

A Kimaragang status particle: Accessible information

Paul Kroeger

Dallas International University & SIL Intl.

1. Introduction¹

Kimaragang is an endangered Philippine-type language belonging to the Dusunic subgroup in northeastern Borneo. This paper discusses the meaning and functions of the Kimaragang use-conditional particle *gima*, comparing it with the German particle *ja*. I propose that the core meaning of *gima* includes at least the following two components of meaning: (a) accessibility, and (b) uncontroversiality. In other words, *p gima* indicates that the speaker (a) believes that *p* is known or knowable by the addressee (and by the speaker, of course); and (b) takes the truth of *p* for granted (not debatable). I discuss these components of meaning in more detail in section 2.

Gima is one of several discourse particles in Kimaragang which “indicate the status of a proposition relative to the common ground (newness, expectedness, speaker commitment etc.)” (Repp, 2013). We might refer to such particles as STATUS PARTICLES, because they mark the information status of the base proposition. The Kimaragang status particles comprise a subset of a relatively large inventory of second-position clitics, as described in section 3.

Section 4 provides evidence for the claim that *gima* contributes use-conditional rather than truth-conditional meaning. I use the term “use-conditional”, following Gutzmann (2015), to refer to content which is part of the conventional meaning of an expression but does not contribute to the “at issue” truth-conditional meaning of the utterance. Potts (2005) and others have proposed a number of tests for identifying use-conditional content.² I will focus on two of these tests, which McCready (2010) identifies as being the most reliable indicators for this purpose: (a) use-conditional content is “scopeless”, meaning that is never interpreted within the scope of semantic operators like negation, interrogative mood, conditionals, etc.; and (b) use-conditional content does not participate in denials, i.e., cannot form the basis for challenging the truth of a statement.

Section 5 discusses contexts where, as predicted by the proposed analysis, *gima* cannot be used. As we will see, many of the same restrictions are reported for unstressed *ja* in German. Section 6 discusses the most common uses of *gima*, all of which involve statements about information that is noteworthy even though it is already part of the common ground, or at least accessible to the addressee. Because such statements are in a sense uninformative, they may appear to violate Grice’s maxim of Quantity. Thus in many of its uses, *gima* can be viewed as a QUANTITY HEDGE, like the English phrase *after all*. Section 7 discusses the expressive content associated with many uses of *gima*, particularly when it occurs in exclamatory utterances.

Many of the Kimaragang example sentences used here are taken from Jim Johansson’s dictionary, some with minor modifications. Others (including all of the unacceptable examples, obviously) have been elicited specifically to test the predictions of my analysis.

¹ **Acknowledgements:** I wish to express my thanks to Jim Johansson for making his draft dictionary available to me; to Jim & Nelleke Johansson for sharing drafts of translated materials; and to Janama Lantubon, my primary language consultant. Part of the research for this study was supported by NEH-NSF Documenting Endangered Languages fellowship no. FN-50027-07.

² Potts extends Grice’s term “conventional implicature” to cover essentially the same range of phenomena which Gutzmann identifies as use-conditional.

Information concerning acceptability in particular contexts was provided by Mr. Janama Lantubon.

2. The meaning of *gima*

The term “accessible” has been used in a number of different ways. When I say that *gima* signals the speaker’s belief that the proposition being asserted is equally “accessible” to both speaker and hearer, I simply mean that the information is available to both. Buring (2017), as part of his definition of German unstressed *ja*, expresses this condition as follows: “*ja p* signals that speaker and addressee are... in an equally good epistemic position to utter *p*.” As Zufferey (2014) points out, in discussing the presuppositional nature of the French conjunction *puisque*, there are several different ways in which information may be mutually accessible: it may be (a) shared knowledge, (b) previously mentioned in the current discourse, (c) observable in the utterance context, or (d) inferable by pragmatic implicature from what has been said.³

One important difference between *gima* and German *ja* is that *ja* stands in opposition to another similar particle, unstressed *doch*. Both of these particles indicate that the current proposition is true and mutually accessible. *Ja* further indicates that it is, in some sense, uncontroversial, whereas *doch* indicates the opposite. Buring (2017) expresses this contrast as follows: “*ja p* signals that speaker and addressee are... equally liable to draw joint attention to *p*”, whereas *doch p* signals that the addressee is not likely to do so.

Kimaragang has no particle equivalent to *doch*, so the meaning of *gima* is not delimited by the same kind of contrast as *ja*. In fact, as we will see, *gima* can actually occur in some contexts where *doch* would be used in German. A slightly different concept of “uncontroversiality” is needed for *gima*. I propose the following: *gima* signals the speaker’s belief that the proposition being asserted is undeniable, and not open to debate.

3. Second-position clitics

Like many other Southeast Asian languages, Kimaragang has a large inventory of particles. Pure expressives such as *ay* ‘surprise’ or *woy* ‘what did I tell you?’ tend to occur sentence-initial, can stand alone as a complete utterance, and get normal word stress and (frequently) intonational prominence. Second-position (2P) particles, in contrast, can never occur on their own. They are generally unstressed⁴ and never get intonational prominence. These 2P particles include nominative and genitive pronouns, focus and aspect markers, at least one evidential, the frustrative marker, question particles, markers of intimacy or friendship, and status particles, which are the primary focus of the present paper.

3.1 Defining second position

Second-position particles occur immediately after the first constituent in their clause. In a normal verb-initial clause, this means immediately after the verb as illustrated in (1). When a negative or other adverbial element occurs in pre-verbal position, 2P clitics will also precede the verb; this is exemplified in (2–3).

³ Zufferey describes these types of information as being “mutually manifest”, in the sense of Sperber and Wilson (1986).

⁴ Apparent exceptions include *toomod*, *dara’ay*, and *bala’ay*. Another exception is the emphatic particle *nôono*, which carries a pitch accent on the first syllable; its usage is illustrated in ex. (20) below.

- (1) *N-o-dindi nu no gaam i=wogok?*
 PST-NVOL-hog.call 2SG.GEN IAM Q NOM=pig
 ‘Have you called the pigs?’
- (2) *Sid=tana ya n-odop-on.*
 DAT=earth 1PL.EXCL.GEN PAST-sleep-LV
 ‘It was on the ground that we slept (after the house burned down).’
- (3) *Amu oku po dati ko-guli dot ...*
 NEG 1SG.NOM yet probably NVOL.AV-return COMP
 ‘I probably cannot return (to work here tomorrow).’

