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Abstract
Information structure is concerned with the management and organization of elaboration in discourse. Speakers and writers have at their disposal a variety of techniques for controlling the presuppositions that they wish to maintain and the new relationships that they wish to assert about them. These techniques vary cross-linguistically, encompassing, inter alia, prosody, morphology, and syntactic structure. Because prosody is a key marker of information structure in many languages, the information structure of written texts is less-studied than that of spoken discourse. The study of written texts offers some research benefits, however, such as ease of annotation and the disentanglement—from superimposed phonological phenomena—of those markers that do manifest in writing. Additionally, the increased linguistic load placed on syntactic marking in written texts may more readily elicit the full spectrum of syntactic use cases. The present study explores the information structure of written Thai, guided by the annotation of a Thai short story.

1 Introduction
The study of linguistic information structure is subtle, owing to complex interactions between communicative goals and the available marking strategies, many of which are overloaded with competing linguistic functions. Until recently, the field of study has also been at the disadvantage of lacking research consensus and uniform terminology (Paggio 2009: 138). An important catalyst for resolving this impasse was Lambrecht’s (1996) exhaustive work, which brought, within the tradition of theoretical linguistics, a welcome degree of rigor. At the broadest level of research consensus are the dual qualia of TOPIC—the mental representation of a discourse referent that a proposition is “about” (ibid.: 127), and FOCUS—the unpredictable portion of an assertion that represents new information (ibid.: 213).

Despite this progress, relatively little of the information structure literature embraces quantitative methods and modern computational capabilities. Naturally, some theoretical study should precede corpus investigation, lest the latter have a haphazard character, but after several decades of proposals it seems appropriate to put promising ideas to test. Even intuitively compelling proposals can benefit from the exercise of corpus study.

One ambitious and worthwhile quantitative methodology is to adopt a hypothesis wholesale and integrate it into a computational grammar system. In this approach, the hypothesis is falsified when the overall system parses or generates incorrectly. Alternative hypotheses can be evaluated by comparing the detailed performance metrics that such systems produce. Within the Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) formalism (Pollard and Sag 1994), authors pursuing sketches of computational information structure representations include Engdahl and Vallduví (1996) (Catalan), Wilcock (2005), Jokinen (2005) (Finnish), and Paggio (2009) (Dutch).

There is also need for—and value in—more preliminary studies which simply aim to document, characterize, and establish the cross-linguistic sufficiency of a theoretical model of linguistic information structure for naturally occurring discourse, and this is the objective of this study. By annotating a short written text in the Thai language for information structure, I hope to document the occurrence, utility, and sufficiency of the TOPIC and FOCUS qualia for Thai, and to make some quantitative observations about their surface manifestation (marking) in a simple written narrative.

2 Prior Work
Few English-language results have been published in Thai information structure. A literature survey (Burusphat 2002) confirms only a handful of relevant papers in the field of discourse studies, many of them in Thai.

Meepoe-Baron (Meepoe 1997, Meepoe-Baron 1998) has a number of studies on how Thai interlocutors tie their utterances together by selecting mirroring or complementing lexemes and syntactic structures. While such a
shared common ground—not of discourse content, but of discourse process—may introduce noise into the information structure signal by further competing for its scarce marking resources, I do not control for any such effects in this study. Although Meepoe-Baron’s studies involve spontaneous conversation, a similar effect in composed text might originate from poetic or stylistic considerations limiting or dictating the expressive means available for information structure marking.

Meepoe-Baron’s research used a discourse corpus collected by Iwasaki, himself the co-author of a major reference grammar of Thai which presents a brief overview of discourse phenomena in Thai, including the TOPIC-COMMENT syntactic construction, TOPIC marking, referent tracking, resumptive pronouns (LEFT-DISLOCATION), expletive use, and non-canonical constituent order (Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom 2005: 359-376).

Warotamasikkhadit (1979) is a transformational-grammar account of LEFT- and RIGHT-DISLOCATION and TOPIC-COMMENT structures. This pioneering work in the study of Thai information structure strives to disentangle syntactic TOPIC from information structure TOPIC.

Some years later, the same author presented examples of fronting and backing constructions in Thai, contrasting them with canonical forms (Warotamasikkhadit 1997). His observations on the role of demonstratives in establishing the rightwards boundary in TOPIC-COMMENT structures are elaborated by Singnoi, who provides a good analysis of the subtle relationship between the demonstrative determiners and demonstrative pronouns and their discourse function (Singnoi 2004). In particular, she posits five pragmato-discourse functions for the demonstratives, which span a range from information status to information structure: drawing attention, switching attention, tracking entities, managing discourse referents, and reintroducing topics (Singnoi 2004: 651).

Both of these authors posit interactions between non-canonical structures and definiteness. The former asserts that fronted topics must be definite, while suggesting that Thai demonstrative determiners do not inherently mark an NP for definiteness (Warotamasikkhadit 1997: 304). Singnoi concurs, citing Christopher Lyons’ analysis of such in English, as well as separate work by Marianne Mithun and Talmy Givón to note that additional pragmatic context is required for fully establishing the definiteness of NPs in Thai (Singnoi 2004: 650). For the purposes of this study, her most pertinent remarks concern the characterization of rigidly right-bounded noun phrases (Singnoi 2004: 650), work that I summarize in Section 4.5.1.5.

More recently, Singnoi presents results of corpus study of the occurrence of six non-canonical structures (existential, fronting, cleft, passive, and left- and right-dislocation), cross-tabulated against eight discourse functions (marking new or given information, or the discourse topic; substituting agency; marking contrast; shifting topic; reactivating referents; and marking unknown or unimportant agents) (Singnoi 2007). She finds that the existential construction tends to be used to present new information, while FRONTING is used to mark given information or refer to the discourse TOPIC, and LEFT-DISLOCATION is used to reactivate past discourse referents.

3 Source Text

This project will consist of the annotation of the short story Building Sandpiles (ก่อกองทราย) (Thanya 1955) written in 1955 by the Thai poet, Thanya Sangkapanthanon (ธัญญา สังขพันธานนท์, 1926- ), writing under the penname Paitoon Thanya (ไพฑูรย์ ธัญญา). This text consists of approximately 2,357 words in 197 sentences. A complete copy of the source text is included as Appendices A (Thai) and B (English).

The central character of the fictional narrative is an unnamed small girl who is playing in the sand by herself on a river bank while a group of boisterous boys swim nearby. Playing alone, she forms structures from the wet sand of the beach, but waves repeatedly wash up to destroy them. At first she is frustrated, but after one of the boys cautiously joins her, the two find renewed optimism despite the adversity. The allegorical meditation is well known for its rustic portrayal of uncomplicated innocence, and its southern Thai folkloric sensibility.
4 Annotation Methodology

The annotation work presented here comprises: full glossing and a new English translation; Thai-English sentence alignment and sense selection; identification of dropped subjects, dropped objects, and pronoun occurrence; coarse syntactic constituent analysis; and judged assignment of topic and focus qualia. The guidelines for each of these annotation categories will be discussed in the following sub-sections.

During the annotation procedure, grammatical judgments were elicited from a native speaker as necessary to resolve points of ambiguity. For this project, the native Thai speaker is a 42-year-old, Seattle-resident, non-linguist, bilingual male ‘A’, who lived ten childhood years in Thailand, and maintains fluency through exclusive Thai speaking with Thai-resident family members and friends, and by frequent travel to Thailand.

4.1 Gloss and Translation

An English translation of the text by was available in bitext format (Glass n.d.) and used for reference, but as with all excellent literary translations, it did not have the specific goal of facilitating linguistic study by, for example, preserving unusual syntactic constructions. With guidance from—and respect to—this source text, it was decided to develop a new full gloss and technical English translation as part of this project. In the new translation, constituent structures of putative information structural interest, such as fronting, backing, left-dislocation, and right-dislocation, are paralleled in English, where possible. Where it was not possible to fully capture these structures (as with verb serialization and certain topic-comment patterns, for example), the interlinear glossed text (IGT) lines in the detailed annotation provides an indication of the constituent structure of the Thai source.

