INFORMATION PACKAGING IN SINHALA: A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF ADVERBIAL CLAUSES IN FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS

VALERIE SULTAN

University of California, Santa Barbara

1. INTRODUCTION. A single utterance in discourse carries within it three different components that contribute to the conveyance of a particular message—syntactic, semantic and pragmatic. To illustrate this, consider the English sentences provided below (boldface indicates stress).

(1)   a. Boo-Boo loves bones.
       b. Bones Boo-Boo loves.
       c. Bones Boo-Boo hates.
       d. Boo-Boo loves **bones**.

Each of these sentences can be compared with one or more of the others to demonstrate the presence of either the syntactic, semantic or pragmatic component. Sentences 1a and 1b both provide the same statement about the world and are thus semantically equivalent, but they differ in terms of their syntax (seen with the change in word order) and pragmatics (seen with the fronting, hence focus, of 'bones'). On the other hand, sentences 1b and 1c are syntactically and pragmatically equivalent but differ with respect to their semantic meaning ('hates' versus 'loves'). Finally, sentences 1a and 1d have the same semantic and syntactic components, but the stress-focus on 'bones' causes these sentences to differ pragmatically.

For the purposes of this paper, the most important comparisons just discussed are those concerning 1a, 1b, and 1d. This is because it is when looking at these examples that we see evidence of what Vallduví and Engdahl (1996) refer to as 'information packaging'. As can be seen in the three sentences expressed in 1a, 1b, and 1d, utterances may express the same propositional content despite changes in sentence structure or intonation or both, but they are not, as Vallduví and Engdahl (1996:459) point out, 'interpretively equivalent in absolute terms'. In fact, these sentences differ because of the extrapropositional, or pragmatic, contribution to meaning, and therefore cannot be used interchangeably in the same context (Szendröi 2004; Vallduví and Engdahl 1996). In other words, it is not the message that is different, but the way in which the message is packaged that is different. In order to address this type of difference, Vallduví and Engdahl (1996:460) refer to this behavior as 'information packaging' which they define as 'a structuring of sentences by syntactic, prosodic, or morphological means that arises from the need to meet the communicative demands of a particular context or discourse'. This is to say that speakers design their talk, both at the discourse and sentence levels, according to their beliefs about what hearers can be assumed to know or have in mind in a given context. As an example of this, it is possible to refer back to the sentences provided above. In these examples, both 1b and 1d are utterances constructed with the expectation that the hearer is aware that there is something that Boo-Boo loves, whereas the object of the love—bones—is presumed to be information that is either new to the hearer or contrasts with the hearer's previously held beliefs. The same, however, cannot be said for 1a.

One of the primary means by which information packaging is represented in a sentence is through the use of focus-ground partitions. Such partitions divide a sentence into the ground—the part which is presumed to be known (Andrews 1990; Szendröi 2004) or predictable (Givón 1990) by the hearer and thus anchors the sentence to the previous discourse or the hearer's 'mental world' (Vallduví and Engdahl 1996)—and the focus—a new, informative (Andrews 1990; Szendröi 2004) or less predictable (Givón 1990) part that contributes to the discourse or the hearer's 'mental world' (Vallduví and Engdahl 1996). The definition of information packaging presented earlier notes that speakers can use morphology, syntax, and prosody to meet different communicative demands, so it is to be expected that the focus-ground division is often represented in the morphosyntax of a language, e.g. with special focus constructions. Such a representation is seen clearly in Sinhala.

Sinhala has an extensive focus construction, as has been widely discussed in the literature (Gair 1970, 1998 [1983], 1998 [1985], 1998 [1989], Gair and Paolillo 1997, Gair and Sumangala 1991, Herring and Paolillo 1995, Kariyakarawana 1998). While it appears that the Sinhala focus construction is likely to have derived from contact with Dravidian languages (Gair 1998 [1985]), it has undergone a great deal of internal development and diversification since that presumed historical influence, and as a result there is an increased role and wider range of discourse uses of focus in Sinhala syntax (ibid). Almost all of these discourse uses, to be discussed in more detail later, revolve around the idea of information packaging by either pointing to information that is expected to be unknown to the hearer or contradicting what is assumed to be known or believed by the hearer. Moreover, these focus constructions tend to involve focusing one of the constituents of the clause, hence bring attention to that constituent's new or contradictory information status.

However, it is possible for speakers of Sinhala to capitalize on the interplay of focus constructions and information status to mark the information status of interclausal relations as well as the information status of constituents. This presents a challenge to traditional notions of focus and information flow, as both have been treated as relevant only with respect to referents in a noun phrase, whereas in Sinhala, both are used to refer to referents of predications, i.e. events and states. Furthermore, the pragmatic factors motivating the use of the focus structure in Sinhala is the same for the referents of both noun phrases and predications. In the preliminary study presented in this paper, I will show that this appears to be the case for a set of data in which the focus form of verbs are used in matrix clauses when there exists a set of particular characteristics with respect to their modifying adverbial clauses. Specifically, it will be shown that focus comes into play when an adverbial clause expresses a new event which provides an explanation for the given or inferred event expressed in the matrix clause.

In order to accomplish this goal, the current paper will begin with a general discussion of adverbial clauses, paying special attention to their different interpropositional functions and discourse roles. Following this will be a brief overview of the structure and use of Sinhala focus, which will lead into a section devoted to the examination of Sinhala adverbial clauses in constructions with focused matrix verbs. Finally, the conclusion will address what these findings mean for the interplay between adverbial clauses, focus, and information packaging.

2. TYPES OF ADVERBIAL CLAUSES. As is noted by Thompson and Longacre (1985), adverbial clauses are those that modify a verb phrase or a sentence. Cross-linguistically, three of the devices used to mark subordinate clauses are also seen to mark adverbial clauses. These are: 1)

adverbial particles (either with or without lexical content), 2) special verb forms (i.e. those not used in independent assertions), and 3) word order. Sinhala utilizes the first two mechanisms. The table below provides a list of the adverbial particles and the verb morphology that is allowable with these morphemes (note that in Sinhala the verb precedes the adverbial particle, which will be shown in the examples in the following section). Also included in this table are verb forms that do not co-occur with an adverbial particle, but rather express the adverbial relationship via bound morphology.

