

## Focus Marking in Kakataibo (Panoan)

Daniel Valle

University of Texas at Austin

[davalle@utexas.edu](mailto:davalle@utexas.edu)

This paper provides a first description of the properties of focus realization in Kakataibo (Panoan), an Amazonian language spoken in Peru, based on data collected first-hand. In particular, it addresses three types of information focus: narrow focus, predicate focus and sentence focus. This study finds that there is not a single strategy to encode focus, but rather focus types are marked by various morpho-syntactic patterns including *in situ* and *ex situ* focus. In addition, it is shown that the information structural status of the subject determines case assignment. Specifically, focused subjects always receive case while non-focused subjects optionally show case.\*

**Keywords:** focus, information structure, Kakataibo, Panoan, differential subject marking

### 1. Introduction

The Amazon basin is one of the most linguistically diverse regions in the world, although most of these languages remain undescribed. While the number of grammatical descriptions of Amazonian languages has increased in recent years, the informational structural properties of these languages have not been explored, with few exceptions (Vallejos 2009 for Kokama-Kokamilla, Van Valin 2009 for Banawá, Wari' and Karitiána, Storto 2011, 2014 for Karitiana, among others). This article addresses this gap and provides a first description of the properties of focus in Kakataibo (Panoan), an Amazonian language spoken in Peru, based on data collected first-hand. The goals for this paper are twofold. First, to account for the realization of three different foci types in Kakataibo: narrow focus, predicate focus, and sentence focus. This study finds that there is not a single strategy to encode focus, but rather focus types are marked by various morpho-syntactic patterns. The second goal is to explore the relation between focus and differential subject marking (DSM) in the language. Section 1 presents the working definition of focus assumed in this study and some basic background on the Kakataibo language. Section 2 discusses the main morpho-syntactic characteristics of focus marking and shows that different foci types exploit dissimilar syntactic strategies to encode focus. In addition, it is demonstrated that focus is not realized by morphological means. In section 3, the interplay between focus and DSM is studied. Specifically, it is shown that focused subjects obligatorily bear case while non-focused subjects optionally show it. A summary and conclusions are presented in section 4.

---

\* Many thanks to Patience Epps, Nora England and Malte Zimmermann and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on previous versions of this paper. Of course, any shortcomings in the analysis are my own. The fieldwork trips for data collection for this paper were funded by the Carlota Smith Scholarship and Joel Sherzer Scholarship from the Department of Linguistics at The University of Texas at Austin and an ELDP grant # IGS0165.

### 1.1. Focus

In this study, FOCUS is regarded as an information structural category that indicates a set of alternatives that are relevant for the interpretation of a linguistic expression (Rooth 1985, 1992; Krifka 2008). Thus, this set of alternatives provides speakers with a tool for interpreting an utterance in the discourse. In other words, the focused element is the one that answers an explicit or implicit question, as in 1.

- (1) Q: What did you eat?                      A: I ate [bananas]<sub>F</sub>.

Wh-questions require an answer in which a constituent must fill in the information requested by the wh-word. Thus, in answers to content questions the constituent that provides the information requested by the wh-word is the focus, whereas the remaining constituents are background information. Thus, content questions are a tool to elicit focused elements.

A focused constituent can have different functions depending on its relation to its alternatives present in the common ground. When alternatives have not been introduced into the common ground, the focus has an information function. This is the kind of focus that is mainly addressed in this paper. Other focus types include corrective focus, when the focus substitutes an alternative already introduced in the common ground; contrastive focus, when the focus is put side by side with another alternative; selective focus, when the focus is picked up from a set of given alternatives.

Another way of characterizing focus is regarding its relation to the syntactic category over which it scopes (Lambrecht 1994, 2000). A first distinction is made between NARROW FOCUS and BROAD FOCUS. In a narrow focus construction, the focus is associated with a singular constituent (e.g. NP, PP, V). Subject, object, and adjunct focus are instances of narrow focus (Section 2.1). Notice that the VP is not an instance of narrow focus since it may contain other constituents V (DO) (IO), but of broad focus, as in 2. Section 2.2 deals with predicate focus in Kakataibo. The other kind of broad focus is sentence focus or all-new sentences, where the focus domain is identified with the whole sentence, as in 3 (Section 2.3).

- (2) Q: What did John do?                      A: John [ate pizza]<sub>F</sub>.
- (3) Q: What happened?                        A: [John ate pizza]<sub>F</sub>.

### 1.2. The Kakataibo Language

Kakataibo is a Panoan language spoken in the Peruvian Amazon by approximately 1500 people (Frank 1994). The data<sup>1</sup> for this paper comes from the San Alejandro dialect of Kakataibo. This data was collected in the years 2008-2012 during several fieldtrips to the Sinchi

---

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations used in glossing: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, A = subject of a transitive verb, ADD = additive, ADJVZ = adjectivizer, APPL = applicative, CAUS = causative, COM = comitative, DAT = dative, DES = desiderative, DISP = distal past, HST = hesternal, INTL = intentional, IPFV = imperfective, INS = instrument, INT = interrogative, NEG = negation, NPROX = non-proximal, LOC = locative, NMLZ = nominalizer, O = object of a transitive verb, PA = participant agreement, PART = participial, PFV = perfective, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PROX = proximal, S = subject of an intransitive verb, SSSEA = same subject, simultaneous event with main A subject, SSPEA = same subject, previous event with main A subject, VAL = validational.

Roca native community in the San Alejandro river. I use the term Kakataibo to refer to the San Alejandro dialect in this work henceforth.<sup>2</sup>

Before analyzing focus in Kakataibo, some grammatical facts should be explained to make the analysis clearer. The alignment system, agreement, and constituent order will be sketched below, based on Valle (2009).

Kakataibo shows a split in its alignment system based on the referentiality properties of the NP (Silverstein 1976, Dixon 1979, 1994). Specifically, pronouns follow an accusative alignment with the nominative marked by =*n* whereas the object is unmarked, as shown in 4 and 5.

- (4) *Ĕnkana*                    *a*        *xĕxánua*                    *mĕrapuni.*  
 ĕ=*n*=*ka*=*na*                *a*        *xĕxá=nu=a*                *mĕra-pun-i*  
 1=*A*/*S*=*VAL*=1*A*/*S*    3        creek=*LOC*=*PA*.*O*        show.up-earlier.same.day-IPFV  
 ‘I found him earlier today in the creek.’

- (5) *Ĕnkana*                    *madinu*        *raká.*  
 ĕ=*n*=*ka*-*na*                *madi=nu*        *rakat-a*  
 1=*A*/*S*=*VAL*=1*A*/*S*        soil=*LOC*        lay.down-PERF  
 ‘I laid down on the ground.’

In nouns, the A argument is marked by the case marker =*n* whereas the S and O arguments are zero-marked, as shown in examples (6) and (7). Table 1 summarizes the split alignment system in Kakataibo.

- (6) *Charunka*                    *sasa*        *bia.*  
*charu=n=ka=a*                *sasa*        *bi-i-a*  
 crab=*A*=*VAL*=3*A*/*S*        fish        pick.up-IPFV-NPROX  
 ‘The crab catches fish.’

- (7) *A uni*        *akĕxuka*                    *ninua*                    *nĕtĕpunia.*  
*a uni*        *a-kĕ-xun=ka=a*                *ni=nu=a*                *nĕtĕ-pun-i-a*  
 3 man do-PART-ADJVZ=*VAL*=3        forest=*LOC*=*PA*.*S*        disappear-earlier.same.day-IPFV-NPROX  
 ‘That child got lost in the forest earlier in the day.’

