SCOIL 2014-13.019

   a. ...“Paaje pimankigare kakinte.”

      pi- ag -aj -e pi- mankigare kakinte
      2- take -REG -IRR 2- spouse human
...“Take a human spouse.”

b. Irigenti pinintabaetake kamaarini!

irigenti pi- nin -bae -ak -i kamaarini
COP.3M 2- want -DUR -PFV -AR snake

“You’re in love with a snake!”

• Note, however, that my sense of information focus here is not simply the nonpresupposed portion of a sentence (see Kiss 1998 and compare with 15)

3 Contrastive Topic

• Previous study of contrastive topic has differed based on whether CT is to be considered a sort of topic, a sort of focus, or something altogether different

• For Constant (2014), CT partially resolves a complex question like Who brought what to the party?

  – Note the subquestions What did Mary bring? and What did Bob bring?

• He analyzes the Mandarin particle -ne as expressing CT, occurring with topic expressions, fragment questions, and in question- and declarative-final position

  – We will see that these distributions partially overlap with Caquinte =mpani and =ga

  – Crucially, neither of the two Caquinte markers occur in the Mandarin-specific question- and declarative-final position

• In a way, Constant’s definition is powerful, and may encompass many morphosyntactic constructions if they are used in the context of this general discourse structure

• Notably fragment questions are not easily handled in Constant’s framework

  – They are problematic because he demonstrates that Mandarin -ne does not attach to other sorts of (i.e., non-contrastive) topics: ‘At best, the contrasting sub-questions of this strategy would have to be defined vaguely, as in “What is the answer to the most salient question about this topic?”

  – We will see that Caquinte fragment questions resemble Mandarin ones, especially in their potential for ambiguity

• For Büring (2016), CT invokes a set of alternative questions, the interpretation of which comes with conventional implicatures of pertinence, independence, and identifiability.

  – ‘For a sentence $S^{CT-F}$ to be felicitous, there must be at least one question meaning in $S^{CT-F}$’s CT-value which is: a. currently pertinent, and; b. logically independent of $[S^{CT-F}]_\sigma$, and; c. identifiable.’

4 Contrastive Topic in Caquinte

4.1 CT with =mpani

• Contrastive topic =mpani attaches to demonstratives, topic pronouns, copulas, verbs, adverbs, and interjections in declarative clauses only
• In (29), a vampire bat brings his new wife home, but he does not want her to see a clay pot of his in which he has deposited the blood and bones of his former wives, her sisters, who he killed

a. "Jero okatika choomo pintiantakempaka."
   je -ro o- ka -tika choomo pi- n- -tig -an -ak -e -mpa =ka
   PRES-F 3F-PROX -OST clay.pot 2- IRR-cook -INSTR -PFV -IRR -MR =REL

   "Here is a clay pot for you to cook with."

b. "Ontatikampani choomo irogenti nashi naatinpa."
   o- nta -tika -mpani choomo irogenti no- ashi naatinpa
   3F-DIST -OST =CT clay.pot COP.3F 1- POSS 1.TOP

   "But that clay pot is mine."

• In (30), from the story of the shaman Kapashini, a man goes to see if a particular woman is at home, but he does not find her there

(30) [AST, kap, 2016, written] TOPIC PRONOUN
a. "Nojikeji nontajenkashtero namenabetapojaro kajaragiteni, irogenti chookatajatsi otsobironakite."
   no- ji -k -i -ji no- N- -tajenka -e -ro no- amen -be -apoj -a -ro kajara
   1- FRST -PFV -AR -FRST 1- IRR-check.on -IRR -3F 1- see -FRST -ALL -MR -3F empty
   -gite -ni irogenti chooka -aj -ats -i o- tsobironaki -te
   -CL -ADJ COP.3F remain -REG -IPFV -AR 3F-house -POSS

   "I checked on her but when I got there I saw that it was empty, the only thing that remained was her house."

b. "Oroatimpampani tee anejeroji."
   oroati mpampani =mpani tee anejeroji
   3F:TOP =CT not.be.there

   "But she wasn’t there."