4.2 Thai Sentence Disambiguation

While sentence breaking is not specifically necessary for information structure analysis, nevertheless an initial goal of this project was to develop consistent guidelines for the treatment of sentences in order to facilitate organized study of the corpus. In Thai orthography, sentence-final punctuation is not used. The space character is a necessary but insufficient marker of a “sentence break,” because it is also used prescriptively in certain typographic situations and may be used to separate ideas within such “sentences” (Wathabunditkul 2003). While some of the more specific prescriptive uses can be identified, this overloading renders the space character’s marking function fundamentally lossy, and the “sentences” in running Thai text cannot be consistently disambiguated, even by fluent natives (Aroonmanakun 2007).

(1) ลำน้ำนั้นไหลมาจากทิศตะวันตก
ลำน้ำนั้นไหลมาจากทิศตะวันตก
[1.] The stream flowed from the west

(2) ลำน้ำนั้นไหลมาจากทิศตะวันตก
ลำน้ำนั้นไหลมาจากทิศตะวันตก
The stream flowed. (it) came from the west.

There are subtle feedback relationships between sentence-determination (as informed by space characters), asyndetic coordination, grammaticalized aspect marker disambiguation3, verb serialization, and subject-dropping. To illustrate these interactions, consider (1), the sum of text which appears before the first space character in the narrative. As attested by informant ‘A’, the correct interpretation of this fragment is shown, but this text also supports an asyndetic coordination, pro-drop reading where the aspect marker /ma:/ is taken to be a main verb

2 Square-bracketed numbers in the text indicate the sequence number of the sentence in the annotated story. When a single sentence generates multiple annotation units, alphabetic suffixes ‘a’, ‘b’, etc. are used.

3 Thai aspect markers are grammaticalized from main verbs from which they are orthographically indistinguishable.
“come,” from which it was grammaticalized, giving the acceptable (if pragmatically unusual), “The stream flowed, (and) (it) came from the west.” Furthermore, by inserting a space before มา as shown in (2), this is now the preferred semantics.

For this project, the text was divided into sentences according to a subjective balance of the above criteria. To avoid the ambiguity described above, I did not impute a dropped subject for serialized verbs. With similar motivation, I avoid ascribing overt English coordination when there is no overt coordination lexeme in Thai, even if this results in stylistically impoverished English. For example, in (3) the translation, “She was nearly crying, and paralyzed with anger,” is not used. Thai orthography containing a space, followed by resumptive serialization (without an overt subject) was preferentially treated as a single sentence, rather than a new sentence with subject drop (3).

A single continued sentence was less favored when the preceding serial verb had adjuncts or clauses to its right, especially when these intervening constituents contained a (non-subject) noun or noun phrase (4, continuing to 5). As shown, a new sentence is designated with an initial dropped subject marker.

Semantic considerations also influence sentence breaking. The space between (6) and (7) was judged to be sentence-breaking despite strong bias for serialization, because it seems unlikely that the girl’s repositioning is an additional consequence, beyond the redesigning, of her displeasure with her efforts.

In order to more usefully generalize about structural forms in a small corpus, certain top-level structural forms were decomposed. In this step, each sentence identified according to the criteria described above yielded one or more annotation units, each of which had the form of a matrix sentence. The decomposed forms include: independent sentences occurring within quoted dialog (these instances were tagged as originating in quoted speech); overt S-coordination; if-then; S-complement; and the like. Function words related to these forms were ignored, even
if they were embedded in the decomposed parts. For example, in (8), จึง /tɕɯŋ/ "therefore" is embedded in the second of two annotation units but is not considered part of the annotation unit. Decomposition was not performed for coordination which is due to monolithic verb serialization, as in (3).

(8) ตะวันเที่ยงลอยคว้างตรงหัว เงาหลุมพอจึงหดสั้นเข้ามาทุกที

ràʔwan tʰîːaŋ lɔːj kʰwáːŋ troŋ hǔːa ŋaw lǔmpʰɔː tɕɯŋ hòt sān kʰâw mā: tʰúkʰìː
sun noon float adrift straight head shadow lumpaw therefore retract short [asp] [asp] increasingly
[96.] The noontime sun loitered overhead, so the shadow of the lumpaw tree retracted increasingly shorter.

In (9), the three independent annotation units that are categorized for the sentence are shown in square brackets. The function words, outside the bracketed annotation units, are discarded. Because of this decomposition, there are more annotation units than there are sentence designations in this study; the study comprises 296 annotation units derived from 197 sentences, an average of 1.5 units per sentence. This ratio is relatively high because each of the 33 sentences with quoted dialog generated at least two annotation units, one for the quotation frame, and one for the quoted speech. Often a single quotation frame contained multiple sentences of quoted speech.

(9) When [one of them dove down and stuck in the branch, hiding it in the base of the stream, the others would dive hunting for it], and if [anyone was able to find it], then [he had the right to chase and hit his friends].

After sentence breaking, the identified annotation units are independently analyzed for syntactic features (subject- and object-drop, Sections 4.3 and 4.4; syntactic structure, Section 4.5) and information structure (Section 4.6). Note that this methodology presumes that the information structure phenomena of interest are localizable within the matrix sentence, a hypothesis which is adopted without examination.

4.3 Subject- and Object-Drop Recovery

The symbol Øs was inserted to represent the grammatical word position for each dropped subject in the text. A firm annotation guideline used here is that drop symbols may only appear in places where an overt Thai expletive or pronoun would be grammatical. Consultant ‘A’ found elicitation for some of these covert-recovery judgments difficult, so strong is the mandate for the dropping of recoverable arguments. (10) illustrates dropped pronouns which, when made overt, ‘A’ found cumbersome but acceptable. In some cases, I constructed parallel structures which introduce new referents, and then substituted-in one pronoun at a time until the insertion position of all drop symbols as pronouns could be simultaneously validated in the target sentence.

(10) มองดูแต่ไกลเหมือนตุ๊กตาตัวใหญ่ไม่สวมเสื้อ
mɔːŋduː tɛː klaj mâj sǔːam sɯ ̂ːa
Øs examine Ød.o. from far Øs resemble doll [cls] big not wear shirt
[30.] Seen from afar, she looked like a big doll with no shirt.

(11) จากนั้นก็ตั้งลงไปปักซ่อนไว้อีก
tàʔk nǎn kɔː dam loŋ pàk sɔːn wáj ʔìːk
from there Øs [link] dive descend go stick-in Ød.o. conceal [asp] again
[58.] After that, he dove down to hide it again.

The object drop symbol Ød.o. was only introduced where the verb strongly or necessarily transitive, or when the referent was deemed significant and identifiable. For example, in (11), the referent of “stick” figures prominently in the discourse at this point, and the verb ปัก /pàk/ “to stick in” seems strongly transitive. Similarly, consultant ‘A’ was not able to form an intransitive use of the verb ตบแต่ง /tɔptɛːŋ/, “to decorate,” so the position of the dropped pronoun in (12) is annotated. Its recoverable referent is the “big pile of sand.”
As noted in the discussion of sentence disambiguation, drop-recovery annotation decisions interact with sentence-breaking, and can also interact with the assignment of primary constituent type. The latter can occur, for example, when the putative topic marking particle (Section 4.5.2.6), which permits an optionally dropped pronoun to its left (13), is alternatively treated as an adverbial linker, which does not (14). Both readings, plus the reading where the dropped pronoun is overt, are judged acceptable by consultant ‘A’. Because of interactions such as these, the annotation process could not be considered final when each stage was initially completed, as rippling effects had to be considered when completing annotations in other stages, or when reconsidering previously-completed annotations.

4.4 Subject and Object Coding

The previous section explained how the recovered positions of dropped entities are represented. In addition to inserting null tokens as described, the facts of subject- and object-dropping—plus other phenomena related to entity coding—were recorded as ad-hoc feature-based annotations for the annotation unit as a whole. Overt, non-pronomial subjects were given no ad-hoc features. Beyond this, features were expressed with forms such as SUBJECT=DROP, which designates that a dropped subject token was imputed. Overt pronomial subjects were designated SUBJECT=PRONOUN. The existential expletive was given the annotation SUBJECT=DUMMY and second-person impersonal subjects were denoted with SUBJECT=IMPERSONAL; these last two designations could additionally be marked SUBJECT=DROP when implied but uninstantiated.