Table 1. Kakataibo alignment

	Pronouns	Nouns
<i>A</i>	= <i>n</i>	= <i>n</i>
<i>S</i>	= <i>n</i>	∅
<i>O</i>	∅	∅

Kakataibo shows grammatical agreement both in the verb and in the clitics =*ka*/=*id* with the A and S arguments; O agreement does not occur either in the verb or those clitics. Verbal agreement is only marked for third person in the perfective aspect. First and second person as well as third person in the non-perfective aspect are not cross-referenced in the verb. Subject agreement on the clitics =*ka* ‘validation’ (Weber 1986) and =*id* ‘second-hand evidential’ distinguishes between first, second and third person; the local versus non-local subject

<sup>2</sup> See Zariquiey (2011) for a grammatical description of the Lower Aguaytía dialect of Kakataibo.

distinction is not made in these clitics.<sup>3</sup> First person is marked by the suffix =*na*, second person by =*mina* and third person is marked by =*a*, as shown in (8).

- |     |                                |                 |                 |
|-----|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| (8) | ka= <i>na</i>                  | id= <i>na</i>   | ‘first person’  |
|     | ka=(m) <i>ina</i> <sup>4</sup> | id= <i>mina</i> | ‘second person’ |
|     | ka= <i>a</i>                   | id= <i>a</i>    | ‘third person’  |

Constituent order in Kakataibo follows two main obligatory landmarks: the second-position clitics =*ka*/=*id* and the sentence-final main verb, as schematized in (9). The position before the second-position clitics (pre-field) can be occupied by only one constituent of any kind with the exception of the main verb. The position between the second-position clitics and the final verb (middle field) can be filled by any number of constituents of any type.

- (9) \_\_\_\_\_ =*ka* / =*id* \_\_\_\_\_ V

Constituent order in Kakataibo is mainly driven by information structural factors, as will be shown in Section 2. This is, there are not syntactic constraints apart from those shown in (9) that drive constituent order; rather, information structural requirements such as different focus types affect the arrangement of the verb and its arguments in the sentence. Nonetheless, the SOV order seems to be the most neutral since this is the order used in all-new sentences (see Section 2.3). In addition, speakers tend to elicit SOV sentences in isolation when no context is provided.

### 1.3. Methodology

The data analyzed here comes from different sources: elicitation, texts and overheard speech. Elicitation sessions were held in three different ways. (i) Simple elicitation sessions were run in which the speaker was asked to translate sentences from Spanish into Kakataibo. By using this method, a risk of obtaining biased data arises. However, this method was very restricted in its use to check grammaticality judgments. (ii) Semi-structured elicitation sessions were run using stimuli in which a sequence of pictures was shown to speakers and then they were asked questions related to those pictures. The Questionnaire for Information Structure (Skopeteas et al. 2006) was the main resource for this task. (iii) Semi-structured narratives in which the speaker listened to a story in Spanish and then s/he re-told the same story in Kakataibo also provided data for this study. This strategy was used mainly to control the number of participants in the discourse and track their reference through it. Naturally occurring texts came from different genera such as traditional stories, procedural texts, narratives and conversations. Overheard speech occurred on a daily basis during my fieldwork. However, when a sentence which seemed to be relevant to this study was overheard, that sentence was checked with a native speaker and written down.

## 2. Focus Types in Kakataibo

In this section, focus marking is discussed in relation to its morpho-syntactic correlates with special attention to constituent order, case marking and ellipsis. In the following

<sup>3</sup> Free pronouns incorporated into the clitics =*ka* and =*id* and then became agreement markers. See Valle (to appear) for a historical view of the development of agreement in the second position clitics.

<sup>4</sup> Young speakers of Kakataibo tend to pronounce /kamina/ as [kaina] dropping the bilabial nasal.

subsections, I will discuss narrow focus (Section 2.1), predicate focus (Section 2.2), and sentence focus (Section 2.3).

### 2.1. *Narrow focus (XP)*

Narrow focus is a focus type in which a single constituent is in focus, as described in Section 1. Arguments of a verb (e.g. subject, object), adjuncts (e.g. temporals, locatives), and even the verb are examples of constituent focus.<sup>5</sup> However, VP focus and S(entence) focus are not instances of constituent focus.

Consider the mini-dialogue in (10). In 10a, the presupposition that ‘someone *x* planted cacao’ is introduced but it is unknown who this *x* is. The answer in 10b fulfills this lack of knowledge by asserting that ‘Solis planted cacao’. As the VP was presupposed in the answer, only the subject NP is in focus, indicated by the small caps. Thus, sentence 10b constitutes an instance of subject focus. A schematic view of the analysis is given in (11).

(10) a. Uinankara                      nuká              apáxa?  
           uina=n=ka=ra=a            nuká              apat-a-x-a  
           who=A=VAL=INT=3A/S    cacao             plant-PFV-3-NPROX  
           ‘Who planted cacao?’

          b. Solisnanka                    nuká              apáxa.  
           Solis=nan=ka=a<sup>6</sup>            nuká              apat-a-x-a  
           Solis=A=VAL=3A/S        cacao             plant-PFV-3-NPROX  
           ‘SOLIS planted cacao.’

(11) Sentence: Solis planted cacao  
 Presupposition: *x* planted cacao  
 Assertion: Solis planted cacao  
 Focus: *x* = Solis

Constituent-focus sentences can also occur with other core arguments such as direct object in (12) and indirect object<sup>7</sup> in (13), and adjuncts such as temporals in (14), instrumentals in (15) and comitatives in (16). As in (10), mini-dialogues are used to clearly show the context of occurrence of these different types of narrow-focus sentences.

(12) a. Ñukaramina                    min              naënu            apati?                      (direct object focus)  
           Ñu=ka=ra=mina            mi=n              naë=nu            apat-i  
           thing=VAL=INT=2A/S    2=POSS            farm=LOC        plant-IPFV  
           ‘What do you plant in your farm?’

<sup>5</sup> Lambrecht (1994:22) identifies constituent focus with a focused argument of the verb. However, a broader view of constituent focus is adopted in this work.

<sup>6</sup> The case marker =*n* has =*an* as one of its allomorphs. The allomorph =*an* occurs when the noun it attaches to ends in a consonant other than [n]. See Zariquiey (2011:113-16) for a discussion on the different allomorphs of =*n* in Kakataibo.

<sup>7</sup> I am using the label ‘indirect object’ to refer to the recipient or beneficiary of a ditransitive verb. However, it should be highlighted that Kakataibo does not make that distinction in its grammar; rather, Kakataibo behaves as a double object language in which there is not a formal property distinguishing the objects of a ditransitive verb (see also Zariquiey 2012).



Based on the different examples of narrow-focus sentences given above, some characteristics of this focus type become apparent:

- (17) (i) The focused constituent occurs in pre-field position, (when one of the second-position clitics is present).  
 (ii) The non-focused constituents remain *in situ*; they do not occur in the pre-field position.  
 (iii) When the subject is focused, it occurs overtly and always shows case.