• In (31), a man goes to see if someone is home, leaving his wife in the main part of the village. The relevant person is not home, and (31a) picks up with his wife’s narration of his return

(31) [AST, not, 2017, written] COPULA
a. Ari ipiaja imontsajabajana orani, kempejitaipoj ani maka ochookatajigeti ishikoňiaki.
   ari i- pig -aj -a i- omontsa -ab -aj -a -na orani kempeji -apoj -i imaika
   PP 3M-return -REG -MR 3M-find -DIR -REG -MR 1 there near -ALL -AR now
   chooka -aj -i =geti ishikoňiaki
   3F-EXT -REG -AR =where school

   Then he returned and found me there, it was near where the school is now.

b. Ari nameniri jeri koraketake, ikanti, "Nomankigare, teekatsi chookatatsine, irogentimpani tsobironaki."
   ari no- amen -i -ri je -ri korake -ak -i -Ø i- kai -i no- mankigare teekatsi
   PP 1- see -AR 3M PRES-M come -PFV -AR -3 3M- say -AR 1- spouse nobody
   chooka -ats -i -ne irogenti -mpani tsobironaki
   EXST -IPFV -AR -IRR COP.3F =CT house
I saw there he was coming, and he said, “Wife, nobody was there, it was only the house.”

- In (32b), Amamani, a powerful shaman, has taken a privileged set of fellow humans with him as he transcends to another dimension. The narrator tells about the remaining humans, who deduce that Amamani has abandoned them permanently based on the fine state in which he left his house.

(32) [AST, ama, 2016, written]
   a. ...aisa itsobironakite, oboapaeki potsonapoani, kejetaka apotsoboatiro potsotiki.
      aisa i- tso bironaki te o- poa =pae =ki potsona -poa -ni keje =ak -a =Ø
      also 3M- house -POSS 3F- trunk =pl. =LOC orange -trunk -adj be.like =pfv -mr -3
      apotsoboatiro potsoti =ki
      annatto-colored annatto =loc
      ...also [there was] his house, and there was an orange color on the tree trunks, it was like an annatto-like color on an annatto tree.
   b. Arikea ikanti igonoro, “Oooshia, tempajanajimpani iriatimpa, yojokanakaji aatimpa.”
      ari =kea i- kan -i i- gonoro oo =shia tempaj -an -aj -i -Ø =mpani
      PP =EVID 3M- say -AR 3M- person INTJ =APP transcend -ABL -REG -AR -3 =CT
      iriatimpa i- ajok -an -k -aji aatimpa
      3M.TOP 3M- place -ABL -pfv -1incl 1incl.top
      Then he said to his people, “Ooo, he’s transcended, he’s left us behind.”

- In (33b,c), a Caquinte woman captured by Ashaninkas explains to them why there is no risk of her attempting to escape

(33) [AST, ttk, 2014, written]
   a. Okanti, “Aato noshiga, ametanakena.”
      o- kan -i aato no- shig -a a me -an -k -i -na
      3F- say -AR NEG 1- run -MR be.used.to -ABL -PFV -AR -1
      She said, “I won’t run [away], I’ve gotten used to things.”
   b. Chapinkimpani tee nametempaji.
      chapinki =mpani tee no- ame -e -mpa -ji
      recently =CT NEG 1- be.used.to -IRR -MID -NEG
      Recently, though, I wasn’t used to things.
   c. “Imaikampani ametanakena.”
      imaika =mpani ame -an -k -i -na
      now =CT be.used.to -ABL -PFV -AR -1
      “Now I’ve gotten used to things.”

- In (34c), Miguel Sergio writes to let me know that a sack that I use to store goods at his mother’s house has gone missing. I then ask him if the same is true of another sack that I left there. His use of teempani stems from the fact that, while the relevant proposition is true of a previous referent, it is not true for the one currently under discussion.

(34) [Messenger, February 26, 2016]
a. MSS: Jeeje, okamankena noniinanite, okanti, “Pinkamankeri Zacarias opeaka.”

Yes 3F- tell -PFV -AR -1 1- mother -poss 3F- say -AR 2- IRR- tell -PFV -IRR -3M
Zacarias 3F- go.missing -PFV -MR

MSS: Yes, my mother told me, she said, “Tell Zacarias it went missing.”

b. ZJO: Ariotesa pikamankena. Chooka otsipa balde noakeka otsobironakiteki, opeaka ora aisa?

ZJO: Thanks for telling me. There was another bucket that I left at her house, did that one go missing too?

c. MSS: Teempani, chooka...

tee mpani chooka -Ø
no =CT EXST -Ø

MSS: [That one] no, it’s here...