Verb Form	Gloss	Adverbial Particle	Gloss	Interpropositional Relationship
-at	CONC.PRES	----	----	Concessive
-a	PST	*wunat*	'even though'	Concessive
-ot	COND.PRES	----	----	Conditional
-naŋ	COND.PST	----	----	Conditional
-iŋ		*passe*	'after'	Time
-mə		----	----	Simultaneous
		sandaha	'in.order.to'	Purpose
-məṭə		*amətərəwə*	'in.addition.to'	Additive
-gat	PPL.REFL	*gamaŋ*	'while'	Simultaneous
		hinda	'because'	Reason
		nisaa	'because'	Reason
nætti	NEG.ADJ	*hinda*	'because'	Reason (negation)
-nə	ADJ	----	----	Reason
		atərədi	'while'	Simultaneous
		gamaŋ[1]	'while'	Simultaneous
		koṭə	'while'	Simultaneous
		hinda	'because'	Reason
		nisaa	'because'	Reason
		pinisə	'in.order.to'	Purpose
-nnə	INF	----	----	Purpose
		issella	'before'	Time
		kaliŋ	'before'	Time
-pu	PST.ADJ	----	----	Reason, Simultaneous
		gamaŋ	'while'	Simultaneous
		hinda	'because'	Reason
		nisaa	'because'	Reason

TABLE 1. Sinhala adverbial clause adverbial particle and verb forms

Note that there are only three adverbial particles that occur with more than one verb form—*gamaŋ* 'while', *hinda* 'because', and *nisaa* 'because' may be used with any of the three participle forms (*-nə, -gat,* and *-pu*)[2]. In all of these cases, the determining factor governing the use of one verb form over another is the timing of the event in the adverbial clause with respect to the event expressed in the matrix clause. The aspectual relationship between the

---

[1] There is one form with *-nnə* that is followed by both *gamaŋ* and *koṭə*, but it is the form *innə* which does not have a corresponding *-nə* form, so it is doubtful that this form actually represents the infinitive in these cases.
[2] This excludes the co-occurrence of *hinda* with the negative existence morpheme *nætti*

other adverbial particles and their respective verb forms becomes evident when one takes into consideration the semantics of the relationship between the adverbial clause and the matrix clause. With the exception of *gamaŋ,* all adverbial particles expressing simultaneity occur with the present adjectival participle *-nə*[3]. In addition, purpose adverbial clauses, which indicate that the act in the adverbial clause is unrealized at the time of the event in the matrix clause, must be expressed with either the present adjectival participle *-nə* or the infinitive *-nnə*. The infinitive is also the only form allowable with morphemes meaning 'before'.

A brief glance at the right-hand column of Table 1 shows that adverbial morphology can express a number of interpropositional relationships between the matrix and adverbial clauses. The next section provides further exploration and illustration of these types.

2.1. INTERPROPOSITIONAL RELATIONSHIPS. Thompson and Longacre (1985) provide a thorough description of the different interpropositional relationships that adverbial clauses can have with the modified matrix clause. They divide the adverbial clauses of the attested languages of the world into twelve basic types, further categorizing them into two groups. The classification they provide appears below.

Time	Simultaneous
Location	Conditional
Manner	Concessive
Purpose	Substitutive
Reason	Additive
Circumstantial	Absolutive

TABLE 2. Thompson and Longacre's Classification of Adverbial Clauses (1985:177)

As Thompson and Longacre note, some of these interpropositional relationships are expressed through other grammatical means, i.e. relative clauses, and this is the case for Sinhala. As a result, only those relationships that utilize an adverbial clause are discussed here. Explanations and Sinhala examples (where possible) are provided for each of these types in the following subsections[4].

TIME. Time adverbial clauses concern the sequencing relationship between clauses, typically marked either by verbal affixes or by independent morphemes along the lines of the English 'when', 'before', 'after', and so on. In the Sinhala example below, we see the use of the independent adverbial particle *issella* 'before' with a special verb form to mark a time adverbial (the adverbial clause is highlighted).

(2) Turtle Hatchery, Sentence 15 (Santa Barbara)

    hari   welaawətə   matai   magee   yaaluwatai   mee
    so   time.SG.DEF.DAT.   1SG.DAT.and   1SG.GEN friend.SG.DEF.DAT.and   1PROX
            just.in.time

---

[3] It is also possible for a verb with the suffix *-mə* to imply simultaneity (like *-nə*) or purpose (like *- nnə*) (the latter with a special adverbial particle), but this suffix is likely related to the emphatic *-mə* and does not inflect for tense or aspect

[4] All explanations are taken from Thompson and Longacre's description

baaldiyə	koociyə	e-nnə	issella	kooci	paareŋ
bucket.SG.DEF.	train.SG.DEF	come-INF	before	train	road.SG.DEF.ABL
					train.track

ehaaṭə	ga- nnə	puluwaŋ	wun-a
other.side.DAT	take-INF	can	do-PST

'Just in time, my friend and I were able to take the bucket to the other side of the train track before the train came.'

Note that in this case the adverbial is a full clause with a predicate and its arguments. It is also marked with a special time morpheme (i.e. 'before'). In addition, the verb is in the infinitive form, which cannot be used in independent assertions except for imperatives. All of these features make the highlighted clause an adverbial time clauses.

MANNER. In many languages, a manner clause can be introduced with a subordinator such as 'like'. One of the means of expressing manner in Sinhala is through the use of the adverbial particle *widiyəṭə* 'as/like'. An example of this appears below.

(3)   Elicited

Adverbial:	kooṭə	gahee	trikoonəyak	hede-nə	widiyəṭə
	stick.SG.DEF	tree. SG.DEF.LOC	triangle.SG.IND	make-ADJ	as/like

heettukəra-nnə
lean-IMP

'Place the stick on the tree so that it forms a triangle' (lit. 'Lean the stick on the tree like making a triangle')

PURPOSE. Thompson and Longacre point out that the interpropositional relationships purpose and reason are often expressed with the same morphology as both provide explanations for the event expressed in the matrix clause. The difference, they note, is that purpose clauses describe an event that is unrealized at the moment of the main event, which can be indicated by a language's grammar. In Sinhala, purpose can be expressed with the use of the infinitive verb form without any other subordinating particle[5]. The example below shows this. Note that the adverbial clause does not have an expressed A argument and therefore represents a general A.

(4)   Chinese New Year, Sentence 4 (Santa Barbara)

ciina	alut	aurudə	samərа-nnə
Chinese	new	year.SG.DEF	celebrate.INF

wiwidə	wiwidə	saŋdaršənə	saha	perəhærə	pawat-wənəwa
various	various	show.PL	and	parade.PL	hold-CAUS

'To celebrate the Chinese New Year various shows and parades are held.'

---

[5] Sinhala also has subordinating particles that are equivalent to the English 'in order to', *pinisə* and *sandaha,* which are used with other verb forms, but these do not appear in examples as they did not appear in the data collected.

REASON. As was noted earlier, purpose and reason are often expressed with the same morphology, but some languages use an adverbial particle that explicitly expresses a causal relationship. Sinhala is an example of the latter type of language, as can be seen with the example below.