The fact that (i) the focused constituent occurs in sentence-initial position is a common cross-linguistic focusing strategy of placing the narrow-focused constituent to the left or right edge of the sentence (cf. Zariquiey 2011:713 in which it is argued that the post-verbal position is a constituent focus position in the Aguaytía dialect of Kakataibo). (ii) The other constituents of the clause are not displaced to the pre-field because they are not focused, as shown in previous examples. (iii) In a subject-focus sentence, the subject needs to occur overtly; subject pro-drop is not allowed in this focus type. It seems that overt pronouns in Kakataibo are used to encode contrastive focus whereas subject agreement in the clitics, without an overt subject pronoun, has an anaphoric function.<sup>8</sup> Deviations from these characteristics of constituent focus yields infelicitous sentences but not ungrammatical ones. Notice that Kakataibo does not have a dedicated morphological focus marker. The *=n* clitic functions as a case marker, as described in Section 1.2. Focused objects (both direct and indirect) do not show any case marking. Also, the clitics *=ka* / *=id* do not mark focus because non-focused material can precede them, as discussed in the following section. Further, the clitics *=ka* / *=id* are present in predicate-focus sentences where the focused VP occurs after them.

In (10), repeated below as (18)a and (18)b for convenience, the question puts the VP as presupposed material and it also requires an answer in which the subject is focused. Sentence (18)b exemplifies a pragmatically-natural answer to the question in (18)a. The answer in (18)c is infelicitous (marked by #) because the subject does not occur in sentence-initial position which goes against characteristic (i) of narrow focus. The answer in (18)d goes against characteristics (ii) because the non-focused object does not remain *in situ*; rather it moves to a position before the clitic *=ka*. In fact, this sentence is ungrammatical because it violates the restriction of not having more than one constituent in the pre-field position (see section 2.1). Sentence (18)e violates characteristic (iii) of subject constituent focus in different ways. In (18)e, the subject is not overt; rather, the anaphoric subject agreement occurs as a contrastive pronoun. In addition, the left periphery is not filled by a narrow focus constituent. In (18)f, the subject occurs overtly and it is in sentence-initial position. However, it does not have case yielding the sentence ungrammatical. Sentences (18)c and (18)e produce a pragmatic clash. They show a focus syntactic structure, predicate focus, when a different focus structure is expected, narrow focus. In other words, those sentences convey a different focus type (predicate focus) from what the context expects them to convey (subject focus). This is schematized in (19) in which the constituent focus is conveyed in a predicate-focus type sentence.

<sup>8</sup> Bresnan and Mchombo (1987) distinguish between two types of pronouns cross-linguistically: pronouns used contrastively and pronouns used anaphorically. When there is a distinction between these two types of pronouns, the former tends to be independent and have more phonological content while the latter tends to be incorporated and have reduced phonological content. This seems to be the case in Kakataibo, independent pronouns are used contrastively whereas agreement markers may also function as incorporated pronouns used for anaphoric agreement. These incorporated pronouns seem to have developed from independent pronouns and then undergone phonological erosion (see Valle to appear).

- (18) a. Uinankara                      nuká      apáxa?  
           uina=n=ka=ra=a            nuká      apat-a-x-a  
           who=A=VAL=INT=3A/S cacao      plant-PFV-3-NPROX  
           ‘Who planted cacao?’
- b. Solisnanka                      nuká      apáxa.  
           Solis=nan=ka=a            nuká      apat-a-x-a  
           Solis=A=VAL=3A/S       cacao      plant-PFV-3-NPROX  
           ‘SOLIS planted cacao.’
- c. # Ka                      Solisnan      nuká      apáxa.  
           ka=a                      Solis=nan      nuká      apat-a-x-a  
           VAL=3A/S      Solis=A      cacao      plant-PFV-3-NPROX  
           ‘SOLIS planted cacao.’
- d. \*Solisnan nukáka apáxa.<sup>9</sup>
- e. # Ka                      nuká      apáxa.  
           Ka=a                      nuká      apat-a-x-a  
           VAL=3A/S      cacao      plant-PFV-3-NPROX  
           ‘[SOLIS] planted cacao.’
- f. \*Soliska      nuká      apáxa.

- (19) Sentence: Solis planted cacao  
 Presupposition: x planted cacao  
 Assertion: Solis planted cacao  
 Focus: x = Solis  
 Focus type: # predicate focus

---

<sup>9</sup> Sentence 18d is ungrammatical because it violates the syntactic requirement of not having two constituents in the pre-field position, but this sentence does not clearly show a violation of the pragmatic requirement of having non-focused constituent *in situ* in predicate-focus sentences. The following minimal pair shows more clearly a violation of this pragmatic requirement. Sentence (i), coming from a traditional story, has the focused subject occurring in sentence-initial position and the non-focused constituents follow it. In contrast, in sentence (ii), coming from elicitation, the non-focused object does not remain *in situ* but rather occurs in sentence-initial position producing a pragmatic clash because the syntactic structure does not correspond to that of (subject) constituent-focus sentences.

- (i) Unin      ain      piakama      tērēkania.  
       uni=n      a=in      pia=kama      tērēkan-i-a  
       man=A      3=POSS      arrow=PL      tie-IPFV-NPROX
- (ii) # Ain      piakama      uni(n)      tērēkana.  
       a=in      pia=kama      uni=(n)      tērēkan-i-a  
       3=POSS      arrow=PL      man=A      tie-IPFV-NPROX  
       ‘The MAN ties all his arrows.’





## c. \* Umishanua    Untinka ransaxa.

The order in which the focused constituents occurs in multiple-foci sentences is not fixed. Two main tendencies are followed. First, there is a correspondence between the position in which the *wh*-words occur in the question and the position of the narrow-focused constituents in the answer. In other words, the focused constituent that occurs in the pre-field in the answer corresponds to the *wh*-word that occurs in that position in the question. Second, when adjuncts and core arguments are focused, the adjuncts tend to occur in sentence initial position whereas the core arguments follow the clitic. This second pattern occurs mostly in narratives in which establishing the settings of the story comes before introducing the participants.

The last case of constituent focus is V(erb) focus, a focus type in which only the verb is focused whereas the subject, object(s) and adjunct(s) are presupposed. Verb-focus sentences behave differently than other narrow-focus constructions. Specifically, the main verb does not occur in the pre-field slot, as in characteristic (i) of non-verbal narrow focus; rather, it remains *in situ* in sentence-final position. In this focus type, the verb tends to occur alone while the other constituents are dropped. Example (23) shows an instance of verb focus in which the narrator is explaining how to fish with an arrow. In the first sentence ‘after fixing [it], [they] put the peach palm fruit in the arrow’, the NP ‘arrow’ is introduced in the discourse and the subject ‘they’ is already presupposed. In the following sentence, the main verb *aruia* ‘[they] put [the arrow]’ occurs without any overt argument. However, it is understood as a complete clause in which the subject and object arguments are already background information. Thus, the verb is the only focused constituent in that sentence. Notice that verb-focus sentences are different from predicate-focus sentences in their information structural values and their realization.

(23)	Mëniotankëxuribika	wanin	anu	pia	aru.	
	mënio-tankëxu=ribi=ka=a	wanin	a=nu	pia	aru-a	
	fix-SSPEA=ADD=VAL=3A/S	peach.palm.fruit	3=LOC	arrow	put-PAST	
	Atankëxu	anu...	niatankëxu	<b>arui-a.</b>	Aika	ridi
	a=tankëxu	a=nu...	nia=tankëxu	<b>aru-i-a.</b>	ai=ka=a	ridi
	do-SSPEA	3-LOC	put.weight-SSPEA	put-IPFV-NPROX	then=VAL=3A/S	thread
	nëaia.					
	nëa-i-a					
	tie-IPFV-NPROX					

‘After also fixing [it], [they] put the peach palm fruit in the arrow. After doing [it]...putting weight [in the arrow] there, [they] PUT [the arrow there]. Then, [they] tie the thread.’