4.5 Syntactic Structure

In order to test the hypothesis that information structure is marked by sentence-scale syntactic structure in Thai, each annotation unit was categorized according to the general ordering of its grammatical constituents. With such a task, there is a danger of presupposing, a priori, syntactic correlations for the information structure phenomena we are trying to study. To minimize this, I avoid using terms such as “topicalization” when describing constituent structure, instead using terms that attempt to characterize the actual direction of reordering from canonical Thai constituent order. Specifically, I differentiate LEFT- and RIGHT-DISLOCATION, movements which introduce an overt pronoun, from FRONTING and BACKING, which do not. Unfortunately, in TOPIC-COMMENT, the field has a well- and long-established name for an important syntactic phenomenon which conflicts with the information-structural use of the term, TOPIC. On this point, it would be tedious for my readers to accommodate an alternative presentation. To avoid confusion, I will italicize TOPIC when it refers to the syntactic constituent.

As noted, The annotation system was ad-hoc and feature-based, allowing an arbitrary number of feature strings to be assigned to each annotation unit. I developed a closed set of primary constituent structure types, exactly
one of which designated for each annotation unit. These basic types are detailed in Section 4.5.2. Optional features, described in the previous section and in Section 4.5.3, were applied for cross-cutting secondary phenomena.

During the course of this work, the Thai particle, ก็ /kɔː/ was gradually identified as a lexeme of great interest since it may have information-structural function as a fronting marker. An intriguing hypothesis is that, when ก็ occurs in a position to the right of a subject, it causes that subject to be summarily cleft from its predicate, either with or without a resumptive pronoun. Its absence renders the construction indistinguishable from CANONICAL sequence. This role is discussed throughout my remarks in this section, and specifically in Section 4.5.2.6.

4.5.1 Subject- and Object Movement

I begin by discussing key constituent movements: RIGHT-DISLOCATION, BACKING, LEFT-DISLOCATION, and object FRONTING. When an annotation unit manifests one of the described structures, the phenomenon is notated as an ad-hoc feature. Because of the way the feature set evolved, these are considered modifications of the ‘CANONICAL’ designation. Subject FRONTING is treated as an instance of the TOPIC-COMMENT syntactic pattern, see Section 4.5.1.4. Subject- and object-FRONTING will receive extended discussion, and I also present a brief overview of an interesting structural property of noun phrases that renders them more amenable to FRONTING in Section 4.5.1.5.

4.5.1.1 Subject Right-Dislocation

Matrix subjects can be dislocated to the right. When this leaves an overt pronoun in place, the phenomenon is called RIGHT-DISLOCATION (Singnoi 2007: 8). The canonical form of (15) is shown in (16). Other names for RIGHT-DISLOCATION include backing topicalization (Warotamasikkhadit 1997: 304) and anti-topic (Lambrecht 1996: 203 after Chafe 1976). The feature SUBJECT=RIGHT is coded for this annotation unit.

(15) พวกเขามาที่กัน
พวกเขามา ที่ กัน ห้า คน
pʰûːakkʰǎw maː kan hâː kʰon
they come together five person

[13.] They came together, five of them.

(16) ห้า คนมากัน
ห้า  คน มา กัน
hâː kʰon maː kan
five person come together

Five people came together.

4.5.1.2 Backing

In SUBJECT BACKING, a rightwards-moving subject leaves no pronoun trace (Warotamasikkhadit 1997: 304). The annotation text contains one case of subject BACKING. In (17), the subject is dropped from CANONICAL position and positioned to the right. Of syntactic interest, perhaps, is that the polite particle is not outflanked by the BACKING movement.

Warotamasikkhadit also categorizes a certain benefactive alternation as an instance of BACKING, but the handful of benefactive constructions in our text (ให้ /hâj/ “give” in 18, e.g.) seem to exhibit the canonical order of complements for Thai ditransitives, that is, the direct object followed by the indirect object. Therefore, in the study text, only (17) receives SUBJECT=BACK.

(17) เป็นไงแก่
เป็น อะไร แก่
pen ŋaj kɛː âː
Øs is how [2s] [polite]
[24a.] What about you?
4.5.1.3 Subject Left-Dislocation

In LEFT-DISLOCATION, a leftwards-moved constituent is followed by a resumptive pronoun. Example (19) is the lone instance of LEFT-DISLOCATION in the narrative. Without the deictic demonstrative pronoun, the sentence would still be grammatical, as the overt pronoun มัน /man/ “it” could refer to any felicitous antecedent. Although this pattern could be considered a fundamental instance of the TOPIC-COMMENT syntactic pattern, I reserve that designation for cases with dual subjects or an enhanced semantic relation between the subject and the nucleus, and prefer the syntactic analysis for cases of simple subject reduplication such as (19). Accordingly, that example is denoted CANONICAL, SUBJECT=LEFT.

4.5.1.4 Subject Fronting

In FRONTING, a leftwards-moved constituent leaves no overt pronoun trace (Singnoi 2007: 8). I hasten to note, however, that absent a syntactic marker, FRONTING of a subject—even when it is rightwards-bounded by a determiner phrase complement (see Section 4.5.1.5)—is syntactically indistinguishable from a subject in canonical constituent order. Therefore, in Thai, for syntactic FRONTING to exist, it must be overtly marked. Later in this paper, I advance the hypothesis that the particle ก็ /kɔ̂ː/ can perform this function. When this word, which has many functions in Thai, acts to demarcate a FRONTED constituent, I will call it the fronting marker. However, for reasons discussed in Section 4.5.2.6, I elect to annotate all instances of FRONTING that are overtly marked with ก็ as instances of the TOPIC-COMMENT pattern.

To summarize, since unmarked SUBJECT FRONTING is degenerate (except perhaps when assisted by semantic infelicity, see Section 4.5.1.6 and example 33), and marked subject FRONTING is considered to be a subtype of the TOPIC-COMMENT syntactic pattern, the annotation SUBJECT=FRONT is not used in this study. OBJECT FRONTING, on the other hand, can be syntactically self-marking and widely attested in Thai. Before continuing to that discussion, however, it will be helpful to discuss noun phrases which are rigidly rightwards-bounded. This is the topic of the following section.

4.5.1.5 Rigidly-Rightwards-Bounded Noun Phrases

Here, I briefly address the claim of one author that an extra-syntactic dependency may apply to leftwards-moved noun phrases. The discussion will lead to an examination of what may be an important structurally distinguishing feature of NPs. In any case, the claim requires examination if a purely syntactic treatment of NP movement is to be licensed.

I begin by examining the case of LEFT-DISLOCATION. Although the resumptive pronoun might be thought sufficient demarcation for LEFT-DISLOCATING a subject, we must account for the observation that bare nominals are not felicitous here. That is, while CANONICAL (20), and LEFT-DISLOCATED (21) are acceptable, *(22), is judged marginal by informant ‘A’, and is generally rejected in reference grammars (Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom 2005: 361). To account for this, Warotamasikkhadit suggests that leftwards-moving arguments “must be made definite” by the presence of one of the definite determiners, or the resumptive pronoun “which is always definite” (Warotamasikkhadit 1997: 304). This language seems to suggest that he believes this constraint to be pragmatically motivated, but I favor a simpler syntactic motivation which is easily tested here. My view may be shared by Singnoi, who notes that one
“quite rigid” syntactic function of Thai demonstratives is to establish the rightwards boundary of an NP (Singnoi 2004: 647-648), and by Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom, who go so far as to distinguish the demonstrative lexemes as “topic markers” when they function in this role (Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom 2005: 361). To test the view that it is syntactic rigidness that is required, and not pragmatic definiteness, I formed a non-corpus sentence (23) with a LEFT-DISLOCATED subject and the non-universal quantifier “some.” Informant ‘A’ judges this sentence acceptable, so assuming that a resumptive pronoun can be no more definite than its antecedent, I ascribe the well-formedness requirements for LEFT-DISLOCATED constituents to syntactic—and not pragmatic—considerations.