(5) Frog Story, Lines 15-16 (Rice)

ballaṭə	dæn	kohoməhari	oluwə	eliyəṭə	ga-nnə	wiḍiyak
dog.SG.DEF.DAT	now	somehow	head.SG.DEF	out.DAT	take-INF	way.SG.IND

næti	hinda	balla	daŋgələ-la	daŋgələ-la	janeelen
NEG.ADJ	because	dog.SG.DEF	fidget-PPL	fidget-CONV	window.SG.DEF.ABL

eliyəṭə	pænn-a
out.DAT	jump-PST

'Now, because the dog had no way of taking his head out, the dog kept fidgeting about and jumped out the window.'

CIRCUMSTANTIAL. Circumstantial adverbial clauses provide information about how the event expressed by the matrix clause came to be. In English, this is usually expressed with the adverbial particles 'by' or 'without'. The one example of a circumstantial adverbial clause in the Sinhala data uses a time adverbial particle, but as Thomspson and Longacre point out, often time clauses and cause clauses are conflated. This example appears below.

(6) Tsunami, Sentence 1 (Santa Barbara)

mamə	sunaamiə	gænnə	šrilaŋkawe	saha
1SG	tsunami.SG.DEF	about	Sri.Lanka.LOC	and

aasiyawe	sunaamiə	gænnə	dænə-gatee
Asia.LOC	tsunami.SG.DEF	about	to.know-REFL.FOC.PST

əntarjaaləyæ	pwuətpatak	kiyəwə-nnə	gamaŋ
on.the.internet	newspaper.SG.DEF	read-INF	while

'I got to know about the tsunami in Sri Lanka and Asia while reading a newspaper on the Internet.'

SIMULTANEOUS. According to Thompson and Longacre, when two events co-occur at the same time, then languages provide a mechanism by which speakers can express that one is the backgrounded event that provides the context for the main event. This can be done one of two ways—either with a marker explicitly indicating simultaneity or with an aspect marker. As can be seen in the example below, in Sinhala, both are used together—a free adverbial particle indicating simultaneity is used along with the present adjectival form of the verb.

(7) Frog Story, Lines 24-25 (Rice)

laməya	gembawə	bimə	hoyə-nə	koṭə
child.SG.DEF	frog.SG.DEF.ACC	ground	search-ADJ	while

miiyek	lamǝyage	nahayǝ	hæpuw-a
mouse.SG.IND	child.SG.DEF.GEN	nose.SG.DEF	bite-PST

'While the child was searching for the frog on the ground, a mouse bit the child's nose.'

CONDITIONAL.   Most languages mark two kinds of conditional—reality conditional and unreality conditionals.   The former refers to real, habitual or past situations, whereas the latter refers to those events that we imagine or predict (Thompson and Longacre 1985). Syntactically, these events are usually represented with an adverbial particle such as 'if', as with English. In Sinhala, however, conditional statements are marked only by verbal suffixes— -*ot* in the non-past tense and –*naŋ* in the past tense. An example of each of these appears below.

(8)   <u>Elicited</u>

Present:

ohu	væṭun-ot	maṭǝ	ohuwǝ	alla-nnǝ	puluwaŋ
3SG.M	fall-COND.PRES	3SG.DAT	3SG.M.ACC	catch-INF	can

'If he falls, I can catch him'

Past:

oyaa	hoňdǝṭǝ	vædǝ keraa-naŋ	hoňdǝ	lakunu	ga-nnǝ	tibun-a
2SG	good.DAT?	work.do-COND.PST	good	grade.PL	get-INF	keep-PST
						could.have

'If you had worked hard, you would have gotten good grades.'

CONCESSIVE.   Concessive adverbial clauses mark a concession against which the matrix clause is contrasted.   According to Thompson and Longacre, there are two general subcategories within the broader category of concessive—definite and indefinite. Definite concessive clauses are usually marked by an adverbial particle like 'although' and can be identified by the fact that they can be paraphrased by the statement 'in spite of the fact that ...' (note the definite noun phrase). Indefinite concessive clauses are those which indicate the sense of 'no matter what' or 'whatever'.

As with the conditional clauses in Sinhala, the concessive adverbial clauses are marked by verbal morphology alone, but this is true only in the past tense. If the verb in the adverbial clause takes the non-past marker then it must be followed by the adverbial particle *wunat* 'even though'. This can be seen with the data below.

(9)   <u>Elicited</u>

Present:

balla	mas	ka-nǝwa	wunat	apee	kukulaṭǝ
dog.SG.DEF	meat	eat-IMPF	even.though	1PL.GEN	chicken.SG.DEF.DAT

haani	kera-nne	næǣ
harm	do-INF	NEG

'Although our dog eats meat, she won't take our chicken'

Past:	balla	mas	kææw-at	apee	kukulaṭə	haani
	dog.SG.DEF	meat	eat-CONC.PST	1PL.GEN	chicken.SG.DEF.DAT	harm

	kera-nne	næǣ
	do-INF	NEG

'Although our dog ate meat, she wouldn't take our chicken'

SUBSTITUTIVE. Substitutive adverbial clauses express a relationship in which the matrix clause event replaces the adverbial clause event, the former being the unexpected event and the latter the expected one. This is expressed in English with 'instead of' and 'rather than'. In Sinhala, substitutives are constructed by using the morpheme *nætuwə* 'without'. Interestingly, sentences constructed in this way can mean either that the event in the adverbial clause was replaced by that in the matrix clause or that both events were supposed to occur, but the one in the adverbial clause did not occur.

(10) Elicited

æwidi-nnə	ya-nne	nætuwə	ohu	tiwi	bæluw-a
walk-INF	go-FOC.PRES	without	3SG.M	TV	watch-PST

'He watched TV instead of going for a walk' or 'He watched TV without going for a walk'

ADDITIVE. Some languages have morphology that indicates a relationship in which one event occurs in addition to another. In English, phrases such as 'in addition to' and words like 'besides' are used to express this relationship. Despite the fact that Sinhala has converbal affixes on verbs, it is possible to construct an additive adverbial clause using the subordinating morpheme *amətərəwə* and a special verb form with the suffix -*məṭə*. A Sinhala example is provided below.

(11) Elicited

keek	picci-məṭə	amətərəwə	ohu	kukis	hadə-nəwa
cake	bake-?	in.addition.to	3SG	cookies	make

'In addition to baking a cake, he is making cookies'

ABSOLUTIVE. The interpropositional category absolute is a broad category, which must meet the following conditions (Thompson and Longacre 1985:200-201):

1. The clause is marked in some way as being subordinate
2. There is no explicit signal of the relationship between the main and subordinate clause
3. The interpretation of the relationship is inferred from the pragmatic and linguistic context.

These clauses are used when there is no need to explicitly specify how the main and adverbial clauses are related. They can be identified by special marking on the verb (often nominalization) and a general adverbial particle. In Sinhala, this can be accomplished with converbs, as is seen in the example below (cf. Taylor current volume).