• Similarly, in (35b), Amamani’s mother accuses him of having committed incest with his sister. The accusation turns out to have been unfounded, which she realizes only after Amamani brings about the apocalypse to prove that she was wrong

(35) [AST, ama, 2016, written]

a. Okantirikea, “Irijani, nojiketarite pipashininkakaro pitsiojite.”

O- kan -i -ri -kea irijani no- ji -k -i =tari =te pi- pashinink -k -a
3F- say -AR -3M =EVID son 1- believe -PFV -AR =CNGR =CE 2- commit.incest -PFV -MR
-ro pi- tsioji -te
-3F 2- sister -poss

She said to him, “Son, I thought you committed incest with your sister.”

b. “Jaampanikaja tee, osheki nokatsimakempi, nokatsimatashikempi intati.”

Jaa mpani ka ja tee osheki no- katsima -k -i -mpi no- katsima -ashi -k
INTJ =CT =MOD =CQ no much 1- be.angry -PFV -AR -2 1- be.angry -PURP -PFV
-i -mpi intati
-AR -2 only

“But augh!, no, I got angry at you, I only got angry at you for no good reason.”

4.2 CT with =ga

• Contrastive topic =ga attaches to demonstratives, topic pronouns, and adverbs in both declarative and interrogative clauses (i.e., fragment questions)

4.2.1 CT =ga in Interrogatives

• In (36), a man greets a woman whose house he has just arrived at

(36) [AST, not, 2018, written]


Ari i- obetsa -apo- a -ro Choaba i- kan -i -ro ari korake -ak -i -na
PP 3M- speak -ALL -MR -3F Choaba 3M- say -AR -3F PP come -PFV -AR -1
Then Choaba spoke to her, and said, “Hello, I’ve come.”

b. Okantirikea, “Iriraga pitsipataka, taa ipajita?”

And she said to him, “What about the one you’re with, what’s his name?”

• In (37), Amamani describes the properties of the apocalypse, which exclude his interlocutor

(37) [AST, kap, 2016, written] TOPIC PRONOUN

a. “Aato yarabijitaji aragetatsika, aisa kanaagetatsika aato yanijibijitaji.”

And she said to him, interrupting, “What about me?”

b. Okantsitarikea, “Naatimpaga?”

And she said to him, “What about the one you’re with, what’s his name?”

• ASIDE: Examples of =ga attaching to an adverb in interrogatives come only from overheard talk in Caquinte. For example, =ga can attach to aka ‘here,’ and the resulting akaga can be used in a context in which someone is pointing to a corner of a large room and explaining that bats defecate there in the middle of the night. The interlocutor may point to a different corner of the same room and ask Akaga? ‘What about here?’ in order to ask if similar defecation occurs there.

4.2.2 CT =ga in Declaratives

• In (38), the narrator describes who makes the shamanistic food and drink that Amamani consumes

(38) [AST, ama, 2016, written] DEMONSTRATIVE

a. ...iriatimpa yagabejaka itsinakajiro isantomaritsate...

...he was able to pound his own ayahuasca...

b. Oraga sheri obatsatabakeneritari iriinanite opijatakeneri tsogepiro

But his tobacco his mother mashed for him, and inserted it into bamboo [i.e., for storage].

• In (39), from elicitation, two speakers of Caquinte gather their luggage at an airport
a. Speaker 1: “Naatimpa noanake.”

naatimpa no- og- an -k -e
1.TOP 1- go -ABL -PFV -IRR

“I’m going to go [e.g., to my hotel].”

b. Speaker 2: “Naatimpaga nonkenashitanakempi.”

naatimpa [=ga] no- N- ken -ashi -an -k -e - mpi
1.TOP =CT 1- IRR- go(.route) -PURP -ABL -PFV -IRR -2

“I’m actually going to go a different way than you [i.e., stay somewhere else].”

• A longer conversational example of =ga, from an interaction between me and Antonina Salazar, is (40)

  – We discuss her paternal uncle †Kisaapakori, whose (biological) mother was †Korinto, who had a sister †Tsantsanaki, who had a daughter †Tyoontyonaki. Thus Kisaapakori and Tyoontyonaki were parallel first cousins. In the Caquinte kin system, marriage between parallel cousins is taboo, but Kisaapakori nevertheless took Tyoontyonaki as his wife. I clarify that I have properly understood this relationship in previous conversations with her and others.