(20) ลำน้ำนั้นไหลมาจากทิศตะวันตก
lamnám nān lāj mā tēāk tʰīttaʔwantōk
stream [dmnst] flow [asp] from west
[1.] The stream flowed from the west.

(21) ลำน้ำนั้นมันไหลมาจากทิศตะวันตก
lamnám nān mān lāj mā tēāk tʰīttaʔwantōk
stream [dmnst] it flow [asp] from west
The stream, it flowed from the west.

* (22) ลำน้ำมันไหลมาจากทิศตะวันตก
lamnám mān lāj mā tēāk tʰīttaʔwantōk
stream it flow [asp] from west
The stream, it flowed from the west.

(23) คนบางคนเขาทำให้ผมปวดหัว
kʰon baːŋ kʰon kʰǎw tʰamhāj pʰǒm pùːathǔːa
person some [cls] they cause I headache
Some people, they give me a headache.

As for unmarked SUBJECT FRONTING, even rigid rightwards NP edges—that is, determiner phrases that end with a demonstrative—are insufficient for establishing contrast with CANONICAL subject position (recall that the fronting marker is typically introduced to achieve this purpose), so Warotamasikkhadit’s claim is not so easily settled in the absence of a resumptive pronoun, and this is left for future work. For purposes of such investigations, I occasionally make note of the “rigid” or “non-rigid” characteristic of fronted NPs in my discussions below.

4.5.1.6 Object Fronting

OBJECT FRONTING, authors describe widely (Singnoi 2007: 5, Smyth 2002: 116, Warotamasikkhadit 1997: 303), and I now return to a discussion of this phenomenon. In Section 4.5.1.4 I noted that OBJECT FRONTING can be self-marking, and it is now possible to note that this is due to the rigid rightwards boundary requirement which I elaborated in the previous section. With a FRONTED object and overt subject, two NPs will be adjacent, and the rigid rightwards boundary on the former helps establish the FRONTING pattern.

It would be interesting to exhibit some examples from the study corpus, but the only use of object FRONTING in the study corpus—including instances within quoted text—is for the dialog frame itself, where the quoted speech as a whole, being the object of a speech-act verb, is FRONTED. In fact, this pattern is used every time speech is attributed to a speaker in the text. Quoted dialog appears to manifest a different form of NP rightwards rigidity, as—even without the use of quotation mark punctuation4—that quoted utterances can usually be disambiguated from the

4 Although Western orthographic punctuation is sometimes used in Thai, it is not mandatory and may be considered prescriptively or stylistically poor practice.
adjacent dialog-frame subject, probably via biased consideration of context, orthographic space, or usage conventions of common speech act verbs.

### 4.5.2 Primary Constituent Structure Type

As discussed in 4.5, each annotation unit is assigned exactly one primary constituent structure type. The complete set used in this annotation project is: CANONICAL, BENEFACTIVE, IMPERATIVE, INTERJECTION, PASSIVE, QUESTION, TOPIC-COMMENT, COPULA, and S-COMPLEMENT. Some of these support or require further specification, as follows: the CANONICAL designation can be extended by noting the chaining of multiple, semantically related clauses (but note that serialization over the same subject is considered an ordinary CANONICAL pattern); the COPULA designation can be extended to denote that the copular word is uninstantiated with the extended notation COPULA=DROP; the S-COMPLEMENT designation requires specification of one of the other primary constituent structure types, using the notation S-COMP=type; and the TOPIC-COMMENT designation requires that the TOPIC-to-COMMENT relation type be specified as either possessor, secondary-cause, or subject. I now review these types in detail.

#### 4.5.2.1 Canonical

The canonical constituent order in Thai is SUBJECT – VERB – OBJECT, where additional predicates may be serialized over the same subject:

\[ [S \ V [O]] \ [V [O]] [\ldots] \]

Verb serialization constructions in Thai include directional, temporal, conjunctive, and resultative varieties, which I will not classify here; refer to Muansuwan (2001, 2002) and Thepkanjana (1986) for treatments. Grammatical aspect markers assume positions both before and after main verbs and interact with verb serialization; I limit the scope of the current work to coding their presence via sense-selection; the analyses of Koenig and Muansuwan (2000, 2005) guided this aspect of the task. Monolithic serialization, where action proceeds uniformly through a string of verbs and aspect markers, is annotated as a CANONICAL structure. In (24), a prepositional phrase adjunct is seen in CANONICAL position (to the right of the verb); as with syntactic subjects and objects (Section 4.5.1), ad-hoc features can be added to the “CANONICAL” designation should a verbal adjunct be positioned left-wise. This is discussed in 4.5.3.1.

115. The girl sank back on the sand.

In addition, the story exhibits cases of clause chaining, where a semantic meta-relation is expressed through the juxtaposition of two (or more) semantically complete events expressed as clauses. When these chains of semantically related clauses did not meet the requirements for partition into distinct annotation units, they were given the designation CANONICAL=CHAIN. With this annotation, ad-hoc features can be independently attached to the subject of the chained clause by using notation of the form, (e.g.) SUBJECT-2=DROP.

#### 4.5.2.2 Benefactive

The syntax of the BENEFACTIVE construction in Thai is a complex subject, and documenting it meaningfully is beyond the scope of this study. In order to permit the four sentences found in the text to be handled accordingly during analysis, they were identified with the primary constituent structure type BENEFACTIVE. Without further comment, I show a simple instance in (25).

180. She scooped up some sand for him to see.
4.5.2.3 Imperative and Interjection

In this story, imperative declarations and interjections occur only within quoted dialog. Corresponding instances are marked with the primary type IMPERATIVE or INTERJECTION. In the case of the latter, annotation features related to dropping or movement are not coded. This allows for consistent treatment of utterances such as (26).

(26) ใช่ ใช่ tɕʰâj yes

4.5.2.4 Passive

Because the phenomenon manipulates subjects and objects in distinctive ways, I chose to annotate occurrences of the overt “adversative” passive marker ถูก /tʰùːk/ (Singnoi 2002: 76) as a primary constituent structure type. I do not attempt to insert a dropped subject marker for the demoted subject of a PASSIVE. For example, in (27), the boys who jumped in the pool are not syntactically positioned. Likewise in (45), the animate actor (“the girl”) is not made explicit. As for Singnoi’s “non-adversative” type, the overt preposition โดย /doːj/ “by” does not appear in the study text, so I conclude that there are no instances of this form of passive construction.

(27) ผืนน้ำราบเรียบถูกแรงกระแทกแตกกระจายเป็นฟองพราย... ผืนน้ำราบเรียบถูกแรงกระแทกแตกกระจายเป็นฟองพราย pʰɯ̌ːn náːm râːprîːap tʰùːk rɛːŋ kràʔtʰɛ ̂ːk tɛ̀ːk kràʔtɕaːj pen fɔːŋ pʰraːj surface water flat [pass] power crash break disperse [→caus] froth brilliant

4.5.2.5 Question

Beyond designating QUESTION as the primary constituent structure type, and annotating the co-occurrence of certain structural movements (the one example of subject BACKING in the text appears in the context of an interrogative, see Section 4.5.1.2), the syntax of interrogative forms is not investigated in this study.

4.5.2.6 Topic-Comment

The so-called TOPIC-COMMENT syntactic pattern is attested in Thai (Smyth 2002:117). Hewing to convention, I exclude clausal TOPICS from this discussion, but will close this section with some remarks on this point. In the present treatment, TOPIC-COMMENT is distinguished from simple FRONTING by either: an enhanced semantic relationship of the left-wise constituent to the COMMENT—TOPIC-COMMENT generally permits greater latitude here; or the presence of an overt fronting marker. In other words, although the most basic TOPIC-COMMENT pattern is indistinguishable from a canonical SUBJECT-VERB sentence (or FRONTED subject), the former is more flexible in allowing the referent of the syntactic TOPIC to enter enhanced semantic relationships with the COMMENT. Being purely syntactic, the LEFT-DISLOCATION and FRONTING analyses are simpler than the more semantically-adept TOPIC-COMMENT. Therefore, when unmarked and when extended semantics is not signaled, I select the syntactic phenomenon, rather than TOPIC-COMMENT, as the constituent structure for the annotation unit. I further define the COMMENT as requiring a verb (NP-NP structures are discussed in 4.5.2.7).