Sentence-level conjunctions do not function as a part of the minimal clause, and so do not affect clitic placement. In the following example, the minimal clause begins after the conjunction *bang*, and the 2P clitic pronoun occurs after the fronted location phrase *id tana*.

- (4) *Bang [id=tana ko monumpa ...]*
 if LOC=earth 2SG.NOM AV:TR:swear
 ‘If it is on the ground that you swear (an oath)...’

In a subordinate clause, whether complement or adjunct, clitic pronouns and particles appear immediately after the first element of their minimal clause; this clearly indicates the location of sentence-internal clause boundaries. Example (5), for example, contains three subordinate clauses as indicated by the location of the highlighted clitic elements.

- (5) *Ela'an ku=i' dot [magaago yalo] nga'*
 know 1SG.GEN=EMPH COMP hurry(AV) 3SG.NOM but
[n-antara-Ø ku] tu' waro [b(în)pros ku sid=dialo].
 PST-intercept-OV 1SG.GEN because EXIST <NMLZ>say 1SG.GEN DAT=3SG
 ‘I knew that he was in a hurry but I held him up because I had something to say to him.’

3.2 Linear order of clitics

As the preceding examples illustrate, it is not uncommon to find as many as three second-position clitics within a single clause. The relative order of the clitics within this second-position cluster is, for the most part, fairly rigidly determined. This ordering can be described in terms of six position classes, as summarized in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1: Template for 2P clitic ordering

Obligatory 2P clitics			Optional 2P clitics		
GEN pron.	NOM pron.	focus/aspect	mood	evaluative	solidarity
<i>ku</i> ‘1sg’	<i>oku</i> ‘1sg’	<i>=i</i> ‘emphasis/	<i>ga(a)m</i> ‘YNQ’	<i>bala</i> ‘ ~ <i>bala’ay</i>	<i>obo</i> (man-to-
<i>nu</i> ‘2sg’	<i>ko</i> ‘2sg’	verum focus’	<i>ma</i> ‘rhet. Q’	‘mirative’	man)
<i>yo</i> ‘3sg’	<i>kito</i> ‘1du.incl’	<i>no</i> ‘iamitive’	<i>pogi</i> ‘forceful’	<i>dara</i> ~ <i>dara’ay</i>	<i>owo</i> (woman-
<i>to</i> ‘1du.incl’	<i>tokow</i> ‘1pl.incl’	<i>po</i> ‘continuative’	<i>to</i> ‘empathetic’	‘frustrative’	to-woman)
<i>ya</i> ‘1pl.excl’	<i>okoy</i> ‘1pl.excl’	<i>nogi</i> ‘again’		<i>gima</i> ‘after all’	
<i>duyu</i> ‘2pl’	<i>kow</i> ‘2pl’	<i>nopo</i> ‘only’		<i>dati</i> ‘likely’	
				<i>toomod</i> ‘likely’	
				<i>mari</i> ‘certainly’	
				<i>katoy</i> ‘counter-	
				assertion’	

The membership of each position class is determined on the basis of relative order and co-occurrence restrictions. In general, a single clause may contain at most one element from any

particular class. In other words, particles assigned to the same class cannot (in general) co-occur with each other, and when two particles assigned different classes co-occur, they will occur in the order specified in this template.

The first three classes, namely GEN, NOM, and focus-aspect, obligatorily occupy the 2P clitic position. The last three classes (mood, evaluative, and solidarity) may optionally occur in clause-final position, though this seems to be relatively rare for the mood particles *gaam* and *ma*. When there are more than three particles in the same clause that could all appear in the 2P clitic position, one or more of the optional 2P particles usually appears clause-finally. Thus clitic clusters containing more than three particles are generally avoided.

3.3 Status particles

Position class 5, containing what I have called the “evaluative” particles, is semantically somewhat heterogeneous.⁵ It includes one particle which does affect the truth-conditional meaning of the proposition, namely *dara* ‘frustrative’. The meaning of the frustrative particle is discussed in Kroeger (2017). The other particles in class 5 appear to be purely use-conditional, and I refer to them as status particles. Most of these particles seem to have a range of functions, and their precise meaning depends very much on the specific context in which they are used, as is the case with the German *modalpartikeln*. Some preliminary examples illustrating typical usage of the more common members of this set are presented in (6).

- (6) a. *D<um>arun dati*’ ... ‘It will *probably* rain (this afternoon)’
 b. *D<in><um>arun katoy!* ‘It did too rain (*contrary to what you claim*).’
 c. *Ki-darun bala*’ *kosodoy!* ‘Oh look, it rained last night (*and I didn’t know it*)!’
 d. ... *ki-darun gima*. ‘(I didn’t go to your house because...) it was raining, *after all / as you know*.’
 e. ... *koo-dorun-an mari*. ‘(At this time of year) it rains a lot (*certainly/ generally*).’

I tentatively identify *dati* ‘probably’, *toomod* ‘probably’, and *mari* ‘certainly’ as validational markers, expressing the strength of the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the current proposition, rather than markers of modality in the narrow sense. *Mari* is often used to indicate knowledge shared by the whole community, or certainty based on prior knowledge of someone’s characteristic properties or behaviour, but these particles have not been investigated in detail and I will not have much to say about them here. Further examples illustrating core uses of *gima*, *bala*’, and *katoy* are presented in (7–9).

⁵ Class 3 is also somewhat heterogeneous, but most of its members are polysemous between aspectual and focus-marking functions.

- (7) *Isos-on nu gima banar ino mato nu, sagay aragang no.*
 rub-OV 2SG GIMA really that eye 2SG.GEN reason red IAM
 ‘After all, you keep rubbing your eye hard, that is why it is all red.’
- (8) *Wiwidsing-o ku it=rangalaw nga’ napapasa=i’ bala’ iri.*
 DUP.peel-ATEMP.OV 1SG NOM=rambutan but PST.DUP.rotten=EMPH MIR this
 ‘I peeled the rambutan but (I discovered) it was rotten.’
- (9) *Yalo katoy ot minanakaw, okon.ko yoku po.*
 3SG.NOM KATOY NOM PST.AV.steal not 3SG.EMPH FOC
 ‘It was him that stole it, not me (contrary to your assertion).’

The status particles are a common feature of conversational speech, but generally speaking do not occur in narrative monologue, apart from direct quotations. (The one exception is the mirative particle *bala’*, which can occur in narratives with a shift in perspective, to indicate surprise on the part of some central participant.)