The realization of narrow focus in the verb as occurring sentence-finally shows another case of the interplay of syntax and information structure in Kakataibo. In this case, the syntactic constraint of not allowing the main verb to occur in the pre-field position overrules the information structural strategy of placing narrow focused constituents there.

In this section, it has been shown that constituent focus is characterized by (i) occurring in sentence-initial position with the caveat that the main verb focus remains *in situ*, (ii) leaving the other constituents *in situ* and (iii) having the subject overt and being marked by case when it is in focus. Different types of constituent focus have been exemplified such as subject focus, object

focus, verb focus, etc. It has also been shown that more than one constituent can be focused in the same sentence which yields a multiple-focus sentence. However, the syntactic requirement of not having more than one constituent in the pre-field slot still holds in multiple-foci sentences.

## 2.2. Predicate Focus (VP)

In predicate-focus sentences, the VP is the focused constituent in the sentence, as described in Section 1.1. In other words, the VP is what remains after subtracting the presupposition from the assertion in a predicate-focus sentence. Content questions of the type “what did s/he do?” usually have a predicate focus sentence as their answer. The elicited mini-dialogues in (24) and (25) show instances of predicate focus in intransitive and transitive sentences, respectively. In example (24)b the subject is presupposed since it was introduced in the question in (24)a by the subject agreement in the clitic =*ka*. Thus, subtracting the presupposition, the subject, from (24)b, the VP ‘is sitting down’ is what remains as the focus of the sentence. In a similar fashion, the subject is presupposed in (25)b because it was introduced by the subject agreement in the clitic =*ka* in the question in (25)a. The VP ‘built a house’ is the product of the subtraction of the presupposition, the subject, from the assertion. Notice that in this instance both the object and the verb are in focus. Since the VP is focused and the subject is part of the background information, the clitic =*ka* occurs in sentence-initial position instead of in second position. A summarized analysis of predicate focus of (24) and (25) is given in (24)c and (25)c, respectively.

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>(24) a. Uidakara                                    a?<br/>                 uida=<i>ka</i>=<i>ra</i>=a                            a-a<br/>                 how=VAL=INT=3A/S    do-NPROX<br/>                 ‘What is [he/she] doing?’</p> | <p>b.    Ka                                    sotaxi.<br/>             ka                                    sot-a-x-i<br/>             VAL=3A/S    sit.down-PFV-3-PROX<br/>             ‘[He/she] WAS SITTING DOWN.’</p>   | <p>c. Sentence: [He/she] was sitting down<br/>          Presupposition: S/he x<br/>          Assertion: He/she was sitting down<br/>          Focus: x = was sitting down</p> |
| <p>(25) a. Uidakaramina                            a?<br/>                 uida=<i>ka</i>=<i>ra</i>=<i>mina</i>                            a-a<br/>                 how=VAL=INT=2A/S    do-NPROX<br/>                 ‘What did you do?’</p>  | <p>b.    Kana                                    iti                                    akë.<br/>             ka=<i>na</i>                                    i-ti                                    a-kë<br/>             VAL=1A/S    be-NMLZ                                    do-PART<br/>             ‘[I] BUILT A HOUSE.’</p> | <p>c. Sentence: [I] built a house<br/>          Presupposition: S/he x<br/>          Assertion: I built a house<br/>          Focus: x = built a house</p>                    |

Based on the examples above of predicate focus, two main properties of predicate-focus sentences can be identified, which are given in (26).

- (26) (i) Predicate focus sentences tend to lack an overt subject. The information about the subject is recovered by subject agreement in the second-position clitics and in the verb (see Section 1.2.), and context.
- (ii) Focus constituent order is OV, where the verb occurs sentence-finally and the object is adjacent to it. No focused element occurs in the pre-field position in predicate-focus sentences.

Predicate focus sentences are also found in narratives showing the characteristics given in (26). Sentence (27) comes from the “tomato story” (Skopeteas et al. 2006) adapted as the “pineapple story” to make it more culturally appropriate.

- (27) [Kanká arutankëxu] xëati axuaxa.  
 [kanká aru-tankëxu] xëa-ti a-xun-a-x-a  
 pineapple cook-SSPEA drink-NMLZ do-APPL-PFV-3-NPROX  
 ‘After cooking the pineapple, [she/mother] MADE [pineapple] JUICE FOR [him].’

At the moment that (27) is uttered, the referent ‘mother’ and the proposition ‘she cooked pineapple’ have already been introduced into the common ground. Thus, the proposition ‘the mother cooked pineapple’ is presupposed in (27). After subtracting this presupposition, we are left with the focus: ‘made juice’. A summarized view of the focus analysis of (27) is given in (28). This instance of predicate focus shows the characteristics of this focus type given above. Namely, (i) the subject is not overt but it is recoverable by agreement and the discourse context and (ii) the constituent order of the focused main clause VP is OV with the predicate occurring in sentence-final position. Even though the clitic =*ka* does not occur in (27), none of the constituents (V and O) of the focused VP occur in sentence-initial position; the focused VP in (27) follows the adverbial clause. Notice that in predicate-focus sentences the O needs to be adjacent to the V, which occurs sentence-finally. This is a crucial difference between object-focus and predicate-focus sentences.

- (28) Sentence: After cooking the pineapple, [she] made [pineapple] juice  
 Presupposition: After cooking the pineapple, mother x  
 Assertion: After cooking the pineapple, she made pineapple juice  
 Focus: x = made juice

So far I have shown the morpho-syntactic characteristics of predicate-focus realization. Now, I will show that deviations from the characteristics of predicate-focus realization yield infelicity, but not necessarily ungrammaticality, since a different focus structure than the expected one is realized. Thus, the pragmatic clash leads to an infelicitous sentence. Consider the mini-dialogue in (25) repeated below as (29) for convenience. The question (29)a introduces the subject as the topic of the dialogue and requires an answer in which the VP is focused and the subject is presupposed. This is exactly the information that (29)b conveys. The subject is presupposed because it is dropped but recoverable by agreement. The VP is focused because it occurs in sentence-final position and none of its constituents occur before the clitic =*ka*. Thus, sentence (29)b is a pragmatically adequate answer to the question in (29)a, which is manifested by their morpho-syntactic features. In contrast, sentence (29)d is not an adequate answer to (29)a

because the VP is not focused but rather only the object. Sentence (29)d is an instance of (object) constituent focus (see Section 2.1.). This difference in focus type is evidenced because the object NP occurs in the pre-field position and not in the middle field, next to the verb, as it is characteristic of predicate-focus structures. The contrast between a pragmatically adequate answer to (29)a and an inadequate answer is given in (29)c and (29)e, respectively. The focus in (29)b is ‘built a house’, which corresponds to the predicate-focus type whereas in (29)d the focus ‘built a house’ does not correspond to the constituent-focus type.

