



PROJECT MUSE®

Perspectives on information structure in Austronesian languages ed. by Sonja Riesberg, Asako Shiohara, and Atsuko Utsumi (review)

Dejan Matić

Language, Volume 96, Number 3, September 2020, pp. 726-729 (Review)

Published by Linguistic Society of America

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2020.0048>

A small, thumbnail-sized image of the table of contents for the journal 'Language'. The title 'LANGUAGE' is at the top, followed by 'JOURNAL OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA'. Below this, there is a list of articles with their respective authors and page numbers, organized into two columns.

➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/764698>

I have noted several quibbles here and there with G's book, but I should stress that they are all quite minor. The book as a whole is a solid work and covers nearly every research thrust in which Labov has been involved. I found no obvious errors anywhere in it. It should appear on the reading list of any graduate-level survey of sociolinguistics. A more comprehensive presentation of Labov's ideas in one place is not available anywhere else.

REFERENCES

- BUTTERS, RONALD R. 1989. *The death of Black English: Divergence and convergence in Black and White vernaculars*. (Bamberger Beiträge zur englischen Sprachwissenschaft 25.) Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- FASOLD, RALPH W.; WILLIAM LABOV; FAY BOYD VAUGHN-COOK; GUY BAILEY; WALT WOLFRAM; ARTHUR K. SPEARS; and JOHN RICKFORD. 1987. Are Black and White vernaculars diverging? Papers from the NWAIVE XIV panel discussion. *American Speech* 62.3–80. DOI: 10.2307/454555.
- FOULKES, PAUL; GERARD DOCHERTY; and DOMINIC WATT. 2005. Phonological variation in child-directed speech. *Language* 81.177–206. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2005.0018.
- LABOV, WILLIAM. 1970. The logic of non-standard English. *Language and poverty: Perspectives on a theme*, ed. by Frederick Williams, 153–89. New York: Academic Press.
- LABOV, WILLIAM. 1997. How I got into linguistics, and what I got out of it. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, MS. Online: <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~wlabov/HowIgot.html>.
- LABOV, WILLIAM; SHARON ASH; and CHARLES BOBERG. 2006. *The atlas of North American English: Phonetics, phonology and sound change: A multimedia reference tool*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MURRAY, STEPHEN O. 1998. *American sociolinguistics: Theorists and theory groups*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- WEINREICH, URIEL; WILLIAM LABOV; and MARVIN HERZOG. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. *Directions for historical linguistics: A symposium*, ed. by Winfred P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel, 95–188. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Department of English
Box 8105
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27695-8105
[erthomas@ncsu.edu]

Perspectives on information structure in Austronesian languages. Ed. by SONJA RIESBERG, ASAKO SHIOHARA, and ATSUKO UTSUMI. (Studies in diversity linguistics 21). Berlin: Language Science, 2018. Pp. iv, 428. ISBN 9783961101092. \$56 (Hb).

Reviewed by DEJAN MATIĆ, *University of Münster*

There has been in the past decade a surge of interest in the investigation of the relationship between discourse and grammar in lesser-known languages, but the number of publications devoted to this topic is still negligible in comparison to those dealing with well-researched national languages. *Perspectives on information structure in Austronesian languages*, edited by Sonja Riesberg, Asako Shiohara, and Atsuko Utsumi, is a welcome addition to the slowly growing body of literature on the subject.¹ The focus is on Western Malayo-Polynesian, with a number of chapters devoted to two 'big' languages, Tagalog and different varieties of Malay, but other Austronesian groups are represented as well, including Formosan, Central Malayo-Polynesian, and Oceanic.

¹ In addition to the hard copy, a digital version of this book is available online, published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Licence (CC BY 4.0); it can be accessed at <https://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/201>, where its ISBN is 9783961101085 (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1402571).

The volume is divided into three parts, which focus on three aspects of what is traditionally subsumed under information structure: the form of NPs and reference tracking, the impact of information structure on syntax, and the relationship of information structure and prosody.