---

5 Singnoi considers โดย /doːj/ a preposition and not a function word, and so she calls this construction “unmarked.” (Singnoi 2002: 86)

6 The use of the term “topic” in describing the TOPIC-COMMENT syntactic pattern should not be construed as implying that the pattern necessarily marks for information structure topic. To avoid confusion, we italicize topic when it refers to the left-positioned syntactic constituent in the TOPIC-COMMENT pattern.

7 Here, I admit the possibility of additional syntactic clefting mechanisms beyond the one that I propose at the end of this section, such as those proposed by Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom (2005: 361).
I propose a topic-demarcation role for the common Thai particle ก็/kɔː/, while noting that the particle has a wide range of uses—including that of discourse marker—and it may at times simultaneously satisfy multiple roles from this set. For example when the particle appears to separate clauses, it must be relevant to clause-chaining, a role which I won’t investigate here. While collapsing multiple distinct roles of the particle ก็ may seem like an appealing generalization, it is clear from detailed studies on Thai verb serialization (Thepkanjana 1986, Muansuwan 2001, 2002), and the vast literature on the (nominal-)TOPIC-COMMENT pattern that—beyond the structural the structural similarity discussed at the end of this section—multiple phenomena are involved.

(28)
แล้วเด็กชายทั้งหมดก็รีบถอดเสื้้อผ้าผลัดกองไว้บนเนินทรายเหลือตัวล่อนจ้อน
แล้วเด็กชายทั้งหมดก็รีบถอดเสื้้อผ้าผลัดกองไว้บนเนินทรายเหลือตัวล่อนจ้อน
lɛ́ːw dèktɕʰaːj tʰáŋ mòt kɔ rîːp tʰɔ̀ːt sɯ̂ːapʰâː pʰlàt kɔːŋ wáj bon ɤːn sjaj lɯ̌ːa tɯa lɔ̄ːntɕɔ̂ːn
then boy all total Øs [link] hurry strip cloth es switch pile keep on mound sand remain self naked

[36.] Then, all of the boys, (they) took off their clothes and threw them on a hump of sand, leaving themselves naked.

In (28), the particle is shown cleaving-off the (non-rigid) NP subject of a CANONICAL sentence. An unusual aspect of this phenomenon is that the lexeme does not precisely partition constituents to its left and right but rather its presence to the 

right
of the optional resumptive pronoun—a position that might be considered within the syntactic COMMENT—designates the syntactic TOPIC as FRONTED or LEFT-DISLOCATED. The canonical version of the sentence is shown in (29). I do not consider the presence of the overt fronting marker to be the type of trace that qualifies (28) as an instance of LEFT-DISLOCATION, because an overt pronoun is still felicitous before the linking particle, as indicated by Øs. Unfortunately, in this study corpus, there are no such instances—ก็ co-occurring with both an overt pronoun and a LEFT-DISLOCATED subject—but consultant ‘A’ judges the case grammatical. His comment is that the reduplication feels to him like colloquial speech, the particle in this case perhaps serving as a discourse marker. Example (30) shows another example of FRONTING marked by ก็, this time where a subject pronoun is dropped, leaving only its quantifying specifier in place. A final example (31) shows that the marking pattern is compatible with a rigid subject NP. Here the demonstrative นั้น /nán/ marks the rightwards boundary of an NP which has a classifier-demonstrative complex as its specifier.

(30)
แล้วทั้งสองก็หัวเราะขึ้นพร้อมกันดังดัง
แล้วทั้งสองก็หัวเราะขึ้นพร้อมกันดังดัง
lɛ́ːw tʰáŋ sɔ̀ːŋ kɔ hǔːarɔ́ʔ kʰɯ̂ npʰ rɔ́ːmkan daŋdaŋ
then Øs all two Øs [link] laugh [asp] concurrently loudly

[194.] Then, the two of them, (they) laughed loudly, together.

(31)
เพียงอึดใจลำคลองสายนั้นก็สัมสลอมไปด้วยเด็กชายด้วยเปลือยเปลือย
เพียงอึดใจลำคลองสายนั้นก็สัมสลอมไปด้วยเด็กชายด้วยเปลือยเปลือย
pʰiːaŋ ʔɯ tɕaj lamkʰlɔːŋ sǎːj nân kɔ sâm sàlɔːŋ paj dûaj dèktɕʰaj tɯa plàːw plɯːaj
only moment canal [clas] [dmnst] Øs [link] mixed profuse [asp] with boy [cls] empty bare

[64.] In just a moment, that canal, (it) became profuse with naked boys.

One way to categorize subtypes of TOPIC-COMMENT is according to the semantic relation between the TOPIC NP and the COMMENT clause. In fact, in combination with a rigid NP (Section 4.5.1.5), a certain degree of syntactic infelicity between the TOPIC-COMMENT pair appears to be sufficient for signaling the unmarked TOPIC-COMMENT pattern (33) that we were unable to obtain with FRONTING. I speculate that such semantically-motivated patterns are most felicitous when the pair suggests a single semantic relationship that is oblique, but minimally so. For this study, subtypes of TOPIC-COMMENT were identified based on: rigidity of an NP’s rightwards boundary, occurrence
of the syntactic fronting marker /kɔ̂ː/, and judgment of the semantic relationship between TOPIC and COMMENT. This collection of subtypes is by no means intended to be exhaustive, but rather just the set that appeared in the study text.

**Subject**

As discussed in the preceding section, the fronting marker /kɔ̂ː/ can be used to demarcate what is otherwise a traditional subject constituent and subject role in a canonical sentence (28, 30, and 31 above). When the fronting marker is not present and there is no semantic obliqueness between the subject and the putative COMMENT, this subtype of TOPIC-COMMENT will not be designated, since a CANONICAL or LEFT-DISLOCATION analysis will be sufficiently and preferentially explanatory.

**Possessor**

A leftwards NP can be in a possession relationship with the main sentence. This subtype can be marked or unmarked by the fronting marker. In an unmarked case (32), the topic “each person” denotes the (several) possessors of asymmetrically conjoined “sickly hands and feet” and “wai-ling-green mouths” (a drop marker records the position of the pronoun required by Thai NP classifier-demonstrative complex). Note that the use of space in the original Thai orthography is not consistent with the partitioning of TOPIC and COMMENT, an issue I note without further comment.

(32) แต่ละคนมือเท้าซีดเซียวปากเขียวเหมือนยอดหวายลิง

tɛ̀ːláʔ kʰon mɯː tʰáːw sîːt siaw pàːk kʰǐːaw mɯ ̌ːan jɔ ̂ːt wǎːjliŋ
Øs each [cls] hand foot pale sickly mouth green similar top wai-ling

[98.] Each person, (their) hands and feet were sickly pale and mouth as green as the top of a wai-ling tree.

**Secondary Cause**

The syntactic TOPIC in a TOPIC-COMMENT structure can have a role of secondary causation with respect to the COMMENT (33). As with other subtypes, the fronting marker /kɔ̂ː/ may follow the COMMENT’S (overt or covert) subject.

(33) เกมนี้พวกเขาสนุกสุดเหวี่ยง

tɛ̀ːm níː pʰûːakkʰǎw sànùk sùtwìːaŋ
[167.] Thanks to this game, they really had fun.