(12) Andare Sugar Story, Sentence 17 (Santa Barbara)

itiŋ	andəre	ehemə	putaaṭə	kiyə-la
therefore	Andare	in.that.way	son.SG.DEF.DAT	say-PPL

aayet	maaligaawəṭə	giy-a
again	palace.SG.DEF.DAT	go-PST

'Therefore, having said that to his son, Andare went to the palace.'

2.2. DISCOURSE ROLES. Thompson and Longacre's (1985) discussion of the discourse roles of adverbial clauses points to two main functions. When an adverbial clause is predicated (through lexical overlap) with another clause in the story, its function is to aid in the progression of the narrative to its goal. When it is not predicated, its function is usually to contribute information that is only relevant to the matrix clause that it modifies.

Ramsay's (1985) findings support and extend Thompson and Longacre's. In her work on preposed versus postposed adverbial clauses in English, she finds a relationship between position and function. Those adverbial clauses that appear before the matrix clause act as a cohesive device, advancing the narrative. On the other hand, those that appear after the matrix clause are only locally significant, completing the information provided in the matrix clause.

Related to the concept of local relevance is work on the role between foreground and background information and independent versus dependent clauses. While this work has been fairly controversial, as the definitions and determinations of foreground versus background information are fuzzy, there does seem to be a relationship between clause type and narrative role. Tomlin (1985) tries to operationalize foreground and background, and he shows that adverbial clauses do tend to contain background information. When looking at the findings discussed earlier, this result is not surprising, as clauses that are only locally relevant and do not advance the narrative are likely to be background as well.

3. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF FOCUS IN SINHALA.

3.1. THE SYNTACTIC STRUCTURE OF SINHALA FOCUS. The primary means by which Sinhala brings a certain element into focus is the use of tense-based focus morphology on the verb (*-nne* if the verb is in non-past and *-e* if the verb is in the past). The focused element then usually appears postverbally, causing a shift in the more typical SOV constituent order (and hence the characterization of Sinhala as having variable constituent order). The example below shows a sentence with different constituents focused.

(13)   Basic:

nimal	dælak	ekkə	maalu	allə-nəwa
Nimal	net.SG.IND	with	fish.PL	catch

'Nimal is catching fish with a net' (as a general statement of fact)

a.   Focus:

nimal	dælak	ekkə	alla-nne	maalu
Nimal	net.SG.IND	with	catch.FOC.PRES	fish.PL

'It is fish that Nimal is catching with a net'

b.   Focus:

nimal	maalu	alla-nne	dælak	ekkə
Nimal	fish.PL	catch.FOC.PRES	net.SG.IND	with

'It is with a net that Nimal is catching fish'

    c. Focus: dælak   ekkə maalu <mark>alla-nne</mark>   nimal
                net.SG.IND with fish.PL catch.FOC.PRES Nimal
                'It is Nimal that is catching fish with a net'

In each of the sentences above, the verb is specially marked for focus, and the focused element—'the fish', 'with a net', and 'Nimal' respectively—follows. Oftentimes, though, if the focused element appears before the verb or *in situ* then it is marked with a focus morpheme such as *tamai* 'indeed' (see the example below). This is not, however, always the case, and it is even possible for *tamai* to appear after a post-verbal focused element. The reasons behind the use of *tamai* or lack thereof appears to be discourse-based and needs to be investigated further.

(14) <u>Tsunami, Sentence 13 (Santa Barbara)</u>
      itiŋ   ehemə   tamai   maŋ sunaamiyə   gænə   muliŋmə
      therefore in.that.way indeed 1SG tsunami.SG.DEF about first

       dænəgatte
       know-REFL.FOC.PAST

      'Therefore, that was how I first got to know about the tsunami.'

The focus constructions discussed in this paper refer to those cases in which the focus morphology appears on the verb, regardless of whether or not the focused element appears with *tamai*.

3.2. THE VARIOUS ROLES OF SINHALA FOCUS. Gair (1998 [1985]) points out that although Sinhala focus may have derived from contact with neighboring Dravidian languages, the use of focus has diversified and become a more central part of Sinhala grammar since that historical contact. This section of the paper discusses some of the main areas in which focus forms can be found[6].

PRESENTATIONAL AND CONTRASTIVE. The two most common typological functions of focus constructions are presentational and contrastive. In both cases, the focused element is something the hearer is assumed not to know, either because it is new (presentational) or because it contradicts what the hearer presupposes (contrastive). In Sinhala, both of these structures appear alike syntactically and are distinguished only by context. An example of each is provided below.

      Presentational
(15) <u>Chinese New Year, Sentence 2 (Santa Barbara)</u>
      mamə wæɖəkar-ee waarta karuwek hæṭiyəṭə
      1SG   work-FOC.PST report do-NOM   as

      'I worked as a reporter' (new information)

---

[6] Note that this paper only includes examples with focus morphology on the verb. There are other ways of expressing focus, but that is not covered here.

Contrastive
(16) <u>Elicited</u>
ṭikeṭekak	gatt-e	nimal
ticket.SG.IND	take-FOC.PST	Nimal

'Nimal bought a ticket.' (as opposed to another person)

OTHER.   In addition to the discourse-based use of focus in declarative clauses, focus structures have developed as obligatory elements in questions and negations and have also grammaticized in some common collocations (i.e. epistemic stance using *maŋ hitanne* 'I think', equationals using focus forms of *kiyannə* 'to say', and locationals using focus forms of *tiyennə*). They also appear with certain adverbial clauses. While the literature on Sinhala focus has addressed many of the functions of Sinhala focus, the role of focus with adverbial clauses has yet to be discussed (Gair 1970, 1998 [1983], 1998 [1985]; Gair and Paolillo 1997; Gair and Lelwala 1991; Herring and Paolillo 1995; Kariyakarawana 1998; Paolillo 1994). Providing a preliminary analysis to discover the motivation governing the use of focus forms with adverbial clauses is the goal of the current paper. For this reason, the following section covers adverbial clause focus constructions in greater detail.

4. FOCUSED ADVERBIAL CLAUSES AND SINHALA DISCOURSE.
4.1. DATA. The data used in the current paper come from a collection of eleven stories of lengths varying from 1½ to 4 minutes. These stories were elicited from two different speakers in two separate field methods classes, one at Rice University and the other at the University of California, Santa Barbara. A total of 50 sentences with adverbial clauses appear in these eleven stories. In the analysis phase, all of the adverbial clauses and their respective matrix clauses were analyzed and classified according to the following features:

1. Relative order of matrix and adverbial clauses
2. Semantics of interpropositional relationship (cf. Thompson and Longacre (1985))
3. Presence of focus morphology on adverbial clause verbs
4. Information status of event/state of adverbial clause
5. Predication of the event/state of adverbial clause in preceding or following sentences[7]
6. Presence of focus morphology on matrix clause verbs
7. Information status of event/state of matrix clause
8. Predication of the event/state of matrix clause in preceding or following sentences

With respect to information status, all of the adverbial clauses were coded according to whether they were New, Given, or Inferred following Chafe's (1976) definitions in which New refers to information which the speaker assumes the addressee is not expected to know at that point, Given information is that which the speaker assumes to be in the addressee's consciousness, and information that is Inferred may not be directly in the speaker's consciousness but can be easily accessed from given context (i.e. that someone was tired can

---

[7] Predication was measured by whether or not the event was mentioned in an earlier or later sentence. The reason that event and sentence was chosen is that both of these represent complete ideas, and it was necessary to see if the complete idea referenced in the adverbial clause was referenced elsewhere.

be inferred if it is known that s/he rested). To illustrate the information status distinction, as well as each of the other categorizations, an example from the stories appears below with the respective analysis.