- (29) a. Uidakaramina                      a?  
       uida=ka=ra=mina                    a-a  
       how=VAL=INT=2A/S                do-PFV  
       ‘What did you do?’
- b. Kana                      iti                      akë.  
    ka=na                    i-ti                    a-kë  
    VAL=1A/S                be-NMLZ            do-PART  
    ‘[I] BUILT A HOUSE.’
- c. Sentence: [I] built a house  
    Presupposition: Someone x  
    Assertion: I built a house  
    Focus: x = built a house  
    Focus type: predicate focus (VP)
- d. # Itikana                      a-kë.  
    i-ti=ka=na                    a-kë  
    be-NMLZ=VAL=1                do-PART  
    ‘I BUILT A HOUSE.’
- e. Sentence: A house, I built it.  
    Presupposition: Someone x  
    Assertion: I built a house  
    Focus: a house  
    Focus type: constituent focus (object NP)

The presence of an overt subject in a predicate-focus sentence also triggers a pragmatic clash even though the object and verb occur in sentence-final position. Consider the mini-dialogue in (30). Sentence (30)b is infelicitous because the subject ‘I’ occurs in the pre-field slot, used to encode narrow focus. However, an appropriate answer to the question in (30)a required a predicate-focus structure in which the pre-field was not occupied by a narrow focused constituent. Sentence (30)b is an instance of (subject) constituent focus (see Section 2.1.) or an all-new sentence (see Section 2.3.). Again, the mismatch between expected focus type (predicate focus) and actual focus type (constituent focus) makes the sentence infelicitous.

- (30) a. Uidakaramina                      a?  
       uida=ka=ra=mina                    a-a  
       what=VAL=INT=2                    do-PFV  
       ‘What did you do?’
- b. # Ënkana                      iti                      akë.  
    ë=n=ka=na                    i-ti                    a-kë  
    1=A/S=VAL=1                live-NMLZ            do-PART  
    ‘I BUILT A HOUSE.’

The presence of an overt subject in a predicate-focus structure, however, does not trigger a pragmatic clash when the subject occurs in the middle field and the object and verb occur

sentence–finally, as in example (31). In other words, the characteristics of predicate-focus sentences, stated in (26), are met. The fact the subject NP occurs in the middle field and not in the pre-field slot suggests that it constitutes background information and not focus material, as it is a characteristic for narrow focus. Since the subject is presupposed, what remains is the focus, in this case, the VP. Notice that the presupposed non-focused subject in this example occurs without case marking (see Section 3). Thus, a pragmatic clash does not occur because the focus type in (31) meets the characteristics of predicate-focus sentences without having the properties of narrow focus. Even though there is an overt subject, it does not show narrow focus realization.

- (31) Ka           Norua   mi    sasa   ñukatia.<sup>11</sup>  
       ka=a       Norua   mi    sasa   ñukat-i-a  
       VAL=3A/S   Norua   2    fish   ask.for-IPFV-NPROX  
       ‘Norua asks you for fish.’

It is important to note that the sentences which have been shown to be infelicitous are not ungrammatical. As argued above, such sentences are infelicitous because they have a focus type different from what is expected by the context in which they occur. The infelicitous sentences are grammatical because they do not violate the restriction of having two constituents in the pre-field position or positing the verb in that slot. These sentences become felicitous when they are uttered in the proper context; that is, when they are uttered in a context in which their focus type is the expected focus type.

The predicate-focus sentence structure, in which the subject is usually non-overt, the O and V form a constituent and the V occurs in sentence-final position, could be viewed as the realization of the topic-comment information flow. The predicate-focus syntactic structure is in accordance with the unmarked coding of the discourse functions of topic and focus (Van Valin 2005:73, Givón 1983). Topics tend to occur as zero elements whereas focus constituents tend to occur as overt NPs in Kakataibo. Thus, subject topics tend to be non-overt but recoverable by agreement whereas focused subjects tend to occur overtly. This topic-comment or predicate-focus structure is the most frequent in natural discourse in Kakataibo. There can be a series of sentences in which a topic is introduced once and then it is omitted in the following sentences, although still recoverable by agreement, as shown in (32) where the subject NP has already been introduced in the common ground.

- (32) Aikana        ën       kuani...        ë kuanki        uani        motosierra gasolina  
       ai=ka-na        ë=n       kuan-i...        ë kuan-ki        uan-i        motosierra gasolina  
       then=VAL=1    1=A/S   go-IPFV...     1 go-SSSEA    take-IPFV   chainsaw   gasoline  
  
       aceite    ën        lima cadena   kamabi    uani        kuani.  
       aceite    ë=n        lima cadena   kama=bi   uan-i        kuan-i  
       oil        1=POSS   lime chain   all=EMPH   take-IPFV   go-IPFV  
  
       kuantankëxunkana   kuma                    o nëdua        tukai.  
       kuan-tankëxun=ka=na   kuma                    o nëdua        tuka-i  
       go-SSPEA=VAL=1        chiwawaco (sp. of tree)   or styrax        saw-IPFV

<sup>11</sup> However, sentences of this type are very rare in natural discourse. It is not yet clear why the subject occurs overtly but it may be for clarity’s sake. Thus, the speaker overtly states the background subject to make sure that the hearer has that particular referent in mind in order to avoid ambiguity.

tukakinkana...	ya,	tukanuxukana	primero
tuka-kin=ka=na	ya,	tuka-nu-xun=ka=na	primero
saw-SSSEA=VAL=1 A/S	already,	saw-INTL-SSSEA=VAL=1 A/S	first

chakámi.	chakamitankëxu	in a mënioi.
chakat-mi-i	chaka-mi-tankëxu	in a mënio-i
drop-CAUS-IPFV	drop-CAUS-SSPEA	tree 3 clear.out-IPFV

mëniotankëxukana	tupuni...
mënio-tankëxu=ka=na	tupun-i
clear.out-SSPEA=VAL=1 A/S	measure-IPFV

‘Then, I go. I go to pick up my chainsaw, gasoline, oil, lime, chain, everything [I] go carrying them. After going [to pick them up], [I] saw chiwawaco or estoraque (kind of trees). While sawing [them]... Before [I] go to saw [them], [I] chop down [the trees]. After chopping [them] down, [I] clear the sticks [out from the field]. After clearing [the field], [I] measure [it].’

As suggested by example (32) above, the pre-field slot can be occupied by given information or discourse particles (e.g. then, so) in predicate-focus sentences without causing infelicity. Sentence (33) shows an all-new sentence (see Section 2.3). In 33b, it is already given that ‘the jaguar is walking’ and it occurs in the pre-field position. Notice that 33b is an instance of predicate focus where the object and verb are adjacent occurring in sentence-final position, but the sentence is not infelicitous because the constituent that occurs in the pre-field is not focused but given information. In a similar way, sentence 34b is a felicitous instance of predicate focus because the discourse marker filling the pre-field slot is not focused. Notice that in this sentence, ‘sitting down’ that is given information occurs in the middle field because the pre-field is already filled.

(33) a. Inuka                      nisia.                      c. Sentence: The jaguar hunts while sitting down  
       inu=ka=a                    nisin-a                      Presupposition: The jaguar x sitting down  
       jaguar=VAL=3A/S        sit.down-NPROX            Assertion: The jaguar hunts while sitting down  
       ‘A jaguar is sitting down’.                      Focus: x = hunts

b. Nikinka                      ñu waria.  
       nisi-kin=ka=a              ñu wari-i-a  
       sit.down-SSSEA=VAL=3A/S    thing look.for-IPFV-NPROX  
       ‘The jaguar HUNTS while sitting down’.

(34) a. Chunaka                      sotaxa.  
       chuna=ka=a                    sot-a-x-a  
       spider.monkey=VAL=3A/S    sit-PEFV-3NPROX  
       ‘The spider monkey was sitting down.’

b. Aika                      soxu                      idia.  
       ai=ka=a                    sot-xun                    id-i-a  
       then=VAL=3A/S        sit-SSPEA                see-IPFV-NPROX  
       ‘Then, after sitting down, (the spider monkey) IS WATCHING (it).’