**Putative “clausal-TOPICS”**

In the introduction to this section, I noted that clausal topics are generally not admitted. I will close this discussion of the TOPIC-COMMENT syntactic pattern with a brief look at how leftwards clausal structures marked by the putative fronting marker /kɔ̂ː/ mirror the more traditional nominal TOPIC-COMMENT structure. The most compelling motivation for this treatment is that having to discard /kɔ̂ː/ as euphonic or vacuous weakens the alternative resultative serialization analysis. Comparing putative TOPIC-COMMENT structure (34) with a conventional NP TOPIC-COMMENT structure (30, 31), and with a serialization reading (35), which draws upon the widely cited sense of /kɔ̂ː/ as meaning “then,” one notes that the positions of /kɔ̂ː/ and imputed subjects correlate closely between the former pair.

(34) พูดจบก็ผลุบหายลงไปพร้อมกิ่งไม้ในมือ
pʰûːt tɕòp kɔ̂ː pʰlùp hǎːj loŋ paj pʰrɔ́ːm kʰìːŋ máj naj mɯː
Øs speak end Øs [link] dive lose descend go with branch wood in hand

[48.] When (he) had finished speaking, (he) dove under the water...

Another treatment of /kɔ̂ː/ suggests that it is an overt conjunction here *(36), but this analysis is rejected on the basis that the explicit conjunction และ /lɛ́ʔ/ “and” can still be added—arguably changing the semantics—immediately
before the (overt or covert) subject of the main (rightwards) clause. Note that *(36)—including the overt conjunction—is acceptable under the homonymous sense of ฯ, “then.” “He finished speaking, and he then dove...”

Semantic relation types between TOPIC and COMMENT in (34) could trivially be characterized along the lines of the accepted serialization types in Thai: directional, temporal, conjunctive, resultative, etc. In short, the proposal has mild allure, but for the purposes of annotation, here I adopt only the conventional TOPIC-COMMENT pattern, which does not admit clausal TOPICS. This concludes the discussion of TOPIC-COMMENT and I now continue with the review of the primary syntactic constituent structure types that are ascribed to each annotation unit in this project.

4.5.2.7 Copula

As noted above, NP-NP structures are not considered to be in the spirit of the TOPIC-COMMENT pattern; such an analysis seems undue, as it would require imputing both a dropped dummy subject and a dropped existential verb to the putative COMMENT. Instead, supported by the additional evidence of an immediately preceding parallel structure *(37)—in which the copula is overt—I suggest a COPULA-DROP analysis for the equated NPs in *(38). This analysis is consistent with the six instances of NP-NP in the text. In fact, the study text is consistent with the additional constraint that the first NP be deictic.

4.5.2.8 S-Complement

Structures that enable whole-sentence complements are given the feature S-COMP=type, where type corresponds to the primary constituent structure type of the complement sentence. In (39), the complement sentence is shown in red; it entails the overall designation S-COMP=CANONICAL.
4.5.3 Additional Features

After assigning a primary syntactic type to each annotation unit, an arbitrary number of additional syntactic features could be assigned, based on the presence of orthogonal syntactic phenomena. These features are described in the following sections.

4.5.3.1 Verbal Adjunct Fronting

The text contains numerous instances of fronted verbal adjuncts. Most are temporal modifiers for the verbs of the main clause (40), although prepositional phrases are also found (24). Annotations units with fronted verbal adjuncts are given the feature VERBAL-ADJUNCT=FRONT, and this feature appears in the story for the CANONICAL, PASSIVE, S-COMPLEMENT, and TOPIC-COMMENT constituent structure types. When dropped pronouns are recovered, semantically-rich verbal adjuncts can begin to resemble chained clauses. In (41), if we are willing to elide the covert impersonal subject in the introductory clause, “(If) you saw (her) from afar...” the introductory clause could be considered a verbal modifier for the main verb “resembled,” giving an approximate de-gapped reading akin to (allowing for severe abuse of English) “She resembled, afar-seen-ly, a doll.” As interesting as this is, the sentence is nevertheless given the CANONICAL=CHAIN—rather than the CANONICAL, VERBAL-ADJUNCT=FRONT—annotation.

(40) สักครู่จึงโผล่พรวดขึ้นมา
สักครู่จึงโผล่พรวดขึ้นมา
just moment therefore Øs visible suddenly [asp] [asp]
[49.] In a moment, he came up again.

(41) มองดูแต่ไกลเหมือนตุ๊กตาตัวใหญ่ไม่สวมเสื้อ
มองดูแต่ไกลเหมือนตุ๊กตาตัวใหญ่ไม่สวมเสื้อ
[cls] big not wear shirt
[30.] Seen from afar, she looked like a big doll with no shirt.

4.5.3.2 Serial Predicate Fronting

As with verbal adjunct fronting, fronting of a portion of a predicate that serializes over the single subject of a nuclear sentence is considered independent of that sentence’s primary syntactic constituent type. In most cases, SERIAL-PREDICATE=FRONT is found in combination with existential constructions. In (42), I note that the LEFT-DISLOCATED constituent เดินนำหน้า “walk lead” is the matrix predicate that might more canonically occur after the subject, as shown in (43).

(42) เดินนำหน้าเป็นชายตัวโตกว่าเพื่อนตามด้วยเพื่อนชายอีกสามคน
เดินนำหน้าเป็นชายตัวโตกว่าเพื่อนตามด้วยเพื่อนชายอีกสามคน
walk lead Øs is male self large [compr] friend follow by friend male another three person
[15.] Walking in front, it was a boy larger than his friends, followed by three more friends, all boys.

(43) ชายตัวโตกว่าเดินนำหน้าเพื่อนตามด้วยเพื่อนชายอีกสามคน
ชายตัวโตกว่าเดินนำหน้าเพื่อนตามด้วยเพื่อนชายอีกสามคน
male self large [compr] walk lead friend follow by friend male another three person
[15.] A boy larger than his friends walked in front, followed by three more friends, all boys.

In order to informally test whether the existential verb must be overt in this construction, I presented informant ‘A’ with a copy of (42) with the existential verb deleted. He judged it grammatical only after having to backtrack, a fact that he volunteered without cue. This is consistent with the “garden-path,” pronoun-drop reading, “Øs walked, leading a boy larger than his friends...,” where the nuclear subject has turned into a direct object. An overt existential
verb blocks this parse with the result that the subject of the sentence becomes a (dropped) dummy expletive, as positioned in (42).

Unusual sentence (44) is the only instance of a fronted serial predicate which does not co-occur with an existential construction. It may in fact be a typographical error in the source.

4.5.3.3 Existential

We saw that some instances of existential constructions are associated with a particular type of predicate fronting. Others occur in simple CANONICAL sentences, with either an overt existential verb (45) or a predicative adjective applied to directly to the dummy expletive (46). Both receive the designation SUBJECT=DUMMY. In the study corpus, the dummy pronoun is always dropped in existential constructions, so the annotation is always accompanied by SUBJECT=DROP.

This concludes the review of the syntax annotation methodology. I now turn a discussion of the information structure annotation methodology.

4.6 Information Structure

Because a goal of the project was to be able to characterize the structural manifestation of TOPIC and FOCUS, it was desirable to adopt guidelines for these features that did not make reference to surface form. This was in order to avoid the illogic of characterizing TOPIC and FOCUS marking based on an annotation of TOPIC and FOCUS marking. Accordingly, it was determined that the criteria for the information structure component of the project would be subjective discrimination—by this author—of TOPIC and FOCUS qualia: the ineffable mental representations of discourse referents and propositions. There appears to be no alternative toehold for initiating a program of quantitative research in information structure. Since qualia are necessarily represented indirectly, the structural elements which seem to most closely correspond to the TOPIC and FOCUS are what are, in fact, annotated, but it is important to bear in mind that neither these surface forms nor their denotata are intended to be necessarily functionally salient in formulating this component of the annotation. Concerns about including a subjective component in the methodology are somewhat allayed by noting that subjective observations are well-contained, and thus easy for other researchers to exclude.

The approach to information structure was strongly influenced by the FOCUS-centric ideas of Lambrecht (1996). To Lambrecht, TOPIC and FOCUS are obliquely-related pragmatic relations where three well-motivated subtypes of FOCUS have primacy. Deviations from this approach arose as a result of practicalities of application, as discussed in the following sections.