(17) Chinese New Year, Sentence 1 (Santa Barbara)

mamə	aurudu	tunəkaṭə	issella	santabarbarawaṭə	e-nnə	kaliŋ
1SG	year.PL	three.IND.DAT	before	Santa.Barabra.?.DAT	come-INF	before

haŋkaŋ	welə	aurudu	dekak	wæḍəkər-a
Hong.Kong	LOC.PL	year.PL	two.IND	work-PST

'Before I came to Santa Barbara three years ago, I worked in Hong Kong for two years.'

In this example, the sentence is the very first in the narrative. The interpropositional relationship between the matrix and the adverb is along a time dimension (i.e. 'before'). The intrasentential ordering of the clauses is adverbial then matrix. Neither the verb in the adverbial clause nor the one in the matrix clause have focus morphology. The event in the adverbial clause (coming to Santa Barbara) can be inferred from the context, as the speaker is telling the story in Santa Barbara but is originally from Sri Lanka. This event, however, is not mentioned anywhere else in the narrative and is thus not predicated by another sentence. On the other hand, while the event described in the matrix clause is new information, it is referred to in the very next sentence of the discourse. This information is summarized in the table below.

1. Intra-sentential order: Adverbial, Matrix
2. Adverbial type: Time
3. Adverbial verb focus: No
4. Adverbial info. status: Inferred
5. Adverbial predication: None
6. Matrix verb focus: No
7. Matrix info. status: New
8. Matrix predication: First Next

TABLE 3. Summary of analysis of sentence in example 28

As was noted, the example just presented does not have a verb with focus morphology in either the matrix or the adverbial clause, but it was mentioned in the section on focus constructions in Sinhala that adverbial clauses are one of the instances in which focus can be seen; and in the data collected for this investigation, there were a total of 7 sentences with adverbial clauses in which a verb carried the focus morpheme (one of which was eliminated from the analysis because it involved negation, which necessitates the use of the focus form of the verb). Therefore, it is worthwhile to determine what, if any, features of sentences with an adverbial clause call for a focus construction. The analysis prepared for this paper indicated some general patterns for those particular sentences, and these patterns will be addressed in the next section.

4.2. GENERAL PATTERNS OF ADVERBIALS IN FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS.   When comparing the characteristics of the sentences with both adverbial clauses and focus constructions, certain patterns emerged. The table below provides the information concerning the characteristics of the six relevant sentences found in the data.

From the data in the table above, there are patterns that become evident. In the row concerning Adverbial Clause Type, we see that the interpropositional relationship in these cases is predominantly reason. There are only two cases which differ, one which is purpose-based and the other which is circumstantial-based; however, the semantics of purpose and circumstantial are related to reason (note that reason and purpose are often represented with the same morphology because they 'can be seen as providing EXPLANATIONS for the occurrence of a given state or action' (Thompson and Longacre 1985:185, emphasis in original)). As a result, all of these can be subsumed under the category 'explanatory'.

With respect to Clause Order, all of the examples provided appeared in the order matrix clause followed by adverbial clause. This is not surprising if we consider the most typical word order in focus constructions noted in section 3.1.2., i.e. focused element following the focus form of the verb. In these cases, therefore, the adverbial clause is the focused element, taking its expected post-verbal position. It is also for this reason that all of the matrix verbs are focused, whereas those in the adverbial clause are not (indicated in the table by 'Yes' in the row 'Matrix Verb Focus' and 'No' in the row 'Adverbial Verb Focus').

The remaining columns concern the information status of the clauses and whether the situations (events/states) of the clauses are predicated elsewhere in the discourse. All of the matrix clauses in these examples refer to an event that is expected to be known by the hearer, either because it was given in the previous discourse or because it can be inferred from the circumstances in which the story was told, and all except for one is predicated by the sentence just preceding them. In addition, none of these clauses are mentioned again in the rest of the story. On the other hand, when looking at adverbial clauses, all of the entries except one are both new and not predicated by any other sentence. The one exception, entry 6, involves an adverbial clause whose event is given in the preceding sentence, and it will be discussed in the section concerning exceptions.

The correlates presented in the table above provide an impetus for determining the functional motivations for focusing these particular adverbial clauses. These motivations are the focus of the following section.

4.3. IMPLICATIONS OF THE PATTERNS. The data just presented indicated that adverbial clauses in focus constructions tend to share the following characteristics: 1) An explanation-based interpropositional relationship, 2) An intrasentential order of matrix followed by adverbial clause, 3) A matrix clause that is expected to be known by the hearer because it was mentioned in the just preceding sentence or because it can be inferred from the circumstances, and 4) An adverbial clause that is both new and unique in the discourse. In the following two subsections, the relationship among these characteristics is examined and the exception to these patterns mentioned earlier is explained in light of this relationship. The final subsection presents evidence for the uniqueness of the characteristics of focused adverbial clauses by comparing them with the other adverbial clauses found in the data.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Story	*Andare*	*Andare*	*Mahadænəmutta*	*Tsunami*	*Vesak*	*Yaalə*
Clause Order	Mat, Adv	Mat, Adv	Mat, Adv	Mat, Adv	Mat, Adv	Mat, Adv
Adverbial Clause Type	Purpose	Reason	Reason	Circumstantial	Reason	Reason
Adverbial Verb Focus	No	No	No	No	No	No
Adverbial Information Status	New	New	New	New	New	Given
Adverbial Predication	None	None	None	First Next	None	First Prev.
Matrix Verb Focus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Matrix Information Status	Given	Given	Inferred	Inferred	Given	Given
Matrix Predication	First Prev.	First Prev.	First Prev.	None[8]	First Prev.	First Prev.

TABLE 4. Summary of the features of sentences with adverbial clauses and focus constructions[9]

---

[8] Despite not being mentioned earlier (as it is the first sentence in the story), this matrix clause is considered inferred because the prompt was 'Tell me how you learned about the tsunami', hence making the hearing about the tsunami (expressed in the matrix clause) given.