The first part consists of four chapters that deal with the influence of such factors as givenness, familiarity, referential persistence, animacy, stance, engagement, and so forth on the selection of the forms of NPs. RIK DE BUSSER's contribution investigates the mechanisms of establishing referential cohesion in oral narratives and Bible translations in Bunun (Formosan), testing formal (word class), semantic (NP meaning), and discourse-pragmatic parameters (position in the text, relationship with coreferential expressions, etc.). 'Stance, categorisation, and information structure in Malay', by FRANTIŠEK KRATOCHVÍL, NUR IZDIHAR BINTE ISMAIL, and DIYANA HAMZAH, is devoted to referent tracking in Singapore Malay, based on the investigation of controlled discourse. There appears to be a split between animate and inanimate referents, such that the former but not the latter can be subject to the so-called strong epistemic stance, which seems to boil down to familiarity. This has repercussions for the ways referents are encoded and tracked in discourse. The only factor that seems to be stronger than stance is the persistence of a referent in subsequent discourse. The following chapter, written by STEFAN SCHNELL, focuses on the meaning and use of demonstratives in Vera'a (Oceanic, Vanuatu). It is argued that the meaning of Vera'a demonstratives cannot be defined along spatial coordinates, such that other, endo- and exophoric, functions are derived from this purported core meaning. Instead, Schnell shows that demonstratives are interactional, in the sense that they are used to manage the attention states of the interlocutors. Their primary meanings are procedural and can be circumscribed as 'you do not attend to this' (speaker-oriented demonstratives), 'you and I attend to this' (addressee-oriented), and 'I do not attend to this' (distal). Major discourse effects derived from these procedural meanings are switch of the focus of attention (speaker-oriented) and maintaining and reinforcing the existing focus of attention (addressee-oriented), while distals are used when joint attention is not relevant. The chapter by ASAKO SHIOHARA and ANTHONY JUKES tackles the use of articles, demonstratives, and possessive NPs to encode different types of referential statuses in the Manado variety of Malay, showing that articles/demonstratives are used for situational and anaphoric reference, while possessive NPs indicate association with the larger shared situation.

Six chapters in the second part of the book deal with the notions of topic, focus, and contrast and their influence on clause syntax in Austronesian, focusing mostly on voice, word order, and left dislocation. In the opening chapter, I WAYAN ARKA and I NYOMANG SEDENG provide a general overview of information-structural phenomena in the Sembiran dialect of Balinese, focusing on NP encoding, word order, and voice. The authors rely on a set of predefined information-structural categories based on different combinations of values for the features [salient], [given], and [contrast], aiming to show that the much discussed categories of information structure can be reduced to these feature-value combinations. DWI NOVERINI DJENAR investigates the discourse structure in Indonesian written texts. Word order and voice selection appear to be dependent on the episode structure, such that agentive clauses encode foregrounded, cumulatively occurring events, while so-called passive and objective clauses correspond to episode shifts. The main focus of DANIEL KAUFMAN's contribution is on the differences in phrase structure between the Philippine and other Austronesian languages. Kaufman argues that all Austronesian languages have a strong tendency to align more referential elements with the subject and those that are less referential with the predicate position. Topic and focus interpretations are thus indirectly assigned to different portions of the clause: topics with subjects, foci with predicates. Due to their pervasive word-class flexibility and a rich voice system, the Philippine languages can achieve this without clefting, simply by altering word classes and using the appropriate voice. In contrast to this, the other Austronesian languages, exemplified by some Malayo-Polynesian varieties of Indonesia (Standard Indonesian, Sundanese, Kulawi, Balantak), must resort to different types of clefts. The paper closes with a tentative historical and functional explanation of these divergent developments.

The following two chapters apply the QUESTION UNDER DISCUSSION (QUD) method of focus identification developed by Riester et al. (2018). ANJA LATROUITE and ARNDT RIESTER use the

QUD model to investigate the role of information structure in voice selection in Tagalog. Three types of possible factors are distinguished: the referential level (roughly, givenness/familiarity), the event-structural level (roughly, actor or undergoer orientation of the predicate), and the information-structural level. The analysis is based on controlled discourse, in which factors other than information structure are kept constant. It is shown that the use of agent and patient voice in Tagalog is influenced by different topic and focus configurations, though the impact of other factors cannot be excluded. Arndt Riester and Asako Shiohara apply the same method in the investigation of word-order variation in Sumbawa (Bali-Sasak-Sumbawa). The analysis of natural conversations shows that there are two types of deviation from the default predicate-initial order. These are the structures including pre-predicate argument foci and pre-predicate contrastive topics, a pattern that the authors note is quite common crosslinguistically. The last chapter devoted to syntax, NAOMI TSUKIDA's 'Preposed NPs in Seediq', aims at identifying factors that trigger the placing of NPs in the preverbal position in Seediq (Formosan). The analysis of different parameters for NPs in written texts shows that there is a strong preference for certain types of NPs to be fronted (subjects, A-arguments, temporal and locational adjuncts, etc.) and that fronted elements display a strong tendency to be coreferential with the subject of the root clause. These elements seem to function either as aboutness topics or as frame setters (in the terminology of Krifka 2007).