This restriction of usage has a grammatical correlate. “Main-line” events in narrative are expressed using the atemporal form of the verb (Kroeger 1991).⁶ This atemporal form functions as a “narrative tense”, and serves as a genre marker to distinguish the act of telling a story from simply describing an event or sequence of events. Most of the status particles seem to be strongly dispreferred in clauses inflected for narrative tense, as illustrated in (10). The exception is *katoy*, which can occur in such clauses in its expressive function, marking disapproval.

- (10) *Piniutap/?*piutapo’ dot=manuk om sada mangarakan bala’ iti.*
 mix.OV.PST/ATEMP ACC=chicken and fish AV.boil PTCL this
 ‘He/she boiled fish and chicken together (I am surprised to learn).’

4. Use-conditional rather than truth-conditional meaning

As noted in the introduction, the meaning contributed by *gima* does not seem to be part of the “at issue”, truth-conditional content of the sentence. One reason for making this claim is the fact that the particle cannot be questioned or negated. In fact, this seems to be true for all of the Kimaragang status particles. They do not seem to occur in questions at all, not even rhetorical questions.⁷ They may occur in another clause of a sentence that contains a question (11a), but not within the interrogative clause itself (11b):

- (11) a. *Siongo mat kisakot ilo’ togilay yo dot⁸ pigamasan yo gima.*
 where RQ grassy that corn 3sg COMP clear.repeatedly 3sg GIMA
 ‘How could there be grass growing in his corn field, when (as you know) he always clears/cuts the grass there?’
- b. *?*Siongo mat kisakot ilo’ togilay yo gima?*

⁶ The atemporal form is also used for imperatives and for main verbs following an auxiliary.

⁷ The only exception I have found to this generalization is an example involving *bala’ay*, which seems to be an exclamatory form of the mirative particle. I was told that *bala’ay* here indicates that the speaker has just realized there isn’t any viand.

(i) *Tongo bala’ay ot=rinapa?*
 what MIR NOM=viand
 ‘What are we going to eat with our rice?’

⁸ The particle *dot* can function as a linker or relativizer within NP, or as an all-purpose complementizer which introduces both complement and adjunct clauses. In this case it introduces a circumstantial adverbial clause.

Moreover, status particles always take scope over clausal negation. Examples (12–13) illustrate this for *gima*.

- (12) *Amu gima owo sinuput nu i=paip noputut,*
 not GIMA PRTCL PST.connect.OV 2SG NOM=pipe broken
intaay aso weeg tokow.
 look.DV.IMP not.exist water 1PL.INCL
 ‘You didn’t fix the broken pipe, **as you well know**; now look, we don’t have any water.’ (cannot mean: ‘It is not known to you that you fixed the broken pipe...’)
- (13) *Amu gima notongkuban nu ino kuuy, ino bala’ ot=kororogis dino.*
 not GIMA PST.cover.DV 2SG that cake that MIR NOM=DUP.reason.sandy that
 ‘You failed to cover the cakes, **as you well know**, and that is why they got all sandy.’
 (cannot mean: ‘It is not known to you that you covered the cakes...’)

A second reason for analysing *gima* as use-conditional rather than truth-conditional in nature is that the presence of *gima* cannot form the basis for challenging the truth of a statement. Example (14) illustrates an appropriate challenge based on the truth-conditional content of a statement. Example (15, B1) shows that lack of familiarity or accessibility is not sufficient grounds for challenging the truth of a statement which contains *gima*. An acceptable way of challenging the appropriateness of *gima* in a particular context is illustrated in (15, B2).

- (14) A: *Yokoy diti, musikin okoy, aso tarata ya.*
 1PL.EXCL this poor 1PL.EXCL NEG.EXIST property 1PL.EXCL.GEN
 ‘As for us, we are poor, we have no wealth.’
- B: *Momudut katoy, amu babanar; akaya yalo’ dilo’.*
 AV.lie KATOY NEG DUP.true rich 3SG that
 ‘He is lying, that is not true; he is rich.’
- (15) A: *Pi-ilang-o yoalo tu’ sompusasawo gima.*⁹
 RECP-eat.together.OV.IMP 3PL.NOM because married.couple GIMA
 ‘Have them eat together, because they are husband and wife *after all*.’
- B1: *#Momudut katoy, amu babanar; a=ku nela’an!*
 AV.lie KATOY NEG DUP.true NEG=1SG knew
 ‘You are lying, that is not true; I did not know that.’ (odd in this context)
- B2: *Ay? A=ku nela’an!*
 PRTCL NEG=1SG knew
 ‘Oh? I did not know that.’ (appropriate response)

5. Contexts where *gima* cannot be used

In section 1 I proposed that *gima* indicates that the speaker (a) believes that *p* is known or knowable by the addressee, and (b) takes the truth of the base proposition for granted, not controversial or debatable. Kratzer & Matthewson (2009 ms.) have suggested that only the second of these components is part of the conventional meaning of unstressed *ja*, but both seem to be necessary to account for the behaviour of *gima*. Consider the following example:

⁹ Of course the main clause in this example, as an imperative, has no truth value to challenge. But the reason clause marked with *tu’* is not subordinated, and counts as a separate (but secondary) assertion. It is this secondary assertion which B’s reply is intended to challenge.

- (16) (situation: B is attending a meeting in the state capital. There he meets A for the first time. A has no prior knowledge about B's family.)

A: *Ki-sawo ko=no oy?*
 EXIST-spouse 2SG=IAM Q

'Are you married?' (lit: 'Do you have a spouse already?')

B: *Waro, nga' amu yalo nakaway.*
 EXIST but NEG 3SG accompanied

Okodok po (#gima) it=tanak ya.
 small yet GIMA NOM=child 1PL.EXCL

'Yes, but she didn't come with me. Our children are still small.'¹⁰

Clearly B takes the content of his utterance to be uncontroversial, but because he cannot reasonably expect the information to be accessible to A, the use of *gima* in his response would be infelicitous.

Unstressed *ja* may be different from *gima* in this regard. Kratzer & Matthewson state: "German *ja* can also be used felicitously in cases where the information given is unlikely to be known to the addressee, or even known to be unknown to the addressee."¹¹ They provide an example which is very similar to (16), in which *ja* is felicitous:

- (17) Context: You are talking to a new colleague who doesn't know you and talking about how it's hard to go on holiday. You say:

'We always have to find someone who takes care of our animals.'

Wir haben ja zwei Katzen. 'We have *ja* two cats.'