[9] As was noted earlier, the sentence number in the discourse was also examined, but does not appear to play a role, as focused adverbial clauses can occur anywhere in a discourse.

THE CORRELATIONS. One of the key related features of sentences with both adverbial clauses and focus constructions concerns the clause order and the verbal focus forms. A common placement for focused constituents in Sinhala focus constructions is postverbal. The fact that we find adverbial clauses following matrix verbs with focus forms indicates that the same behavior occurs with elements larger than a phrase, namely with clauses that bear a relationship to the matrix verb. Therefore, Sinhala speakers have the ability to focus an even broader range of elements.

The question then arises what would motivate a Sinhala speaker to use a focus construction with an adverbial clause, and it is here that we see how information status plays a role. The first thing to note is that there is a difference in the information status of the two clauses with the adverbial clause expressing new information, a characteristic not found in those sentences with a non-focus-marked matrix verb (a point that is addressed in §4.3.3). More specifically, the event in the matrix clause is given whereas the event in the adverbial clause is new. As was discussed in both the introduction and the section on the types of Sinhala focus structure, a primary function of focus in languages is to point to new participants. Extending what was found earlier concerning the extrapolation of post-verbal focused participants to post-verbal focused clauses, we can argue that a similar extrapolation is occurring here. Namely, it is not just new participants of a discourse that are focused, but new information as a whole, including new states and events. Furthermore, the interpropositional relationship between the clauses serves to explain the event in the matrix clause. This is expected because in these cases, we have focused new information that modifies only a particular given event as opposed to modifying the narrative at large, and such information is likely to provide an explanation— hence its use with purpose, reason, and circumstantial interpropositional relationships.

In order to illustrate how the correlations work, it is worthwhile to look at some of the examples from the data. In example 19, we see the very beginning of the story of Mahadaenemutta. The sentence of interest is the second, but the first and third have been provided for context.

(18)   Mahadaenemutta (Santa Barbara)

Sentence 1:
ekomatekədawəsəkə	laŋkaawe	dakunu	prədeešəye	kæægallə
once.upon.a.time	(Sri)Lanka.LOC	south	province.SG.DEF	Kaegalla

kiyən-a	nagərəye	mahadǽnəmutta	kiye-la
know.as-PST	town.SG.DEF.LOC	Mahadaenemutta	know.as-PPL

siiyakenek	hiṭiy-a
grandfather.person.SG.DEF	exist-PST
old.man	

'Once upon a time in the town known as Kaegalla in Sri Lanka's Southern province there was an old man knows as Mahadaenemutta.'

Sentence 2:
mahadǽnəmuttaṭə	ehemə	mamə	aaw-e	eya	itaamat
Mahadaenemutta.DAT	that.way	1SG	come-FOC.PST	3SG	very

ugat	pudgələyek	hæṭiyəṭə	gamee	minisu
wise	person.SG.IND	as.DAT	village.SG.DEF.LOC	man.PL

      salǝkǝ-pu   nisaa
      consider-PST.ADJ   because

      'The name came in that way to Mahadaenemutta because the people of the village considered him to be a very wise person.'

Sentence 3:   mahadænǝmuttaṭǝ   goolǝyo   pasdenekut   hiṭiy-a
            Mahadaenemutta.DAT follower.PL five.people.and exist-PST

      'Mahadaenemutta also had five followers.'

In this example, the character of Mahadaenemutta is introduced in the first sentence. Because the hearer can be expected to know from the previous sentence that the man had been given the name Mahadaenemutta, the new information in the clause is the circumstances or reasons that led to the giving of his name. This contrast in information status is represented syntactically by the focusing of the adverbial clause, represented with a focus morpheme on the verb and the immediately postverbal position of the adverbial clause. Notably, the state described by the adverbial clause is not mentioned in the following sentence, and in fact is not mentioned at any other place in the story.

In example 20, the story of Andare and his eating of the sugar in front of the palace has just begun. The relevant sentence to the current study is the fifth sentence of the story. The first three sentences establish respectively the existence of the jester Andare, that he usually worked at the king's palace, and that workers in the king's palace were treated very well by the king. The fourth, fifth, and sixth sentences appear below (as with the earlier example, the surrounding sentences provide context for the sentence under study).

(19)   Andare Sugar Story (Santa Barbara)

Sentence 4:   dawǝsak   da   andǝree   rajjǝmaaligaawǝṭǝ   weḍǝṭǝ   udee
            day.SG.IND   ?   Andare   palace.SG.DEF.DAT   work.DAT   morning

            ya-nǝ   koṭǝ   maaligaawǝ   issǝrǝha   siini   goḍak   elǝ-la
            go-ADJ while palace.SG.DEF in.front sugar pile.SG.IND spread-PPL

            tiye-nǝwa andǝree dækk-a
            keep-IMPF   Andare   see-PST

            'One day, while Andare was going to the palace to work in the morning, he saw a pile of sugar spread out in front of the palace.'

Sentence 5:   ee   siini   ehemǝ   elǝ-la   tibbe   weele-nnǝ
            DIST   sugar that.way spread-PPL keep-FOC.PST   dry-INF

            'The sugar was spread in that way to be dried.'

Sentence 6:   mokǝdǝ dawas kiipǝyǝkǝṭǝ   issǝlla hungak   wæssǝ ewi-la
            because day.PL few.SG.IND.DAT before lot.SG.IND rain   come-PPL

            siini   malu   hungak   temi-la
            sugar sack.PL lot.SG.IND wet-PPL

            'Because a few days ago a lot of rain came and many sacks of sugar got wet.'

The first sentence in example 30 establishes the foundation upon which the rest of the story will be built by introducing the sugar that Andare will soon eat. The next sentence provides an explanation for the unexpected spreading of the sugar on the ground. In this sentence, the adverbial clause expressing purpose is focused and immediately follows the focused verb. As with the preceding example, this focusing is done with the focus form of the verb in the matrix clause and the post-verbal position of the adverbial clause[10]. The reason for the focusing of the adverbial clause in this example is again a difference in information status and predication. The information in the matrix clause of sentence 5 is introduced in the immediately preceding clause, whereas the purpose explanation provided by the adverbial clause is not mentioned elsewhere in the story. In addition, this explanation is only relevant to the sentence to which it belongs.

As is seen with the above examples, the relationships among the features of the adverbial clauses in focus constructions also support the findings of both Ramsay (1985) and Thompson and Longacre (1985) concerning the discourse roles of adverbial clauses. As was discussed earlier, Ramsay's study found that in English, a difference in position of the adverbial clause reflected a difference in discourse function, with one position indicating a more limited focus, elaborating the matrix clause, and another position acting as a means to advance the narrative. This point is made again by Thompson and Longacre, as they note that adverbial clauses that share an intraparagraph relation involve paraphrasing another element of the paragraph, whereas those that do not only contribute local background to the surrounding sentence. The adverbials in this study all appear after the matrix clause. In addition, they all provide new information that modifies a matrix clause containing an event that is already known, thus limiting the scope of the matrix. As a result, these adverbial clauses are not re-predicated, as they do not constitute a significant event that advances the plot. Therefore the results here support both of these studies.