I accede at times in this paper to the convention of annotating surface constituents with square brackets and subscripted TOPIC and FOCUS indications. The system has patent inadequacies; for example, “a referent which is top-
ical in a discourse is not necessarily coded as a TOPIC expression in a given sentence or clause” (Lambrecht 1996: 130); and there is no reason to assume that the surface representations must be contiguous.

4.6.1 Focus

Lambrecht’s three-way categorization of FOCUS (Lambrecht 1996: 223) is used in this project. This approach being FOCUS-centric, it was straightforward to assign one of his three FOCUS types to each annotation unit. The annotation procedure involved multiple sequential reading passes through the story. Unresolved annotation units from earlier passes were identified as either: elaborating what an identifiable TOPIC referent did (PREDICATE FOCUS, ibid.: 226); resolving a free variable in the TOPIC RELATION, which is necessarily an open proposition (ARGUMENT FOCUS, ibid.: 228); or asserting something entirely non-presupposed (SENTENCE FOCUS, ibid.: 233). In Lambrecht’s view, all pragmatically felicitous sentences necessarily belong to one of these FOCUS types. In the following subsections, each FOCUS type is discussed in turn. Examples in these sections include TOPIC RELATION annotations, which assume a form that will be explained in Section 4.6.3.

4.6.1.1 Sentence Focus

The first FOCUS category in Lambrecht’s scheme concerns event-reporting or presentational sentence types. When a proposition does not seem to make reference to lexicogrammatical presuppositions (Lambrecht 1996: 233), it is called SENTENCE FOCUS, “wide focus,” (Casielles-Suarez 2004: 142) or “all-focus” (Paggio 2009: 145) structure. The first sentence of a text (47) is typically an instance of SENTENCE FOCUS (ibid.: 145).

(47) ลำน่นั้นไหลมาจากทิศตะวันตก ทอดตัวเลื้อยเลี้ยวเข้าเขตหมู่บ้าน...

The TOPIC RELATION of SENTENCE FOCUS sentences is designated \{x such that x happened\}, as many authors have made the observation that SENTENCE FOCUS is a special case of ARGUMENT FOCUS which invokes the “stage topic” (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 16) or “here and now” (Casielles-Suarez 2004: 160).

4.6.1.2 Predicate Focus

Lambrecht calls syntactically CANONICAL sentences, where the proposition can be construed as a comment about the TOPIC referent “topic-comment” sentences (Lambrecht 1996: 226). Because I use this same terminology to refer to the specific syntactic pattern described in 4.5.2.6, I will not adopt this usage, instead referring to sentences which manifest PREDICATE FOCUS as having PREDICATE FOCUS STRUCTURE. Asserting that this type of FOCUS structure is “the most useful pragmatic articulation,” Lambrecht concludes that PREDICATE FOCUS is the “most natural... pragmatic construal” for isolated sentences (Lambrecht 1996: 132). Sentence (48) is judged to be in predicate FOCUS.

(48) หลุมพอต้นใหญ่งอกงามชิดตลิ่ง

The TOPIC RELATION of SENTENCE FOCUS sentences is designated \{x such that x happened\}, as many authors have made the observation that SENTENCE FOCUS is a special case of ARGUMENT FOCUS which invokes the “stage topic” (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 16) or “here and now” (Casielles-Suarez 2004: 160).

4.6.1.3 Argument Focus

In Lambrecht’s work, sentences which identify an argument in an open proposition are identificational sentences with ARGUMENT FOCUS. For each instance of ARGUMENT FOCUS, I annotate an open proposition of the type, \{x such
that \( x \) in the annotation unit’s TOPIC field. This proposition informally codes a presupposition that may involve a “topical” discourse entity, but Lambrecht does not admit the use of the term TOPIC here, instead suggesting that a “pragmatic subject”—additionally distinct from the “semantic subject”—is manifested (Lambrecht 1996: 229-230). In his scheme, the pragmatic subject and pragmatic predicate of (49) are, \( \text{THE X THAT WAS KEEPING UP THE REAR} / \text{WAS A SMALL GIRL} / \text{KEPT UP THE REAR} \). The mapping to syntactic constituents is illustrative; the syntactic predicate “keeping up the rear” corresponds to the pragmatic predicate and the semantic subject, while the syntactic subject “a small girl” codes the pragmatic predicate and the semantic subject (ibid.: 231). So, in ARGUMENT FOCUS, it is the FOCUS referent which resolves \( x \) in the open proposition. The information structure annotation for the example is shown below the English translation.

In his scheme, the pragmatic subject and pragmatic predicate of (49) are, \( \text{THE X THAT WAS KEEPING UP THE REAR} / \text{WAS A SMALL GIRL} / \text{KEPT UP THE REAR} \). The mapping to syntactic constituents is illustrative; the syntactic predicate “keeping up the rear” corresponds to the pragmatic predicate and the semantic subject, while the syntactic subject “a small girl” codes the pragmatic predicate and the semantic subject (ibid.: 231). So, in ARGUMENT FOCUS, it is the FOCUS referent which resolves \( x \) in the open proposition. The information structure annotation for the example is shown below the English translation.

For the purposes of this project, TOPIC RELATION is considered “contemporaneous” with its resolution (see Section 4.6.3). This means that the open proposition which is coded as the TOPIC RELATION in an ARGUMENT FOCUS sentence need not be recoverable exclusively from prior discourse context; it has access to information in its in-sentence resolution, which is the FOCUS. That is, in (49), the TOPIC RELATION seems to gratuitously presuppose that someone was “walking in the rear.” Such presuppositions may require accommodation of entities or placeholder predicates that may not be entirely established in the preceding discourse. I construe the intentional content of the TOPIC proposition to be instant and holistic with its FOCUS resolution, this pair being interrelated through both their unified syntactic realization and their accessibility in the mind of the speaker, prior to utterance. I now turn to a description of the subtypes of ARGUMENT FOCUS that were encountered in the narrative.

**Dialog**

The special ability of quoted dialog to partition inner- from outer-structure seems to suggest special information structure treatment for the outer frame itself. Accordingly, I arbitrarily designate quoting frames as an instance of ARGUMENT FOCUS where the TOPIC is \( \{ x \text{ such that } X \text{ said } x \} \), and the dialog itself is the FOCUS which resolves this open proposition. Consider sentence [21], which consists of annotation units [21a] and [21b]. Annotation of the outer frame is shown in (50), and in this case, the inner dialog comprises just one annotation unit, which is independently annotated (51). A dialog frame may contain several annotation units.

**Dialog**

The special ability of quoted dialog to partition inner- from outer-structure seems to suggest special information structure treatment for the outer frame itself. Accordingly, I arbitrarily designate quoting frames as an instance of ARGUMENT FOCUS where the TOPIC is \( \{ x \text{ such that } X \text{ said } x \} \), and the dialog itself is the FOCUS which resolves this open proposition. Consider sentence [21], which consists of annotation units [21a] and [21b]. Annotation of the outer frame is shown in (50), and in this case, the inner dialog comprises just one annotation unit, which is independently annotated (51). A dialog frame may contain several annotation units.
Copular resolution

Pragmatic equation can manifest in ARGUMENT FOCUS in a few different ways. The simplest form is the copular presentation of the resolving FOCUS entity for the free variable in the TOPIC proposition (52). I call this the resolution subtype of ARGUMENT FOCUS. This subtype also admits examples which use deixis to resolve the TOPIC proposition (53). The copular function, proper, should only enter the FOCUS when it is establishing a relation that is not presupposed (this is discussed in the next section). In (53) both copular arguments are instantiated entities that must sensically be located somewhere (e.g., a stick and “here”), and in (52) one argument is, by construction, a part of the other (e.g., a stream necessarily has a deepest part). Therefore, because these two locative sentences relate two entities that are presupposed to have fixed locations, they are seen as instances of ARGUMENT FOCUS.