In other respects, however, the limitations on *gima* are very similar to those reported for *ja*. For example, a number of authors have observed that unstressed *ja* occurs only in declarative clauses, and the same is true for *gima*.¹² And, as we would expect, *gima* is infelicitous in most contexts if the addressee does not have prior knowledge of the relevant facts. The particle would be unnatural in (18) if the addressee does not already know who cleaned the fish, and in (19) if the addressee does not already know that the person in question was drunk at topic time.

- (18) *Ololonsi no iti tunturu ku, yoku gima o=minonobuk di=sada.*
 DUP.stink IAM this finger 1SG 1sg(EMPH) GIMA NOM=AV.PST.stab ACC=fish
 'My fingers stink, (because) I was the one **after all** who cleaned the fish.'

- (19) *Songkoboroso dialo dot asot tatantu, owukan gima.*
 speak.wildly 3SG COMP NEG.EXIST DUP.certain drunk GIMA
 'He was saying crazy things, **after all** he was drunk.'

¹⁰ A reviewer points out that within Kimaragang culture, the fact that a married couple has children is probably predictable, or at least statistically probable. Shouldn't this kind of inference make *gima* at least possible in this context? Two points can be made in this regard. First, the assertion marked with *gima* is not simply about the existence of children but about their ages, which is clearly not predictable. Second, in answer to the question 'Are you married?', an affirmative reply probably does not, apart from some special circumstance, trigger a conversational implicature that the speaker has children, even in traditional Kimaragang culture. The mention of inference-based accessibility in section 2 was specifically limited to conversational implicatures.

¹¹ This statement does not seem entirely consistent with the generalizations of Zimmermann (2011) quoted directly below. I do not know whether there are special factors involved in (17) that make it acceptable.

¹² For example, Grosz (2016 ms.) states: "At the matrix level, *ja* is restricted to declarative assertions and banned from interrogatives..."

Zimmermann (2011) lists the following specific types of contexts which are incompatible with the use of unstressed *ja*, and these same restrictions apply to *gima* as well, as illustrated in sections 5.1–5.3:

In contrast, *ja* is illicit whenever the truth of the propositional content of an utterance is not known to be shared by the addressee, or even known to be controversial. This is typically the case in breaking news..., in answers to questions, which denote a set of controversial alternatives to be resolved by the addressee..., or in corrections of previous assertions...

5.1 Breaking news/out of the blue statements

When a speaker conveys new information which the addressee would have no way of knowing, especially when that information is unexpected, the particle *gima* cannot felicitously be used. A striking example of this type, in which the news comes literally “out of the blue”, is found in the beginning of St. Luke’s gospel, when the angel Gabriel appears to the Virgin Mary with some unexpected news. As (20b) shows, the use of *gima* in this context would be highly unnatural.

- (20) a. *Monon-tiyan ko nôono dino om monusu dot kusay ot=tanak.*
 AV.wear-stomach 2SG PRCL that and AV.give.birth COMP male NOM=child
 ‘You will become pregnant and give birth to a son’ (Luke 1:31)

b) #*Monontiyan ko gima om monusu dot kusay ot tanak.* (impossible in this context)

5.2 Answering a question

We have said that the use of *gima* indicates the speaker’s belief that the base proposition is known or knowable by the addressee, and is not controversial (i.e., the truth of the proposition is not open for discussion). If the base proposition is presented as the answer to a question which the addressee has just asked, then the information is normally not known by the addressee and the truth of that proposition is in fact the current issue under discussion. Under these circumstances, the use of *gima* would again be highly unnatural, as illustrated in (21).

- (21) Q: *Nunu ot=tonomon daalo ad gopu yo dilo’?*
 what NOM=plant.OV 3PL in garden 3GEN that.DIST
 ‘What will they plant in their garden plot?’

A. *Togilay dati’/mari’/#gima ot=tonomon daalo.*
 maize probably/certainly/GIMA NOM=plant.OV 3pl
 ‘Probably/naturally/#as you know they will plant corn/maize.’

5.3 Contradictions of previous assertions

As discussed below (section 6.2), *gima* can be used to highlight accessible information which is relevant to current purposes but seems to be ignored or overlooked by the addressee or some other salient person. However, *gima* is not appropriate when the speaker directly contradicts something that has just been stated. In such contexts the truth of the proposition is very much under discussion, and *katoy* would be used instead of *gima*. In (22), for example, if the speaker has just been told that he was accused of stealing by the owner of the coconuts, *katoy* would be appropriate but *gima* would not.¹³ A similar example is seen in (23), where

¹³ In addition to marking a contradiction, *katoy* can also be used as an expressive particle to indicate disapproval. Perhaps both functions are intended in (22), and also in (14).

the owner of a certain chicken is reported to have claimed (mistakenly or falsely) that he bought it.

- (22) *Yalo katoy ot minangangat dogon manganu di=niyuw doalo.*
 3SG PRTCL NOM AV.PST.invite 1SG AV.take NOM=coconut 3PL
 ‘He was the one who invited me to take some of their coconuts.’

- (23) A: *Minomoros i=Jim dot “At=manuk dilo’ binoli ku,” ka.*
 AV.PST.say NOM=Jim COMP NOM=chicken that.DIST bought 1SG QUOT
 ‘Jim said, “I bought that chicken.”’

B: *Doo maantad do manuk ilo’, okon.ko’ binoli yo katoy/*gima.*
 3SG.DAT originally LNK chicken that NEG bought 3SG PRTCL
 ‘It was his chicken in the first place, he didn’t buy it (contrary to what he now claims).’

6. Uses of *gima*

Grice explained why we do not normally tell people what they already know: it would be uninformative, and thus a violation of the maxim of Quantity. *Gima* typically functions as a QUANTITY HEDGE, like the English phrase *after all* (Levinson 1983: 162): a signal to the hearer that the current utterance may not be informative. This function is illustrated in examples (24–25), in which the clause containing *gima* expresses information which must clearly be known to the addressee at the time of speaking:

- (24) *G<in>umu nu gima monorimo, orubat nopo ami=i’ naawi mangakan.*
 <PST>much 2SG GIMA cook.rice waste only NEG=EMPH finished AV.eat
 ‘**After all**, you cooked a lot of rice; it is a shame that it didn’t all get eaten.’

- (25) *Subay.ko ipag-on nu yalo dilo tu’*
 should brother.in.law-OV 2SG.GEN 3SG.NOM that because
tobpinee di=sawo nu yalo gima.
 sibling GEN=spouse 2SG.GEN 3SG.NOM GIMA
 ‘You should/must call him *ipag* (‘brother-in-law’), because **after all** he is your wife’s brother.’