- c. Sentence: Then, after sitting down, (it) is watching (it)  
 Presupposition: The spider monkey x sitting down  
 Assertion: Then, after sitting down, (it) is watching (it)  
 Focus: x = is watching

In this section, I have shown that the main characteristics of predicate-focus sentences, in which the subject is presupposed and the VP is focused, are: (i) the subject tends to be non-overt (or occurring in the middle field) and (ii) the focused OV within the VP occurs in sentence-final position. However, there is not enough data to make a generalization with respect to the position of constituents other than the V or O within the VP in a predicate-focus sentence. It has also been suggested in this section that the syntactic structure of predicate focus is the realization of the topic – comment information flow. When the predicate-focus structure occurs in a context in which it is not expected (e.g. a different focus type is expected), a pragmatic clash occurs. Nonetheless, the pre-field position can be filled by non-focused constituents such as given information.

### 2.3. Sentence Focus (IP)

Sentence focus, also known as all-new focus, is a focus type in which the whole sentence is focused; there is no presupposed constituent. As there is no presupposition to subtract from the assertion, the whole sentence equals the focus. Sentence-focus sentences usually occur at the beginning of a narrative or as out-of-the-blue sentences. Example (35)a is the opening sentence of a narrative. In this sentence, nothing has been introduced as a presupposition. Thus, there is nothing to subtract from the assertion which makes the whole sentence focused, as summarized in (35)b. Sentence (36)a comes from an elicitation session in which a picture depicting an event was shown to the speaker who was then asked ‘what do you see in the picture?’. As none of the participants or the action shown in the picture are presupposed, it follows that the whole sentence is in focus.

- (35) a. Uni achúi xanuñu iákëxa.  
 uni achúi xanu=ñu i-ákë-x-a  
 man one woman=HAVE be-DISP-3-NPROX  
 ‘A MAN HAD A WIFE LONG AGO.’

- b. Sentence: A man had a wife long ago  
 Presupposition: -----  
 Assertion: A man had a wife long ago  
 Focus: A man had a wife long ago

- (36) a. Uninka xanu ninia.  
 uni=n=ka=a xanu nini-i-a  
 man=A=VAL=3A/S woman pull-IPFV-NPROX  
 ‘A MAN IS PULLING A WOMAN.’

- b. Sentence: A man is pulling a woman  
 Presupposition: -----  
 Assertion: A man is pulling a woman  
 Focus: A man is pulling a woman



As in the other type of focus sentences, sentence-focus sentences are characterized by the following morpho-syntactic features:

- (37) (i) Constituent order is SOV with the subject occurring in the pre-field position and showing case.  
 (ii) All constituents are overt; pro-drop is disallowed.

Characteristic (i) of sentence-focus sentences states that these sentences follow the neutral constituent order in Kakataibo when the two arguments of a transitive verb are overt. As a corollary of (i), characteristic (ii) follows. As there is no presupposition in a sentence-focus sentence, there is no way to recover information about the participants or the main event. For this reason, all the information about the sentence needs to be overtly stated. Thus, subjects cannot be dropped and be recoverable by agreement nor can the object occur as zero anaphora.

When characteristics (i) and (ii) of sentence-focus sentences are not followed, they become infelicitous. Examples (38) and (39) show violations of characteristic (i) of sentence-focus sentences. Example (38) is infelicitous because constituent order is not SOV, rather, it is OSV. Also notice that the subject *o wëna* (person name) does not show case and does not occur in sentence-initial position. Example (39) is infelicitous because the subject does not occur in sentence-initial position and is not marked by case. In (40), the subject is not overt which makes the sentence infelicitous.

- (38) # Noimika            o    wëna    papia.  
       noimi=ka=a        o    wëna    papi-i-a  
       aguano=VAL=3A/S    tapir    young    carry-IPFV-NPROX  
       ‘O wëna is carrying aguano (sp. of wood).’

- (39) # Ka                xanukama    asana            chakakë        aru-axa.  
       ka=a                xanu=kama    asa=na            chaka-kë        aru-a-x-a  
       VAL=3A/S        woman=PL    manioc=POSS    pound-PART    cook-PFV-3-NPROX  
       ‘The women made masato (traditional drink).’

- (40) # Ain            chichinu            iakëxa.  
       ai=n                chichi=nu        i-ákë-x-a  
       3=POSS        grandmother=LOC    be-DISP-3-NPROX  
       ‘[He] lived with his grandmother.’

Examples (38)-(40) are infelicitous in the context in which any presupposition has already been introduced when they are uttered. However, they are felicitous when they are uttered in the appropriate context for their focus type. In example (38), the object is in sentence-initial position, which suggests that this sentence is an instance of an object-focus sentence. Having this focus type, sentence (38) presupposes both the subject and the verb. Thus, this sentence is used appropriately to convey object focus but not sentence focus. This mismatch between expected focus type (sentence focus) and actual focus type (predicate focus) produces a pragmatic clash. A schematic view of this analysis is given in (41). Pragmatic clashes also occur in examples (39) and (40). These sentences have the form of predicate-focus sentence when the structure of a sentence-focus is expected.

- (41) Sentence: O wëna is carrying aguano  
 Presupposition: -----  
 Assertion: O wëna is carrying aguano  
 Focus: O wëna is carrying aguano  
 Focus type: predicate focus

There is a striking formal similitude between the sentence-focus and the subject-focus sentences. They both share the characteristics that (i) the subject occurs in the pre-field position, (ii) it is marked by case and (iii) the constituent order is SOV. The fact that the subject is marked with case when it is focused will be addressed in Section 3. The syntactic similitude of these focus-type sentences may be attributed to a discriminatory function. Namely, Lambrecht (2000) argues that there is a cross-linguistic tendency by which sentence-focus sentences tend to be differentiated from the unmarked predicate-focus sentences. Thus, languages tend to detopicalize the subject in sentence-focus sentences to make it different from the topical subject of predicate-focus sentences. Languages follow different phonological and/or morpho-syntactic strategies to make this distinction. Kakataibo follows two strategies to morpho-syntactically detopicalize the subject: (a) place the subject in the pre-field position (b) the subject is marked with case. These two characteristics are in contrast with topical subjects (occurring in predicate-focus sentences), which are usually dropped but recoverable by agreement. However, when topical subjects occur overtly they occur after the clitic =*ka* and are not marked with case. Thus, the morpho-syntactic means of detopicalizing the subject makes the subject-focus sentence and the sentence-focus sentence formally similar.

In this section, I have shown the main morpho-syntactic characteristics of sentence-focus sentences: (i) constituent order is SOV with the subject in sentence-initial position showing case and (ii) all constituents are overtly expressed. The properties of sentence-focus sentences are similar to those of subject-focus because those sentences detopicalize the subject using the same morpho-syntactic means.