(40) [AST, elic, 9/5/2016, SCOIL 2014-13.025]

a. AST: Korinto...imaika, Korinto ogetyotepae Tsantsanaki.

imaika Korinto o- igetyo-te =pae Tsantsanaki
now Korinto 3f- sister -poss =pl Tsantsanaki

Korinto...now Korinto and Tsantsanaki were sisters.

b. ZJO: Jeeje.

c. AST: Jeeje...ogetyotepae Tsantsanaki, Korinto.

jeeje o- igetyo-te =pae Tsantsanaki Korinto
yes 3f- sister -poss =pl Tsantsanaki Korinto

Yes...she was sisters with Tsantsanaki, Korinto [was].

d. ZJO: Ari irira Kisaapakori yaakero orijanite ogetyote iriinanite.

So Kisaapakori took his mother’s sister’s daughter [as his wife]?

e. AST: Jeeje, imaika ora iro irashi iria iriinanite, ora Korinto...

jeeje imaika ora iro iri- ashi iria iri- iinani -te ora Korinto
yes now hes 3f.foc 3m- poss 3m.top 3m- mother -poss hes Korinto

Yes, now um she was his mother, um Korinto [was].

f. ZJO: ...jeeje...

g. AST: ...irashi iriotimpa.

iri- ashi iriotimpa
3m- poss 3m.top

...his.

h. Imaika Tsantsanaki, irotari aisa iriinanite iria Kisaapakori.

imaika Tsantsanaki iro =tari aisa iri- iinani -te iria Kisaapakori
now Tsantsanaki 3f.foc =cngr also 3m- mother -poss 3m.top Kisaapakori

Now Tsantsanaki, she was also Kisaapakori’s [classificatory] mother.

i. Kotankitsi iria Shintyoi, itsipa nogonoro.
But Shintyoi, he was another one of my people.

Yes, he was another.

Tsantsanaki on the other hand, now...what is it...her son...Paribanti took Tsantsanaki.

4.3 Disentangling =mpani and =ga

- The distributions of =mpani and =ga that we have seen up until this point are summarized in Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>=mpani</th>
<th></th>
<th>=ga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DECL</td>
<td>INTERR</td>
<td>DECL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATIVE</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC PRONOUN</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPULA</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❔</td>
<td>❔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERB</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERJECTION</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>❔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In this section we delve deeper into the meanings of =mpani and =ga, beginning with an interaction between me and Miguel Sergio in a Spanish-based elicitation session

- In (41), I construct a context in which it is difficult to construe the referent as in contrast with any other, and =ga is infelicitous – note the salience of fragment questions in Miguel’s reworking of the context


a. ZJO: Digamos aquí hay una mesa, y ahi hay un libro, y llega una persona que va a llevar el libro, y dice, “Paanakero okaga.”

• Antonina has similar intuitions regarding the salience of fragment questions, as in (42), from a monolingual elicitation session – I had previously been asking Antonina about the difference between forms marked with *mpani versus* *ga*

(42) [Φ AST, elic, 7/11/2017, SCOIL 2014-13.043]

It’s like it’s someone else’s. It’s like recently with your stove, your...they say, “Give it to me.” I give them mine. They say, “What about that one?” That one is Zacarías’s.

• A similar example from the same elicitation session is in (43)

(43) [Φ AST, elic, 7/11/2017, SCOIL 2014-13.043]

It’s like, the manioc at my house ran out. I go to my daughter-in-law’s house and say, “Give me manioc.” She says, “There is none.” She looks around. Then I see that there is some, and say, “What about that lying on the ground there?”