Like unstressed *ja*, *gima* is expected when the speaker is stating something that is already obvious (Kaufmann & Kaufmann 2012). Example (26) comes again from the Gospel of Luke. In this context, Peter’s statement would be unnatural without the particle *gima*.

- (26) (context: Jesus is walking along a road surrounded by a large crowd of people)
 Jesus: “*Ay, isay minonudu dogon?*”
 hey who AV.PST.touch 1SG
 ‘Hey, who touched me?’
 Peter: “*Guru, ogumu gima o tongo tulun kotobping om*
 teacher many GIMA NOM PL person bump and
muurudun id dikaw.”
 crowd/jostle LOC 2SG
 ‘Rabbi, there are many people crowding and bumping you.’ [Luke 8:45]

Even when a quantity hedge is used, the assertion of information which is already available to the addressee is generally somewhat odd, apart from special motivating circumstances. In my data the most commonly attested types of circumstances which license such statements, and thus uses of *gima*, seem to belong to one of the following types. First, *gima* frequently occurs

in reason clauses. In this construction the content of the reason clause itself may be already known, but the assertion of a causal relation between the two clauses could still be informative. A second common use of *gima* is for reminding the addressee of information which is already accessible but which the addressee seems to have forgotten or ignored, as in example (26). Third, *gima* frequently occurs with certain kinds of expressive meaning, in particular with expressions of surprise, scolding, and certain types of exclamatory utterance. In these cases the truth-conditional, at-issue content of the utterance may be known or accessible to the addressee, but the expressive content may be new. On the other hand, expressive content does not seem to be governed by the maxim of Quantity in the same way as descriptive content; speakers all too often express their feelings even when this information is well known to the addressee.

6.1 Reason clauses

Examples (18) and (19) illustrated the use of *gima* in unmarked reason clauses, which are simply juxtaposed to the main clause. Another such example is presented in (27).

- (27) *Nopuunan ko bo dino, winajak nu gima momoros yalo*
 hexed 2SG PRTCL that PST.spoke.clearly.OV 2SG GIMA AV.speak 3SG
dot pangansakon.
 COMP cause.to.cook.OV
 ‘You have brought a hex on yourself, **after all** you asked her directly to cook food for you.’

More often, however, reason clauses are marked with the conjunction *tu* ‘because’ as seen in examples (15-A) and (25). Further examples of this type are presented in (28–31). As noted above, *gima* appearing in the ‘because’ clause indicates that the reason is shared or accessible information. Example (28) for example would be unnatural if the addressee does not already know that the deceased woman was a priestess (shaman).

- (28) *Imboluan yalo’ dilo’ tu’ boboliyan gima.*
 toll.gong.DV 3SG.NOM that because priestess GIMA
 ‘They will toll the funeral gong for her, because **after all** she was a priestess.’
- (29) *Isot babatang nga’ a=ku elaan tu’ a=ku*
 one DUP.letter also NEG=1SG know because NEG=1SG
nokosikul gima owo.
 AV.PST.NVOL.attend.school GIMA PRTCL
 ‘I don’t know even one letter, because **after all** I never went to school.’
- (30) *Munaru po yalo dilo’ tu’ omulok po gima.*
 grow.longer yet 3SG that because young yet GIMA
 ‘He/she will grow taller, because **after all** he/she is still young.’
- (31) *Amu needu bâanar iti bongkuris diti wagas tu’*
 NEG removed truly this rice.hull this uncooked.rice because
tinutu gima.
 PST.pound.OV GIMA
 ‘The hulls were not completely removed from this rice, because **after all** it was pounded (in wooden mortar and pestle, rather than being milled).’

Another way of marking causal relations is with the conjunction *sagay* ‘reason’. This conjunction is used to introduce clauses expressing a result, with *gima* frequently occurring in the reason clause as illustrated in (32).

- (32) *Sagay nelaan ku ot=wayaan mongoy sid=Kudat,*
 reason PST.know.DV 1SG.GEN NOM=way AV.go DAT=Kudat
babaya nokoongoy oku gima.
 DUP.previously AV.PST.NVOL.go 1SG.NOM GIMA
 ‘The reason I knew the way to Kudat was because I’ve been there before, **after all**.’

6.2 Correction

One way in which mutually accessible information might be worthy of mention is if the addressee (or some other salient person) has failed to access that information when it would be relevant to current purposes. In German the particle *doch* would be used in such contexts, but since there is no equivalent to *doch* in Kimaragang, *gima* is sometimes used here as well:

- (33) *Kukuro yoalo’ misasawo, miobpipinee gima.*
 how 3PL.NOM RECP.spouse RECP.DUP.sibling GIMA
 ‘How can they marry each other, *after all*, they are siblings.’
- (34) *Siongo mat kisakot ilo’ togilay yo dot pigamasan yo gima.*
 where RQ grassy that corn 3SG COMP clear.repeatedly 3SG GIMA
 ‘How could there be grass growing in his corn field, when *after all* he always clears/cuts the grass there?’

However, *gima* is not used to directly contradict something that has just been stated. As illustrated in (22–23) above, only *kato*y and not *gima* can appropriately be used for this purpose.

6.3 Surprise

Another situation in which information that is already mutually accessible might be considered newsworthy is if the information has been newly discovered by the speaker. Examples (35–37) involve information which is known to the hearer but new and surprising to the speaker. However, this new information is treated as being accessible to the speaker because it is observable in the immediate speech context. German unstressed *ja* can also be used in contexts of this type, e.g. ‘Oh, you have *ja* green eyes’ (noticed for the first time; Grosz, 2014).

- (35) *Kawantang no diri ilot tanak nu momoros gima*
 fluent IAM this that child 2SG AV.speak GIMA
dot okodok po om.¹⁴
 COMP small yet and
 ‘Your child can already speak clearly/well, even though it is still small!’
- (36) *Nakaganaru ko=no d̄iri gima.*
 grew.longer 2SG=IAM this GIMA
 ‘You have gotten taller (since I last saw you)!’
- (37) *Sabat po om a=ku notutunan ika,*
 little yet and NEG=1SG PST.recognize.DV 2SG.NOM

¹⁴ The coordinating conjunction *om* ‘and’ normally occurs between the two conjoined clauses. Here it is used in sentence-final position as a concessive particle, ‘even though’. This is somewhat reminiscent of the current usage in spoken English of certain conjunctions as sentence-final particles, especially *so*. Some English speakers use sentence-final *but* in a similar way.

orurungut ko=no dino bongit **gima**.
 DUP.overgrown 2SG.NOM=IAM that beard GIMA
 ‘I almost didn’t recognize you, your beard has gotten so long and shaggy.’
 (lit: ‘you have been overgrown by that beard’)

In these contexts *gima* may be interchangeable with the mirative particle *bala’*. In other similar contexts, either particle may be possible but with a subtle difference in meaning between the two. In examples (38–39), *bala’* merely indicates that the information is newly acquired by the speaker, while *gima* is described as indicating that the information is contrary to prior expectations. I do not have an explanation for this difference.