### 3. Differential Subject Marking (DSM)

In the previous section, it was shown that the pragmatic status of the subject in a given sentence creates a contrast between predicate-focus sentences, on the one hand, and (subject) constituent-focus and sentence-focus sentences, on the other. The subject bears the pragmatic function of topic in predicate-focus sentences whereas it bears the pragmatic function of focus in the other two focus-type sentences. The different pragmatic functions of the subject in the different focus-type sentences are correlated with certain morpho-syntactic features: (i) pro-drop, (ii) position in the sentence and (iii) case. The topical subject of a predicate-focus sentence (i) occurs as a pro-drop constituent in most cases, (ii) cannot occur in sentence-initial position and (iii) tends to not show case, when occurring overtly. In contrast, the focused subject of constituent and sentence-focus sentences (i) needs to occur overtly; it cannot occur as a pro-drop constituent, (ii) occurs in the pre-field position and (iii) always receives a case-marker. These characteristics are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Morpho-syntactic properties of the different focus type sentences

	Predicate focus	Subject (A and S) constituent focus	Sentence focus
Subject pro-drop	+	-	-
Focus in pre-field position	-	+	+
Case	+/-	+	+

This behavior suggests that DSM is triggered by the information structural status of the noun or pronoun. This difference of subject marking holds in addition to the split triggered by the contrast between nouns and pronouns. Notice that other factors such as TAM, the semantics of the verb or animacy/definiteness do not trigger DSM in Kakataibo, as argued below. As shown in Section 1.2., the subject shows a split alignment triggered by referentiality which distinguishes between pronouns (nominative alignment) and nouns (ergative alignment). On top of this split alignment, DSM conditioned by the pragmatic status of the subject takes place. When the subject (A and S) is focused, the ergative vs. nominative split alignment is found. Focused subject pronouns obligatorily show the case marker =*n* while object pronouns are never marked by case. Focused nouns in A function obligatorily have the case marker =*n* whereas focused S and O nouns are never case-marked. However, a neutral alignment, for both nouns and pronouns, occurs when the subject is non-focused, occurring in the middle field position. The presence of a case-marker for non-focused A and S is optional. However, more study is still needed to attempt an explanation of the instances where non-focused subjects do show case. The contrast in case marking of focused and non-focused subjects is summarized in Table 3. While DSM triggered by information structure occurs with both pronouns and nouns, pronouns tend to preserve their case in more instances than nouns.

Table.3 Kakataibo split case alignment triggered by referentiality and focus

	Focused		Non-focused	
	Pronouns	Nouns	Pronouns	Nouns
S	{-n}	{∅}	{-n}/{∅}	{∅}
A	{-n}	{-n}	{-n}/{∅}	{-n}/{∅}
O	{∅}		{∅}	

Minimal pairs distinguished by the information structural status of the subject showing DSM are shown by examples (42)-(43/45). In (42), the subject *uni* ‘man’ is not focused, which makes it occur in the middle-field position and have no case. In contrast, the subject is focused in (43), which makes it occur in the pre-field position and show case. A similar contrast occurs in the minimal pair in (44)-(45). The topical subject ‘my father’ occurs after the clitic =*ka* and without case in (44) whereas the focused subject occurs in the pre-field position and with case in (45).

- (42) Xanuka                      uni    wënë              papia.                      (non-focused subject)  
 xanu=ka=a                      uni    wënë=Ø              papi-i-a  
 woman=VAL=3A/S    man    young=A              carry-IPFV-NPROX  
 ‘The young man carried the WOMAN.’
- (43) Wësi    uninka                      ë    ináxa.                      (focused subject)  
 wësi    uni=n=ka=a                      ë    inan-a-x-a  
 other    man=A=VAL=A/S    1    give-PFV-3-NPROX  
 ‘ANOTHER MAN gave [it] to me.’
- (44) Ka                      ën                      papa              iti                      aia.                      (non-focused subject)  
 Ka=a                      ë=n                      papa= Ø              i-ti                      a-i-a  
 VAL=3A/S    1=POSS              father=A              be-NLZR              do-IPFV-NPROX  
 ‘My father is BUILDING A HOUSE.’
- (45) Ën                      papanka                      iti                      aia.                      (focused subject)  
 ë=n                      papa=n=ka=a                      i-ti                      a-i-a  
 1=POSS              father=A=VAL=3A/S              be-NLZR              do-IPFV-NPROX  
 ‘My FATHER is building a house.’

So far, I have argued that DSM is triggered by information structure in Kakataibo. Now, I will show that this split is not triggered by other factors which trigger DCM cross-linguistically such as the semantics of the NP or the semantics of the verb.

Apart from the split alignment distinguishing between nouns and pronouns based on referentiality, semantic factors of the NP such as animacy and definiteness do not cause the subject to not show case when it is focused (cf. Bossong 1983, Malchukov 2007). Here I will only consider nominal NPs. Animate (i.e. human and animal) nouns as well as inanimate (i.e. objects, natural forces, etc.) nouns show case when they occur as a focused subject. Examples (46) and (47) show non-human animate and natural force inanimate subjects, respectively, bearing a case mark.

- (46) Rununka                      motor    chawóxa.  
 runu=n=ka=a                      motor    chawot-a-x-a  
 snake=A=VAL=3A/S              engine    get.wet-PFV-3-NPROX  
 ‘The snake broke down the engine.’
- (47) Uënanka                      motor    chawóxa.  
 uë=nan=ka=a                      motor    chawot-axa  
 rain=A=VAL=3A/S              engine    get.wet-PFV-3-NPROX  
 ‘The rain broke down the engine.’

The definite vs. indefinite distinction is not morphologically marked in Kakataibo; a given NP may be definite or indefinite depending on the context. However, the third person pronoun *a* can be used to add emphasis to a definite NP. NPs marked as definite by the pronoun

*a* show case as well as the definite/indefinite NPs which are not marked by that pronoun, as shown in (48) and (49).

- (48) A inminka mi ratuaxa.  
 a inmi=n=ka=a mi ratut-a-x-a  
 3 blood=A=VAL=3A/S 2 frighten-PFV-3-NPROX  
 ‘That blood frightened you.’

- (49) Inminka mi ratuaxa.  
 inmi=n=ka=a mi ratut-a-x-a  
 blood=A=VAL=3A/S 2 frighten-PFV-3-NPROX  
 ‘(The) blood frightened you.’

The semantics of the verb does not cause the subject to not show case either. Subjects of transitive verbs with a low prototypical level of transitivity preserve their case. Verbs showing negation, desiderative or future meanings have been analyzed as showing a low degree of transitivity (Hopper & Thompson 1980). Focused subjects occurring with verbs having these operators show case mark, as presented in the following examples.

- (50) Ën onka o paranta pikasi kia. (desiderative)  
 ë=n o=n=ka=a o paranta pi-kas-i ki-i-a.  
 1-POSS parrot=A=VAL=3A/S banana eat-DES-SSPEA say(intr.)-IPFV-NPROX  
 ‘My parrot wants to eat banana.’

- (51) Ënkana nunti amai. (negative)  
 ë=n=ka=na nunti a-ma-i  
 1=A=VAL=1A/S canoe do-NEG-IPFV  
 ‘I am not making a canoe.’

- (52) Ën titanka ë mëtadkanuxu a . (future/unrealized)  
 ë=n tita=n=ka=a ë mē-tadka-nuxu a-a  
 1-POSS mother=A=VAL=3A/S 1 hand-hit-INTL AUX-NPROX  
 ‘My mother is going to hit me on the hand.’

Furthermore, subjects of psychological verbs (in which the object is not directly affected by the action) are also marked with case as subjects of highly prototypical verbs such as ‘kill’, ‘cut’, or ‘break’ do.

- (53) Pedronanka mimi manania.  
 Pedro=nan=ka=a mi=mi manani-i-a  
 Pedro-A=VAL=3A/S 2=DAT accuse-IPFV-NPROX  
 ‘Pedro accuses you.’

- (54) Noruanka o xanu ënmëratì.  
 Norua=nan=ka=a o xanu ënmërat-i-i  
 Norua=A=VAL=3A/S tapir woman love-IPFV-PROX  
 ‘Norua loves tapir woman.’