THE EXCEPTION. The correlates just discussed were consistent among all of the examples except for the one example from the *Yaale* story, in which the event in the adverbial clause is given in the preceding sentence, resulting in a lack of difference in information status between the matrix and the adverbial clauses. This particular sentence is the last sentence of the actual narrative. It appears in the example below along with its surrounding sentences.

(20)   Yaale (Santa Barbara)
Sentence 11:   mæturuwa-iŋ   passe   ee   aliya   ekəpaarəṭəmə
               chant-?   after   DIST elephant.SG.DEF one.?.EMPH
                                                            suddenly

               wanəyaṭə   aayet   diuw-a
               jungle.SG.DEF.DAT   again   run-PST

               'After he chanted, that elephant suddenly ran again into the jungle.'

---

[10] It needs to be noted that the reason clause following the infinitive verb *weelennə*, beginning with *mokədə* 'because', is actually not an adverbial clause but a separate sentence that has dropped the inflected verb *tibba* 'place-PST' from the end.

Sentence 12: itiŋ   meekə   apiṭə   itaamat pudumə   awastaawak
                therefore 1PROX.SG.INAN 1PL.DAT very   incredible occasion.SG.IND

'Therefore this was to us a very incredible occasion'

Sentence 13: mukədə ekə atəkiŋ   apiṭə   pee-nne   eekə
                because one hand.SG.IND.ABL 1PL.DAT see-FOC.PRES DIST.SG.INAN

ee   aliyə   aayet wanəyaṭə   diuw-e
DIST elephant.SG.DEF again jungle.SG.DEF.DAT run-FOC.PST

ṭrækə   mahattəya   maturə-pu   hinda-i   kiyə-la
tracker gentleman.SG.DEF chant.PST.ADJ. because-COMP say-PPL
                                                          COMP

anit   pættəṭə   apiṭə   mætir-iimə gænə kisimə
other side.SG.DEF.DAT 1PL.DAT chant-NOM about any

wišwaasəyəkut   næhæ
belief.SG.IND.and NEG.have

'Because on the one hand we saw the elephant run into the jungle again because the ranger chanted; on the other hand, we had no belief about chanting'

Sentence 14: itiŋ   eekə   tamai magee keṭi kataawə
                therefore DIST.SG.INAN indeed 1SG.GEN short story.SG.DEF

'Therefore this is my short story.'

In order to determine why this particular sentence differs from the others in the collection, it is necessary to establish the motivations behind the use of the focus form here. The storyteller begins this sentence stating that the event just mentioned was *itaamat pudumə awastaawak* 'a very incredible occasion'. This is a key statement in determining what is happening with the sentence under study, as the simple running of the elephant into the jungle would not be remarkable on its own. Rather, it is the fact IT WAS BECAUSE THE RANGER CHANTED that the elephant ran into the jungle that is noteworthy in this narrative. Therefore, what we see here is another function of focus forms, namely highlighting an unexpected, thus noteworthy, interpropositional relationship. The unexpected reason relationship between the two events is what is important. The focus is on the entirely unexpected causal interpropositional relationship between the two events. This provides further evidence that not only can participants be highlighted, but events and their interrelationships may as well.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NONFOCUSED ADVERBIAL CLAUSES. As has been shown, all sentences with focused adverbial clauses share particular features. The question that must now be addressed is whether or not these features are unique to sentences with focused adverbial clauses in the data collected. In order to establish that this is indeed the case, it is necessary to examine the characteristics of non-focused adverbial clauses and compare them with focused adverbial clauses, specifically looking at: 1) intrasentential order of matrix and adverbial clause, 2) information statuses of matrix and adverbial clauses, and 3) interpropositional relationship.

Because of the nature of focus structures, namely the typical post-verbal position of the focused element, it is no surprise that all of the focused adverbial clauses follow their matrix clause. It is also to be expected that in sentences with non-focused adverbial clauses, the order will likely be an adverbial clause followed by the matrix, and this is what is demonstrated in the data. In all but three sentences with non-focused adverbial clauses, the adverbial clause appears first.

Due to the fact that the positioning of focused adverbial clauses can so easily be related back to the syntax of focus as a whole, the remaining two characteristics—information status and interpropositional relationship—are more central to determining whether or not the focused adverbial clauses have a special discourse purpose. In the first case, it is important to determine whether or not there is a distinction with respect to the information status of the matrix and adverbial clauses. The table below provides data for the four possible permutations[11] of information status for both nonfocused and focused adverbial clauses.

Information Status Matrix/Adverbial	Non-focused Adverbial Clauses	Focused Adverbial Clauses
New/New	10	0
New/Given	26	0
Given/New	2	5
Given/Given	5	1
TOTAL	43	6

TABLE 5. Information Status of Matrix and Adverbial Clauses

As is evidenced in the table above, sentences with non-focused adverbial clauses predominantly have new information in the matrix clause and very frequently given information in the adverbial, whereas focused adverbial clauses always have a given event in the matrix clause with the adverbial clause primarily containing new information. Note that in most cases, regardless of focus, the information status of the matrix clause and adverbial clause are opposite of one another. The fact that sentences with focused adverbial clauses have an inverse information status relationship to those with nonfocused adverbial clauses is not surprising when considering the discourse role of these clauses. As was noted earlier, the focused adverbial clauses tend to have a limited scope, only modifying their respective matrix clause (and are hence often new with given matrix clauses). On the other hand, given adverbial clauses tend to act as narrative ties, linking previous events with a new event in the matrix clause (cf. Ramsay's (1985) findings on postposed and preposed adverbial clauses and Tomlin's (1985) work on adverbial clauses and foreground and background). It is also worth noting that both cases in which a nonfocused adverbial clause was new while the matrix clause was given were both expressing an interpropositional relationship of simultaneity, which points to the significance of interpropositional relationship.

Although all of the focused adverbial clauses had an explanatory relationship with their matrix clause (either purpose, reason, or circumstantial), it is not the case that only focused adverbial clauses have such a relationship, as the data indicate that nonfocused adverbial clauses may also share an explanatory relationship with their matrix clause. However, nonfocused adverbial clauses are far less restricted than focused adverbial clauses, as they are

---

[11] For ease of reference, Inferred information status is collapsed with Given in this table.

able to express a variety of interpropsositional relationships in addition to cause. This is seen in the table below.