- (38) a. *Nokosogurut no diiri a=paray duyu gima*.
 became.lush IAM this NOM=rice.plant 2PL GIMA
 ‘Your rice plants have grown well (contrary to my expectation).’
 b. *Nokosogurut no diiri a=paray duyu bala’*.
 became.lush IAM this NOM=rice.plant 2PL MIR
 ‘(I see that) your rice plants have grown well (which I didn’t know before).’
- (39) a. *Ririnumangkama=i’ do gima i=kangkung tinanom ku*.¹⁵
 DUP.PST.creep=EMPH LNK GIMA NOM=kangkung planted 1SG
 ‘The *kangkung* (swamp spinach) that I planted has crept/spread out (contrary to my expectation).’
 b. *Ririnumangkama=i’ bala’ i=kangkung tinanom ku*.
 DUP.PST.creep=EMPH MIR NOM=kangkung planted 1SG
 ‘The *kangkung* (swamp spinach) that I planted has crept/spread out (I see now; previously unaware of this development).’

This surprise use of *gima*, as with German *ja*, is only possible when the information being asserted is observable in the immediate utterance context. For this reason, *gima* cannot be used for describing past discoveries on the part of the speaker; only *bala’* is possible for such statements, as illustrated in (40–41). This restriction follows from the meaning of *gima*: if the information being reported as a new discovery is not observable in the utterance context, it cannot be assumed to be accessible to the addressee.

- (40) a. *Powurilongo ku it=takod ku sid=luwang nga’ aralom bala’ iri*.
 put.into.hole 1SG NOM=foot 1SG DAT=hole but deep MIR this
 ‘I stuck my foot into the hole, and it turned out to be deep.’
 b. *?*Powurilongo ku it takod ku sid luwang nga’ aralom gima iri*.
- (41) a. *Tantaman ku sompusasawo yoalo, miobpipinee bala’ay*.
 thought 1SG married.couple 3PL DUP.RECP.sibling MIR
 ‘I thought they were husband and wife, but they turned out to be siblings.’
 b. *?*Tantaman ku sompusasawo yoalo, miobpipinee gima*.

In addition to marking the information status of the current proposition in these examples, both *gima* and *bala’* seem (impressionistically) to convey expressive meaning as well. Malay

¹⁵ The phrase *do gima* seems to be interchangeable with *gima* in some contexts, as here, but not in others. The differences between the two are not yet understood.

translations of such sentences frequently include the adverbial particle *pula* ‘also’, which in this context seems to have a purely expressive function, indicating surprise.

6.4 Scolding

Yet another reason for stating information that is already known to the addressee is to express displeasure with something the addressee has done. *Gima* is frequently used in scolding and complaints about the behaviour of the addressee, as seen in examples (12–13) above. Additional examples are presented in (42–45).

- (42) *Unanawon ku=no itit paray, monuu ko=po gima.*
 DUP.crush.OV 1SG=IAM this rice AV.order 2SG=yet GIMA
 ‘Here I am already crushing the rice seed (e.g. to feed chickens) and you still tell me to do it *gima*!’
- (43) *Monigagang ko gima, sodoy om muli ko nogi.*
 AV.frighten 2SG GIMA night and AV.return 2SG only.then
 ‘You frightened/worried me *gima*, coming home so late at night!’
- (44) *Osorulakan nu manganit ino kulit do=kayu gima.*
 backwards 2SG AV.peel that skin GEN=tree GIMA
 ‘You peeled that bark off against the grain *gima*!’
- (45) *Ad=susut gima ot=pinangalaasan nu dino suduwon,*
 LOC=space.below.house GIMA NOM=place.of.splitting 2SG that fire.wood
intaay pogi nakawawantuk no=ino kapak dilot tontom.
 look.IMPER PRTCL DUP.snagged IAM=that axe that floor.joist
 ‘You chose to split the firewood under the house *gima*, now look, the axe has caught on the floor joist!’

The use of *gima* for complaints about the behaviour of the addressee is consistent with its status-marking function, since this information is presumably already known by the addressee. But in scolding and complaints, as in expressions of surprise, *gima* seems to contribute not only the presumption of accessibility but also some affective or expressive content, expressing the speaker’s anger or frustration.¹⁶ In the next section we will consider expressive functions of *gima* in more detail.

7. Expressive meaning and exclamatory use

Gima frequently occurs in exclamatory statements, i.e., declarative sentences which not only assert a proposition but also express the speaker’s feelings or attitude toward that proposition.¹⁷ Intonation plays an important role in distinguishing exclamatory statements from other declarative sentences, but exclamations can also be identified by the presence of certain sentence-initial expressive particles, as in (46–47), or other formulaic elements.

¹⁶ Wouk (1998) and Östman (1981) also argue that a quantity hedge may serve as a marker of information status (its primary function), and simultaneously express secondary stylistic or emphatic functions.

¹⁷ I follow Rett (2011) in distinguishing these declarative exclamations from exclamatives. An exclamative is formed from something other than a declarative sentence and does not count as an assertion of its propositional content, e.g. *How very beautiful she was! Was he ever mad! The nerve of some people!* No investigation has been attempted as yet on exclamatives in Kimaragang.

- (46) *Woy obo, nakaabir at=takanon, osongow ko gima monook!*
 PRTCL PRTCL scattered NOM=cooked.rice rough 2SG GIMA AV.scoop
 ‘Now look what happened! The rice is scattered all over because you scooped it out so roughly/carelessly!’
- (47) *Woy obo oleed om nitutup nu nogi’ gima it=tuunuson,*
 PRTCL PRTCL long.time and closed 2SG then GIMA NOM=gate
nokosuwang it=karabaw doalo sid=paray tokow.
 have.entered NOM=buffalo 3PL DAT=rice.plant 1PL.INCL
 ‘Now look what happened! You were too slow in closing the gate, and now their buffalo have gotten into our rice field!’