TAM differences do not trigger DSM either. As shown through this paper, focused subjects show case in different aspects (i.e. imperfective vs. perfective) and in intentional statements. TAM is not a cause for DSM. The focused subject shows case in declarative and interrogative sentences (55); the subject does not occur in imperative sentences.

- (55) Noruankara                                      posonu      nanëaxa.  
 Norua=n=ka=ra=a                                poso=nu     nanë-a-x-a  
 Norua=A=VAL=INT=3A/S                      well-LOC    sink-PFV-3-NPROX  
 ‘Did Norua sink in the well?’

Notice that the instances in which the subject is not case-marked are not due to an intransitivizing process. First, DSM in Kakataibo occurs both with subjects of transitive and intransitive verbs since A and S pronouns are marked with case (accusative alignment) and A nouns are also marked with case (ergative alignment). Thus, the fact that a transitive subject does not show case cannot be attributed to an intransitivizing strategy. Second, Kakataibo shows third person zero anaphora. In a transitive sentence, the O argument can be null, but still recoverable from previous discourse, without decreasing the verbal valence. Thus, the A argument can be the only overt argument in a transitive sentence. Focused subjects show case no matter whether there is an overt object or not.

In this section, I have shown that the focused vs. non-focused status of the subject NP plays a role in the assignment of case to it. Semantic factors of the verb and NP have been considered, showing no effect on case assignment. Furthermore, it has been argued that DSM is not an intransitivizing strategy.

#### 4. Conclusions

The morpho-syntactic correlates of focus realization in Kakataibo, a Panoan language, have been explored in this paper. The discussion centered on three types of information focus: narrow focus, predicate focus and sentence focus. Information focus in Kakataibo can be realized by different strategies, which has been reported in other languages such as Tangale (Hartmann & Zimmermann 2007). Narrow focus on a non-verbal constituent follows an *ex situ* strategy by placing the focused constituent in the pre-field slot. In contrast, narrow focus on the verb is left *in situ*. In turn, predicate focus is encoded by placing the verb in sentence-final position and the object adjacent to it. In the case of sentence focus, constituents follow a SOV order with the subject occurring in the pre-field position.

The fact that narrow focus on the subject and sentence focus are realized similarly is a feature that Kakataibo shares with other languages such as Buli, Dagbane and Gurene (Gur, Fiedler et al. 2010). This isomorphism, in turn, seems to be the result of a strategy languages employ to flag the subject as having a non-default interpretation as non-topic (Lambrecht 2000).

In addition, it has been argued here that the information structural status of the subject plays a role in the presence or not of case on it. Namely, focused subjects always occur in the pre-field position bearing case. Non-focused subjects do not appear in that position and usually do not show case mark. Thus, the Kakataibo data provides further evidence to the claim that information structure categories affect the grammar proper, in particular, case marking (Kwon & Zribi-Hertz 2008, de Hoop & de Swart 2009, Aikhenvald 2010, Iemmolo 2010, Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011).

### References

- AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA. 2010. "Language contact and Pragmatic notions: Tariana in its multilingual context", 17-38. In Camacho, José, Rodrigo Gutiérrez-Bravo and Liliana Sánchez (eds.), *Information Structure in Indigenous Languages of the Americas..* Berlin, Mouton.
- BOSSONG, GEORG. 1983. "Animacy and markedness in universal grammar". *Glossologia* 39, 7-20.
- BRESNAN, JOAN AND SAM MCHOMBO. 1987. Topic, Pronoun, and Agreement in Chichewá. *Language* 63:4, 741-782.
- DALRYMPLE, MARY AND NIKOLAEVA, IRINA. 2011. Objects and information structure. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- DE HOOP, HELEN AND PETER DE SWART. 2009. Cross-linguistic variation in differential subject marking. In De Hoop, Helen and Peter de Swart. *Differential Subject Marking*, Dordrecht, Springer, pp. 1-16.
- DIXON, R. M. W. 1979. Ergativity. *Language* 55:1, 59-138.
- DIXON, R. M. W. 1994. Ergativity. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- FIEDLER, INES. 2010. Subject focus in West African languages. In Zimmermann, Malte and Caroline Féry (eds.). *Information Structure. Theoretical, Typological and Experimental Perspectives*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 234-257.
- FRANK, ERWIN. 1994. Los uni. In Santos, Fernando y Frederica Barclay (eds.). *Guía etnográfica de la Alta Amazonía*, FLACSO/IFEA, Quito, pp.133-237.
- GIVÓN, TALMY. 1983. Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language analysis. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- HARTMANN, KATHARINA AND MALTE ZIMMERMANN. 2007. Focus strategies in Chadic – the case of Tangale revisited. *Studia Linguistica* 61:2, 95-129.
- HOPPER, P. AND SANDRA THOMPSON. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 56: 2, pp. 251-299.
- IEMMOLO, GIORGIO. 2010. Topicality and differential object marking. *Studies in Language* 34:2, pp.239-272.
- KRIFKA, MANFRED. 2008. Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55:3, 243–276.
- KWON, SONG-NIM AND ANNE ZRIBI-HERTZ. 2008. Differential Function Marking, Case, and Information Structure: Evidence from Korean. *Language* 84:2, pp.258-99.
- LAMBRECHT, KNUD. 1994. Information structure and sentence form. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- LAMBRECHT, KNUD. 2000. When subjects behave like objects: a markedness analysis of sentence focus constructions across languages. *Studies in Language* 24:611-82.
- MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ. 2007. Animacy and asymmetries in differential case marking. *Lingua* 118:2, 203-221.
- ROOTH, MATS. 1985. Association with focus. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
- ROOTH, MATS. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.
- SILVERSTEIN, MICHAEL. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In R.M.W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical categories in Australian Languages*. Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, pp.112-171.

- SKOPETEAS et al. 2006. Questionnaire on Information Structure (QUIS): Reference Manual. ISIS, vol. 4. Potsdam, Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- STORTO, LUCIANA. 2011. Information Structure in Karitiana. *Proceedings of CILLA V*, The University of Texas at Austin.
- STORTO, LUCIANA. 2014. Constituent Order and Information Structure in Karitiana. In van Gijn et al. (eds.). *Information Structure and Reference Tracking in Complex Sentences*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 163-192.
- VALLE, DANIEL. 2009. El sistema de marcación de caso en kakataibo. Undergraduate thesis. UNMSM, Lima.
- VALLE, DANIEL. To appear. Desarrollo de morfemas de concordancia de sujeto en kakataibo. *Amerindia*.
- VALLEJOS, ROSA. 2009. The focus function(s) of =pura in Kokama-Kokamilla discourse. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 75:3, 399-432.
- VAN VALIN, ROBERT. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- VAN VALIN, ROBERT. 2009. Information Structure in Banawá, Wari' and Karitiána: An Overview. Available at <http://wings.buffalo.edu/linguistics/people/faculty/vanvalin/infostructure/Site/Intro.html>
- WEBER, DAVID. 1986. Information Perspective, Profile, and Patterns in Quechua. In Chafe, Wallace and Johana Nichols (eds.). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ, Ablex, pp.137-155.
- ZARIQUIEY, ROBERTO. 2011. A grammar of Kashibo-Kakataibo. PhD Dissertation, La Trobe University.
- ZARIQUIEY, ROBERTO. 2012. Ditransitive construction in Kashibo-Kakataibo and the non-distinguishable object analysis. *Studies in Language* 36:4, 882-905.