• Now we segue into examining examples like (44), where there is the potential for ambiguity because the fragment question has minimal content

  – The general construction in (44d) is a common way to inquire about the locations of others, although *ga* may be absent and the string is otherwise identical

(44) [AST, not, 2018, written]


  no- amen -poj -i -ro iri- mankigare o- ra Tsantsanaki o- kan -i -ri no- mankigare
1- see -ALL -AR -3F 3M- spouse 3F- MED Tsantsanaki 3F- say -AR -3M 1- spouse
Joanka o- kan -i -ri abiro =kea no- shai korake -ankits -i
Juan 3F- say -AR -3M 2.FOC =EVID 1- grandson come -PFV -AR

Having arrived there [at Paribanti’s house] I saw his wife, Tsantsanaki, and she said to my husband Juan, she said, "You’ve come, grandson."

b. Ikantiro, “Jeeje.”

  i- kan -i -ro jeeje
3M- say -AR -3F yes

He said to her, “Yes.”

c. Okantiri, “Pinchokotitapoje.”

  o- kan -i -ri pi- n- chokoti -apoq -e
3F- say -AR -3M 2- IRR- sit -ALL -IRR

She said to him, “Sit down.”

d. Ikantirokea, “Tyao, iriraga pimankigare?”
Then he said to her, “Grandmother, where is your husband?”

- What, then, conditions the appearance of =ga in contexts such as that in (44), given that fragment questions do not require =ga (see also 45 below)?

- It seems to depend on whether the speaker expects the two referents to be in the same location
  - If they do, and one is absent, then =ga is likely to appear; if they don’t, then =ga is absent

- In this vein more generally, fragment questions may occur with the counter-expectational clitic =te (45)

(45) [ESS, pik, 2016, written, read, SCOIL 2014-13.036]
  a. …otonkoabetanaka amenapojiri chokotitake apaniro, okantiri. “Koraketajimpi.”
     o- tonkog -be -an -k -a Ø- amen -poj -i -ri chokoti -ak -i -Ø apaniro o- kan
     3F- go.up -FRST -ABL -PFV -MR 3F- see -ALL -AR -3M sit -PFV -AR -3 alone 3F- say
     -i -ri korake -aj -i -mpi
     -AR -3M come -REG -AR -2

     …she went up and saw him sitting alone, and said to him, “You’ve come back.”

  b. Iriatimpa ikanti, “Jeeje, koraketajana.”
     iriatimpa i- kan -i jeeje korake -aj -a -na
     3M.TOP 3M- say -AR yes come -REG -MR -1
     He said, “Yes, I’ve come back.”

  c. Irira oraanate ikantiri, “Oratikate orijani?”
     iri- ra or- apani -te i- kan -i -ri o- ra -tika[=te] orijani
     3M- MED 3F- father -POS 3M- say -AR -3M 3F- MED -OST =CE daughter
     Her father said to him, “My daughter?”

  d. “Tee onkoraketajeji.”
     tee o- N- korake -aj -e -ji
     NEG 3F- IRR- come -REG -IRR -NEG
     “She hasn’t come back.”

- In turn, =ga and =te may co-occur, as in (46)

(46) [ESS, pik, 2016, written, read, SCOIL 2014-13.036]
  a. Yaitsitari igotare, itsimataitsitari, yarejebaetapojaka tsobironakiki yojokapojiri kotaren.
     i- ag -itsi -a -ri i- kota -re i- atsimatai -itsi -a -ri i- areje -bae -apoj
     -k -a tsobironaki =ki i- ojok -poj -i -ri koten
     -PFV -MR house =LOC 3M- place -ALL -AR -3M ILOC
     He grabbed his bundle, carried it on his back, and after a while he arrived at the house, he set it down, and it came unwrapped koten.

  b. Oratika ibagirote obetsatanakari, okantiri, “Oragajate norijanite, ari ometojakero Tsonka-monki?”
His mother-in-law spoke to him, and said, “Where is my daughter, did Tsonkamonki kill her?”

c. Iriatimpayobetsatanaka, ikanti, “Jeeje, ometojakero, irotarinokoraketantajaka, ometojanatsi naatimpa.”

He spoke, and said, “Yes, it killed her, that’s why I’ve come back, lest it kill me.”

- At this juncture, it is important to be clear that fragment questions themselves, independent of any additional marking, indicate that a referent is not in interlocutors’ joint attentional space, and that it needs to be, so to speak, for the purpose of further description
  - If the purpose of that description is to contrast that newly introduced referent, then =ga is used
- It follows that =mpani, which expresses that the relevant objects to be contrasted are both being paid attention to, would never occur in a fragment question
- At other times, speakers wish to indicate the same meaning (non-joint attentional space) but do so without a question – these are the declarative uses of =ga, and, depending on the context, they seem to come with additional implicatures
- This is the case in the scenario (47), a video transcript, in which Joy Salazar walks me around her house garden teaching me about plants