The expressive particle *woy* by itself generally conveys the sense of, ‘What did I tell you?’ or ‘I told you so’. *Obo*¹⁸ can occur by itself as an interjection of surprise, but the sequence of particles observed in (46–47) seems to be an exclamation formula meaning something like ‘Now look! What do you expect?’, and often rendered in Malay translations as *Itu=lah!* ‘that=FOC’. Another formulaic marker of exclamations was seen in (12) and (45) above, *intaay (pogi)* ‘just look!’, which occurs frequently in scolding and complaints. An additional example is provided in (48).

- (48) *Bibinuak nu gima i=weeg owo, intaay pogi*
 DUP.PST.waste.OV 2SG GIMA NOM=water PRTCL look FOC
asot pomoog da=pinggan.
 NEG.EXIST wash.IV ACC=plate
 ‘You wasted the water, now look, we don’t have any to wash the plates with!’

In addition to scolding, complaints, and expressions of surprise, *gima* appears in other types of exclamations as well. The exclamatory formula *Sagay gima* ‘No wonder!’, typically rendered in Malay as *Patut=lah!* ‘appropriate=FOC’, introduces exclamations about causal relations. *Sagay* by itself is used to introduce clauses expressing a result, as illustrated in (32) above. When the two words *sagay* and *gima* appear together, as seen in (49–52), they indicate exclamatory force. One indication of the formulaic nature of this combination is that the particle *gima* seems to occur in the “wrong” clause: in this construction it marks the result rather than the reason. On the other hand, perhaps *gima* occurs here because the result is known (old information), whereas the reason is newly discovered.

- (49) *Sagay.gima aso no=ot=weeg siti=id=dagay, nonus i=paip.*
 no.wonder NEG.EXIST IAM=NOM=water here=LOC=1PL.EXCL pulled.out NOM=pipe
 ‘No wonder we don’t have any water, the pipe has been pulled out!’
- (50) *Sagay.gima dumarun nopo owo,*
 no.wonder raining only PRTCL
urarakadon dialo at=lobong da=tulun.
 DUP.dig.up.OV 3SG NOM=grave GEN=person
 ‘No wonder it just keeps raining, he broke open/is breaking open someone’s grave!’
- (51) *Sagay.gima nakalabus no i=sada owo, nayangat i=pangat.*
 no.wonder has.escaped IAM NOM=fish PRTCL bent NOM=hook
 ‘No wonder the fish got away, the hook bent!’

¹⁸ The expressive particle *obo* occurs in initial position, and is distinct from the 2P solidarity particle *obo* listed in Table 8.1.

- (52) *Sagay.gima nokosuwang no=ilo' sapi, amu nokoolit ilo' lalawangan.*
 no.wonder has.entered IAM=that cow NEG restore that gate
 'No wonder the cows got in, the gate did not get closed!'

Exclamations are utterances that convey expressive meaning (frequently in addition to descriptive meaning). The fact that *gima* often occurs in such utterances suggests an association between *gima* and expressive meaning. A further indicator of this association comes from EXPRESSIVE REDUPLICATION, a pattern of partial reduplication in Kimaragang described by Kroeger & Johansson (2017). That paper illustrates a wide range of semantic functions associated with expressive reduplication, and discusses a number of criteria by which expressive reduplication can be distinguished from aspectual reduplication.

In a number of the examples presented above, *gima* is reinforced by the use of expressive reduplication: <ba>baya in (32), miob<pi>pinee in (33), o<ru>rungut in (37), naka<wa>wantuk in (45), and <bi>binuak in (48). The reduplicated form <ba>batang 'letter' is used in (29) to emphasize total illiteracy ('not one single letter!'), occurring in the same sentence as *gima* but not in the same clause. The same is true for o<lo>lonsi 'stink' in (18), and <ta>tantu 'certain' in (19).¹⁹

Since both *gima* and expressive reduplication are frequently observed in exclamations, it is not surprising that they should frequently co-occur. In some contexts, however, this co-occurrence seems to be obligatory (or at least strongly preferred). My primary informant stated that examples (53, 54a) would be unnatural if the expressive reduplication is omitted but *gima* is retained.²⁰ The simple declarative example (54b), in contrast, which contains neither *gima* nor expressive reduplication, is fully acceptable.

- (53) Amu *gima* si-sinobut dialo it=gopu yo
 NEG GIMA DUP-PST.visit.OV 3SG NOM=field 3SG.GEN
 sampay notowunan do=sakot i=togilay.
 until PST.NVOL.cover.DV GEN=grass NOM=corn/maize
 'He never went to check on his field *gima*, so his corn got overgrown with grass.'
- (54) a. Ri-rinumangkama=i' do *gima* i=kangkong tinanom ku. (=39a)
 DUP-PST.AV.creep=EMPH LNK GIMA NOM=water.spinach PST.plant.OV 1SG.GEN
 'The *kangkong* (water spinach) that I planted has spread out (I am surprised to see)!'

 b. Rinumangkama no i=kangkong tinanom ku.
 PST.AV.creep IAM NOM=water.spinach PST.plant.OV 1SG.GEN
 'The *kangkong* that I planted has spread out.' (neutral statement)

Clearly there is a strong association between certain uses of *gima* and certain kinds of expressive meaning, e.g. surprise, annoyance, disapproval, etc. It may be possible to provide a purely pragmatic explanation for this association; or it may turn out that these expressive meanings have become grammaticalized or conventionalized to some extent. I leave this question as a topic for future research.

¹⁹ U<na>nawon in (42) and u<ra>rangkadon in (50) are ambiguous between expressive reduplication and aspectual reduplication. Examples of expressive reduplication occurring with the mirative particle *bala* were seen in (8) (<wi>widsingo 'peel' and na<pa>pasa 'rotten') and (41a) (miob<pi>pinee 'related as siblings').

²⁰ My informant made a similar comment about <bi>binuak 'wasted' in example (48), but he also stated that this root is rarely used without reduplication. Perhaps a reference to someone wasting something usually involves expressive as well as descriptive meaning.

8. Conclusion

In some ways it seems curious for a language to have a grammatical morpheme which indicates that the information being expressed is already available to the addressee, since this should be a somewhat abnormal kind of utterance. In fact, as noted by Zimmermann (2011) and Grosz (2016 ms.), such morphemes have been reported in a number of languages. The motivation for using such markers is summarized by Crone (2017: iv–v) as follows:

It so happens that redundant utterances ... are quite often explicitly marked as redundant... The puzzle is why a speaker would ever explicitly mark an utterance as redundant, when this is unnecessary for achieving the speaker's goals. It is argued here that speakers do so in order to ensure that their listeners are well-informed with respect to the speakers' beliefs about their listeners. Put differently, if I don't tell you that I know you know, you might conclude that I don't know you know. To ensure that you know that I know you know, I tell you that I know you know.