The chapters in the third part of the volume tackle the topic of prosodic expression of information-structural categories. NIKOLAUS P. HIMMELMANN's 'Some preliminary observations on prosody and information structure in Austronesian languages of Indonesia and East Timor' investigates the relationship between prosody and information structure in the languages of Indonesia and East Timor. It is convincingly demonstrated that the standard analysis based on the assumed correspondence between pitch accents and focus interpretation cannot be applied to these languages. In contrast to English or German, most of the Austronesian languages of the area either have no lexical stress or, if they do have it, it does not serve as an anchor for information-structure-related pitch accents. Another option, phrasing, does not seem to be determined by information-structural considerations either, even though Himmelmann allows for the possibility that some of the phrasing phenomena from these languages could be influenced, although not fully determined, by the need to express information structure. NAONORI NAGAYA and HYUN KYUNG HWANG deal with Tagalog focus prosody in their contribution. The paper attempts to determine whether the readings of the canonical VSO structure as argument, predicate, or polarity ('all old', in Nagaya and Hwang's terminology) focus are marked by distinct prosodic patterns. The reading experiment the authors conducted shows no relevant differences in F0 between argument and predicate focus readings. Only the polarity focus reading seems to be marked with a distinct prosodic contour. The last chapter in the volume, written by SONJA RIESBERG, JANINA KALBERTODT, STEFAN BAUMANN, and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, reports the results of two perception experiments conducted with speakers of Papuan Malay. The results show that pitch-related cues do not seem to play any role in the perception of prominence, while prosodic boundaries are consistently perceived and determined by a number of factors, including pauses and syntactic structure. It is worth noting here that the application of perception experiments to Austronesian data is a welcome novelty in the study of this language family.

All chapters in this volume have a strong empirical basis and contain invaluable data that have not been investigated before. Some of them are also important contributions to our understanding of the ways information can be structured in natural languages, beyond Austronesian. I would like to single out the papers by Schnell, Latrouite & Riester, Tsukida, and Himmelmann, which, each in their own domain, shed new light on perennial issues in information-structure research (NP form and demonstratives, the role of pitch accents and word order) and/or propose novel methods of exploring information management in discourse.

The field of information-structure research has been plagued by notional and concomitant terminological confusion for decades, and, despite the very careful editorial work, this volume could not completely avoid this pitfall. It would have been good to persuade the authors to avoid sloppy use of technical terms (e.g. it is not quite clear what is meant by participants in an event being presupposed; 186) and to avoid idiosyncratic terminology or at least consistently define the

terms they use (e.g. ‘epistemic stance’ and ‘less’ and ‘more referential’ appear to boil down to what is commonly known as ‘familiarity’, but we cannot be quite sure about that). As is common in typological research on information structure, most authors rely on Lambrecht’s (1994) approach to topic and focus, often felt to be easily applicable to natural language data, in contrast to the highly formalized models prominent in more theoretical work. Some of the contributions (e.g. Schnell and Himmelmann) express doubts about the applicability of ready-made categories such as topic and focus to the description of Austronesian systems, admonishing that attention be paid to language-specific categorizations. It would be worthwhile to see if other structures dealt with in this volume would also be amenable to alternative approaches, especially those that dispose of preconceived categories (topic, focus, background, etc.) and assume a potentially open-ended list of categorial distinctions relevant for information structure, which can range from intersubjectivity and epistemicity all the way to common-ground-based categories (Matić & Wedgwood 2013, Ozerov 2018). This is all the more true in view of the fact that the standard categories of information structure were conceived to account for a couple of European languages, so that it is anything but certain that unrelated languages, such as Austronesian, encode the same set of divisions.

These minor qualms notwithstanding, *Perspectives on information structure in Austronesian languages* is a volume that everybody interested in discourse and grammar should consult. It enhances our knowledge of information management in a wide range of Austronesian languages and opens new perspectives on a broad array of questions revolving around the grammatical and prosodic encoding of the interpersonal aspects of communication.

REFERENCES

- KRIFKA, MANFRED. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. *Working Papers of the SFB 632: Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure* 6.13–56.
- LAMBRECHT, KNUD. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MATIĆ, DEJAN, and DANIEL WEDGWOOD. 2013. The meaning of focus: The significance of an interpretation-based category in cross-linguistic analysis. *Journal of Linguistics* 49.127–63. DOI: 10.1017/S0022226712000345.
- OZEROV, PAVEL. 2018. Tracing the sources of information structure: Towards the study of interactional management of information. *Journal of Pragmatics* 138.77–97. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2018.08.017.
- RIESTER, ARNDT; LISA BRUNETTI; and KORDULA DE KUTHY. 2018. Annotation guidelines for questions under discussion and information structure. *Information structure in lesser-described languages: Studies in syntax and prosody*, ed. by Evangelia Adamou, Katharina Haude, and Martine Vanhove, 403–43. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Institut für Sprachwissenschaft
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster
Aegidiistraße 5, 48143 Münster, Germany
[matic@uni-muenster.de]

Non-prototypical reduplication. Ed. by AINA URDZE. (Studia typologica 22.) Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2018. Pp. xi, 286. ISBN 9783110597004. \$114.99 (Hb).

Reviewed by JEFFREY P. WILLIAMS, *Texas Tech University*

Variation in the forms that reduplication can take in a language, as well as crosslinguistically, has confounded linguists for quite some time now. Efforts have been made along two clines of analysis: either to group all types together as one unified processual formation, or to separate the representational types of reduplication. Typically, this second view has differentiated full or complete reduplication from other types of partial reduplication, including echo words (which can go by a variety of names in the literature, depending on the language in question). *Non-prototypical reduplication* is a recent contribution to this second cline of analysis.