Interpropositional Relationship	Non-focused Adverbial Clauses	Focused Adverbial Clauses
Explanatory:		
Reason[12]	6	4
Purpose	4	1
Circumstantial	1	1
Simultaneous	21	0
Time	8	0
Absolutive	3	0
TOTAL	43	6

TABLE 6. Interpropositional Relationships of Adverbial Clauses

Table 6 indicates that while focused adverbial clauses are limited to explanatory interpropositional relationships, non-focused adverbial clauses have more varied functions. Indeed, nonfocused adverbial clauses appear to predominantly express temporal relationships between the events in the matrix and adverbial clauses. However, there is overlap with respect to explanatory interpropositional relationships, so it is worthwhile to determine what, if anything, sets focused adverbial clauses apart from their non-focused counterparts when considering only explanatory interpropositional relationships.

	Non-focused Explanatory Adverbial Clauses (Total = 11)	Focused Explanatory Adverbial Clauses (Total = 6)
Clause Order		
Mat/Adv	2	6
Adv/Mat	9	0
Information Status Matrix/Adverbial		
New/New	3	0
New/Given	6	0
Given/New	0	5
Given/Given	2	1

TABLE 7. Explanatory Adverbial Clauses

From this table, it is clear to see that focused adverbial clauses must have a matrix clause in which a given event is expressed followed by an adverbial clause that is most often new

---

[12] There is an additional adverbial clause with a reason interpropositional relationship, but as it also is a negative sentence, thence requiring focus verbal morphology, it is not possible to determine if the adverbial clause is focused or not, so it is not included in the count.

information (depending on the function of the adverbial clause). On the other hand, there are only two nonfocused explanatory adverbial clauses that follow their matrix clauses. Interestingly, these two are also the two in which both the matrix and adverbial clauses express given events. While this points to another intriguing area of study, for the current purposes, it is important to note that only focused explanatory adverbial clauses have a matrix concerning a given event followed by an adverbial concerning a new event.

The data presented in this section show that for each independent feature of focused adverbial clauses, that feature is predominantly expressed by the focused adverbial clauses and almost absent in nonfocused adverbial clauses. More importantly, however, when considering the intersection of all three features, we find that only the focused adverbial clauses simultaneously have a clause order of matrix followed by adverbial, an explanatory interpropositional relationship, and a given adverbial clause describing a new matrix clause. However, it is important to recognize that due to the limited data set, the results discovered in this study are preliminary and further investigation is required to ensure that these results concur with larger sets of data.

5. CONCLUSION. Discourse is based on the interaction of two or more people, and in order for this discourse to flow smoothly, participants keep track of one another's state of knowledge so as to provide just the right amount of information. One way in which this is indicated in the grammar is through the use of information packaging mechanisms such as focus. Most of the literature concerning focus attends to the fact that focus constructions are used to introduce sentence participants that are either new to the hearer or contradictory to his/her presuppositions. However, one mechanism that languages can use to introduce new information that will be only locally relevant is through adverbial clauses, so it should be possible for these elements of a sentence to be in focus as well. In the current paper, it is shown that Sinhala speakers do just this. The evidence provided indicates that in the cases examined here, adverbial clauses become the focused element of a sentence when they provide new information about a matrix clause that contains given information. Moreover, this only occurs when the adverbial clause is only relevant to the immediate sentence as opposed to the surrounding narrative.

REFERENCES

ANDREWS, AVERY. 1990. The major functions of the noun phrase. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, vol. 1*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 62-154. New York: Cambridge University Press.

CHAFE, WALLACE L. 1976. Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View. *Subject and Topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 25-55. New York: Academic Press.

FERNANDO, WIROSHANA. 2005. Personal Communication (University of California, Santa Barbara Field Methods Course).

GAIR, JAMES W. 1970. *Colloquial Sinhalese Clause Structures.* Paris: Mouton.

GAIR, JAMES W. 1998 [1983]. Nonconfigurationality, Movement and Sinhala Focus. *Studies in South Asian Linguistics: Sinhala and Other South Asian Languages*, ed. by Barbara C. Lust, 65-563. New York: Oxford University Press.

GAIR, JAMES W. 1998 [1985]. Sinhala Focused Sentences: Naturalization of a Calque. *Studies in South Asian Linguistics: Sinhala and Other South Asian Languages*, ed. by Barbara C. Lust, 155-169. New York: Oxford University Press.

GAIR, JAMES W. 1998 [1989]. Sinhala Nonverbal Sentences and Argument Structure. *Studies in South Asian Linguistics: Sinhala and Other South Asian Languages*, ed. by Barbara C. Lust, 87-107. New York: Oxford University Press.

GAIR, JAMES W.; JOHN C. PAOLILLO. 1997. *Sinhala.* München: Lincom Europa.

GAIR, JAMES W.; LELWALA. SUMANGAIA. 1991. What to focus in Sinhala. In the proceedings of the *Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, 93-108.

GIVÓN, TALMY. 1990. Contrastive Focus Constructions. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction, vol. II.*, 699-737. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

HERRING, SUSAN C.; JOHN C. PAOLILLO. 1995. Focus position in SOV languages. *Word Order in Discourse*, ed. by Pamela Downing and Michael Noonan, 163-198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

KARIYAKARAWANA, S. M. 1998. *The Syntax of Focus and Wh-Questions in Sinhala.* Colombo, Sri Lanka: Karunaratne & Sons Ltd.

LUST, BARBARA C., ed. 1998. *Studies in South Asian Linguistics: Sinhala and Other South Asian Languages.* New York: Oxford University Press.

PAOLILLO, JOHN C. 1994. The Co-Development of Finiteness and Focus in Sinhala. *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*, ed. by William Pagliuca, 151-170. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

RAMSAY, VIOLETA. 1985. The functional distribution of preposed and postposed 'if' and 'when' clauses in written discourse. *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse, Typological Studies in Language, vol. 11*, ed. by Russell Tomlin, 383-408. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

SZENDRÖI, KRISZTA. 2004. Focus and the interaction between syntax and pragmatics. *Lingua* 114.229-254.

TAYLOR, CHRIS. 2005. Perfect, Sequence, Recapitulation: Common Construal and the Sinhala Conjunctive Participle. Santa Barbara Working Papers: Sinhala. 2005.

THOMPSON, SANDRA A.; ROBERT E. LONGACRE. 1985. Adverbial clauses. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, vol. 2*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 171-234. New York: Cambridge University Press.

TOMLIN, RUSSELL S. 1985. Foreground-background information and the syntax of subordination. *Text* 5.85-122.

VALLDUVÍ, ENRIC; ELISABET ENGDAHL. 1996. The linguistic realization of information packaging. *Linguistics* 34.459-519.

WICKREMASINGHE, NISSANKA SIRIMEVAN. 2005. Rice University Field Methods Course.

University of California, Santa Barbara
Department of Linguistics
3607 South Hall
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
vsultan@umail.ucsb.edu