(47) [JST, elic, 7/18/2018, SCOIL 2014-13.063]

a. JST: ...kempekarika koyokoyo, shaapio, kero ipajitani, jagitya, irirakea panaba, koonkarini. Irishekatakemparo, onchookatanakegeti onirojegitanake.
JST: ...like guans, currasows, um, Spix’s guan, panaba tinamous, koonkarini tinamous. They will eat it [the fruit], when it grows and is gets big.

b. ZJO: Kero pikantiro?
ZJO: What do you call it?

c. JST: Oka inchakitso.
JST: This is inchakitso.

d. ZJO: inchakitso

JST: Yes. This is pineapple. Pineapple...that...we plant it, then when it’s ripe I eat it, this, it’s eaten, everything eats it. This one is abiu.

f. ZJO: Kero?
ZJO: Which one?
h. ZJO: This is ice cream bean. Later when it grows, that’s what it will be like and we eat that. This is, um, a big ice cream bean, it will measure this big size, this, this is what’s like tsarintsaripa ice cream bean. It’s eaten, we eat it.

• In contrast, when the relevant objects are both being paid attention to, =mpani appears, as is the case in (48), another video transcript, when Antonina walks me around the village teaching me about plants


a. AST: Oka jero okatika kachorontoshi.
AST: This, here is kachoronto.
b. ZJO: Kero?
ZJO: Which one?
c. AST: kachorontoshi
d. ZJO: kachorontoshi
e. AST: Jeeje, kachoronto maasano aka, oshi, kachoronto. Okampani inkajarankitika, yogenti. Jero oka kachoronto, okejebekaro sanko.
AST: Yes, kachoronto, everything here, the leaf, kachoronto. But this one is the one from earlier, yogenti. Here is kachoronto, it’s sort of like sugarcane.

• We conclude by examining the final example in (49), comparing it with the airport example in (39)

(49) [ESS, pik, 2016, written, read, SCOIL 2014-13.036]

a. ...omiraka irakagaja, okantiri, “Nontineokitanaje.”
   o- mir -k -a irakagaja o- kan -i -ri no- N- tineoki -an -aj -e
   3F- drink -PFV -MR chapo 3F- say -AR -3M 1- IRR- sleep -ABL -PFV -IRR
   ...she drank chapo, and said, “I'm going to go to sleep.”
b. Iriatimpa ikanti, “lintsija, naatimpampani aato notineokiti, noshinkotakeri osaiteberi.”
iriatimpa i- kan -i iintsija naatimpa =mpani aato no- tineoki -i no- shinko -ak -e
3M.TOP 3M-say -MR sure 1.TOP =CT  NEG 1- sleep -AR 1- smoke -PFV -IRR
-ri osaiteberi
-3M paca

He said to her, “Sure, but I’m not going to sleep, I’m going to smoke the paca.”

- In elicitation =ga was not a substitute for =mpani in (49), and as a felicitous example (39) was provided
  - I propose that this is because there is nothing out of the ordinary – i.e., nothing to explicitly contrast – in two people not going to bed at the same time, one staying up to engage in an activity
  - On the other hand, the implicature in the airport context (with =ga) seems to be that the speaker construes their proposition as not among the relevant propositions being paid attention to, perhaps because they assume that their interlocutor assumes they are going to the same hotel
  - I expect that =mpani and =ga could be made to each be felicitous in each of these contexts

5 Conclusion

- I suggest that =mpani is the classic marker of contrastive topic in both Constant and Büring’s senses, but that =ga should also be analyzed as a sort of CT
  - The difference lies in whether the two contrasted objects are construed as both within interlocutors’ attentional space
  - This distinction accounts for the presence of =ga in fragment questions, and the absence of =mpani

- An analysis of =ga in either of these frameworks would need to assume different things about the discourse structure of CT (for Constant) or about the interpretation rule based on conventional implicature (for Büring)

- Crucially, both =mpani and =ga are ungrammatical with the focus “ro” pronouns, which is expected given their exhaustive semantics
  - Under Büring’s approach, this is simply because exhaustive focus and contrastive topic invoke different sorts of alternatives

- Internal to Caquinte then, it follows that =mpani and =ga would associate with forms that do not carry this exhaustive interpretation, i.e., “topic” pronouns, demonstratives, other word classes, etc.
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