Gima, like other status particles, helps speaker and hearer to manage the common ground by signalling the speaker's awareness of the hearer's knowledge. I have noted a number of similarities of usage between *gima* and German unstressed *ja*, but also some differences. As Grosz (2016 ms.) points out, this is a common situation in comparing the discourse particles of one language with those of another language:

Nevertheless, from a cross-linguistic perspective, the issue of the discourse particles' individual contributions is precarious. While other closed-class items, such as modal auxiliaries, exhibit a certain degree of equivalence across unrelated languages, it appears to be rather difficult to establish one-to-one correspondences between a particle α in one language and a particle α' in another language... Nevertheless, tentative correspondences can be established... Moreover, on a pretheoretic level, we observe that, in particular, the uncontroversiality component of *ja*... and the contrast component of *doch*... surface as 'semantic atoms' in many languages (where the term 'semantic atoms' informally refers to a part of the meaning contribution of an abstract functional element).

For example, Wouk (1998: 403) describes the core sense of the Indonesian discourse particle *kan* as "presupposition of conjoint knowledge." Like *gima*, *kan* is often used as a quantity hedge and indicates that the information being expressed is already accessible to the addressee.²¹ Clearly the two particles share much of their core meaning. However, the range of uses is not identical. *Kan* can be used for several functions where *gima* is never used, e.g. to extend the common ground by inviting the addressee to accommodate new information, or as a topic marker (activating information that is already in the common ground). Similarly, based on Wouk's description it appears that *kan* is not used in some contexts where *gima* frequently occurs, e.g. to indicate the speaker's surprise about something newly discovered and observable in the utterance context.

The Mandarin sentence-final particle *ma* in declarative sentences also appears to have essentially the same core meaning as *gima*, but again exhibits a slightly different range of uses (Chappell 1991; Chu 1998).

Of course part of the challenge in comparing such particles across languages is that the number of languages for which detailed information is available concerning the meanings and

²¹ I am ignoring here the other major use of *kan*, as a confirmation tag, which is distinguished by intonation and (fairly often) word order.

functions of these particles is still relatively small. This case study is offered as a modest contribution toward enriching the empirical basis for further investigation.

Abbreviations

1	first person	ITER	iterative aspect
2	second person	IV	instrumental voice
3	third person	LNK	linker
ACC	accusative case	LOC	locative case
ATEMP	atemporal	LV	locative voice
AV	actor voice	MIR	mirative
CAUS	Causative	NEG	negator
COMP	complementizer	NMLZ	nominalizer
DAT	dative case	NOM	nominative case
DIST	distal (demonstrative)	NVOL	non-volitive
DU	dual	OV	objective voice
DV	dative voice	PL	plural
EXIST	existential	PFV	perfective
EXCL	exclusive	PRTCL	particle
EMPH	emphatic particle	PST	past
EXCLM	exclamation	Q	interrogative
GEN	genitive case	QUOT	quote marker
HAB	habitual	RECP	reciprocal
IAM	Iamitive (“already”/perfect)	RED	reduplication
IMPER	imperative	REL	relativizer
INCL	inclusive	RQ	rhetorical question
INTR	intransitive	SG	singular
IRR	irrealis mode	TR	transitive

References

- Abraham, Werner. 1991. Discourse particles in German: How does their illocutive force come about? In Werner Abraham (ed.), *Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 203–252.
- Büring, Daniel. 2017. “Ja Doch!” In Clemens Mayr & Edwin Williams (eds.), *Festschrift für Martin Prinzhorn*. Wiener Linguistische Gazette 82. 23–35.
- Chappell, Hilary. 1991. Strategies for the assertion of obviousness and disagreement in Mandarin: a semantic study of the modal particle *me*. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 11.1: 39–65.
- Chu, Chauncey. 1998. *A Discourse Grammar of Mandarin Chinese*. New York and Bern: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Coniglio, Marco. 2007. German modal particles in root and embedded clauses. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 17: 109–141.
- Crone, Philip. 2017. Redundancy and awareness in discourse. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Grosz, Patrick. 2014. German *doch*: An element that triggers a contrast presupposition. *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 46: 163–177.
- Grosz, Patrick G. 2016 ms. Discourse particles. To appear in: Lisa Matthewson, Cécile Meier, Hotze Rullmann, & Thomas Ede Zimmermann (eds.), *The companion to semantics*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Gutzmann, Daniel. 2015. *Use-conditional meaning: Studies in multidimensional semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena & Stefan Kaufmann. 2012. Epistemic particles and performativity. *Proceedings of SALT* 22: 208–225.

- Kratzer, Angelika & Matthewson, Lisa. 2009. Anatomy of two discourse particles. Paper presented at SULA 5. Harvard/MIT.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1991. The event line in Kimaragang narrative. In Stephen Levinsohn (ed.), *Thematic continuity and development in languages of Sabah*, 93–104. Pacific Linguistics C-118.
- Kroeger, Paul. 2017. Frustration, culmination, and inertia in Kimaragang grammar. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 2(1): 56. 1–29.
- Kroeger, Paul & Jim Johansson. 2016. Descriptive vs. expressive reduplication in Kimaragang. In Hiroki Nomoto, Takuya Miyauchi & Asako Shiohara (eds.), *AFLA 23: The Proceedings of the 23rd Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, 1–19. Asia-Pacific Linguistics 34. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCready, E. 2010. Varieties of conventional implicature. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 3(8). 1–57.
- Östman, Jan. 1981. *‘You know’: A discourse-functional approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Potts, Christopher. 2007. Conventional implicatures, a distinguished class of meanings. In Gillian Ramchand & Charles Reiss (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic interfaces. Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*, 475–501. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Repp, Sophie. 2013. Common ground management: Modal particles, illocutionary negation and VERUM. In Daniel Gutzmann & Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.), *Beyond expressives: Explorations in use-conditional meaning*, 231–274. Leiden: Brill.
- Rett, Jessica. 2011. Exclamatives, degrees and speech acts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 34(5). 411–442.
- Waltereit, Richard. 2001. Modal particles and their functional equivalents: A speechact-theoretic approach. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33. 1391–1417.
- Wouk, Fay. 1998. Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker *kan*. *Multilingua* 17. 379–406.
- Zimmermann, Malte. 2011. Discourse particles. In Paul Portner, Claudia Maienborn & Klaus von Stechow (eds.), *Handbook of Semantics/Handbücher zur Sprachund Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 2012–2038. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.