Performative

Alternatively, it can be the equation of two entities itself that is in FOCUS. In this eventuality, I ascribe ARGUMENT FOCUS with a TOPIC RELATION of the form, e.g., \{ x such that the relation between \( y \) and \( z \) is \( x \} \), and the FOCUS resolves the free variable by designating the type of this relation. In this way, the speech act is performative, effecting a new relationship by its utterance. One variation of this pattern that appears in the text is locative designation (54), which reflects the aboutness notion of “what shall be (performatively) designated where.” Extending the analysis from the previous section, we would expect that this type of designation require that one of the copular arguments be unbound, that is, that it not carry a presupposition of fixed location, and this is what we see in (54), where one of the copular arguments, “kitchen” is an uninstantiated generic. We could further speculate that exactly one of the copular arguments must be unbound, since it seems infelicitous to pin one unbound entity to another, but this takes us a bit afield; in any case, there are no such instances in our small corpus, so we leave the issue for further investigation.
In this example, there are no surface elements which readily and obviously summarize the TOPIC or FOCUS. This points out the insufficient rigor of annotating bracketed grammatical constituents as information structure TOPIC or FOCUS. Another issue with bracketing is that, in Thai, a predicative adjective lexeme may need to split its two pragmatic roles between TOPIC and FOCUS. This is discussed at the end of Section 4.6.5.

**Corrective**

In (55), it is neither a copular argument nor the equating property of a copula sentence that is in FOCUS, but rather the type of one of the copular arguments. This subtype is related to Gussenhoven’s “corrective focus” (Gussenhoven 2007: 11), although that work does not discriminate the correcting of a referent entity from the correcting of the type of a referent entity, which is what we see here. The location of the entity as established by the implicit copula is not contested, so the FOCUS is on re-categorizing the type of this entity. This implies a subtle distinction whereby the FOCUS is neither the referent entity, nor instance of a generic type itself, but rather the abstract type of the referent entity. In other words, it is not the house referent itself that is new, it is the assertion that the designated entity is, in fact, a thing of type “house.”

Here, although the context of the story informs the corrective reading, two additional readings could be obtained by alternatively FOCUSing the possessive pronoun “my” or the demonstrative pronoun “this.” A fourth, performative reading can also be obtained in accordance with the discussion in the previous section. But this example presents an opportunity to discuss an interesting fifth reading, a reading which combines corrective FOCUS with the relationship-focusing aspect of the performative reading. The TOPIC of a performative reading is a type of relationship, which the very utterance of a performative ARGUMENT FOCUS assertion enacts. However, it is also possible to correct, rather than enact, a relationship expressed in a TOPIC proposition. With performative ARGUMENT FOCUS, a speaker changes world-truth so that it matches her discourse model; conversely, with corrective ARGUMENT FOCUS, she changes her hearer’s discourse model so that it matches her own. In (56), I give two illustrations of this by placing FOCUS on the correction of the presupposition that a certain presupposed place in the world does not have the “one and the same” relationship with the presupposed house of the speaker. The TOPIC here, informally-vetted by the aboutness test, is found to be: { x such that the relationship between the indicated place and the location of your house is x } which correctly identifies the FOCUS—the resolution of the free variable in the TOPIC—-as being the “one and the same” (or “is-ness”) relationship.

“This [deictic entity] isn’t your house.) (Actually,) This [IS] FOC my house!”

“(Why don’t we go [from where we are now] to your house now?) (Actually,) This [IS] FOC my house.”
This concludes the discussion of FOCUS types. In Section 4.6.4 I will examine the possibility of unifying all three FOCUS types into a monolithic representation which captures all aspects of a proposition’s information structure (with the exception of the FOCUS entity itself). Such a generalized form holds great promise for more naturally revealing—rather than imposing—information structural types that may appear in a corpus. First, I will turn to a discussion of the approach to TOPIC adopted for this study.

4.6.2 Topi c Referent

For TOPIC, the objective of this study was to capture aboutness impressions from the experience of reading each sentence, and the primary subjective diagnostic for TOPIC is the aboutness test, which considers whether a sentence seems to primarily increase the hearer’s knowledge “about” the specified referent (Lambrecht 1996: 131).

Many authors assert that a TOPIC REFERENT must be an entity (Gundel 1988: 210). Lambrecht qualifies his account, noting that “TOPIC referents are for the most part not propositions but entities” (Lambrecht 1996: 151). One difficulty is that different authors use the term to variously refer to both inter- and intra-sentential referents. Büring (1999: 145) is careful to avoid this confusion, designating the former D-TOPIC (“discourse”) and the latter S-TOPIC (“sentence”). Carefully observing this dichotomy clarifies much apparent contradiction in the literature. For example, Büring suggests that S-TOPICS can contrast (“contrastive”), narrow down (“narrowing”), or be in part-whole relationship (“partial/residual”) with a D-TOPIC (ibid.). Identifying the TOPIC subtypes that Büring proposes thus appears to require maintaining a running tabulation of possibly overlapping discourse- and sentence-level TOPICS. While this approach may indeed capture interesting insights, it is left for future elaboration; I instead elected to hew to Lambrecht’s observations which are described next.

Lambrecht is less concerned with DISCOURSE TOPIC and attempts to characterize S-TOPIC in isolation, while noting that the concept is fundamentally intertwined with discourse context:

Strawson’s remark that ‘there is great variety of possible types of answer to the question what the topic of a statement is’ stresses the inherently vague character of the notions of aboutness and relevance. This inherent vagueness has consequences for the grammatical coding of topics in sentences... It is often necessary to take into account the discourse context..., whether the [referent is] ‘a matter of standing current interest or concern’ (Strawson)..., the communicative intentions the speaker had..., and the state of mind of the addressee with respect to the referent. (Lambrecht 1996: 119-120)

He continues by noting that (S-)TOPIC and FOCUS, as succinctly summarized by another author, “do not form a dichotomy” and are not complementary (Casielles-Suarez 2004: 158). In particular, he explains that his three FOCUS types—PREDICATE FOCUS, ARGUMENT FOCUS, and SENTENCE FOCUS—imply certain “information structure categories,” namely: unmarked “topic comment” sentences, identificational sentences, and event-reporting sentences, respectively (Lambrecht 1996: 121-127). Another type, the “background establishing” sentence, may contain a

non-topical or ‘semi-topical’ expression which appears within a sentential scene-setting topic expression, which itself [may be] embedded within a matrix clause whose subject is the primary topic of the sentence. (ibid.: 125)

Lambrecht’s FOCUS types not only imply certain TOPIC “information structure categories,” but prototypical TOPIC RELATIONS as well For example, SENTENCE FOCUS, it is claimed, has no readily identifiable TOPIC (ibid.: 124). I continue in the next section with a more detailed examination of TOPIC RELATION, which introduces the form for the annotation of TOPIC that was adopted for this project.

4.6.3 Topic Relation

Lambrecht introduces the concept of the TOPIC RELATION: the aboutness relation that holds between TOPIC REFERENTS and propositions (Lambrecht 1996: 130). He is careful to distinguish TOPIC RELATION from TOPIC REFERENT (and TOPIC EXPRESSION), and notes that, “while a TOPIC expression always... designates a TOPIC referent, a referent which is TOPICAL in a discourse is not necessarily coded as a TOPIC expression” (Lambrecht 1996: 130). Despite his
care, in places, confusion can arise from ambiguous uses of the word, “topic.” For example, even in his ultimate definition, he seems to first characterize “topic” as a referent, only to immediately call it a relation:

A referent is interpreted as the topic of a proposition if in a given discourse the proposition is construed as being about this referent, i.e. as expressing information which is relevant to and which increases the addressee’s knowledge of this referent. Following Reinhart (1982), we may say that the relation “topic-of” expresses the pragmatic relation of aboutness which holds between a referent and a proposition with respect to a particular discourse. The term “pragmatic relation” should be understood as meaning “relation construed within particular discourse contexts.” Topic is a pragmatically construed sentence relation. (Lambrecht 1996: 127, emphasis added)

Since the primary criterion for topic annotation was aboutness, and since this citation links aboutness with topic relation, an annotation of aboutness primarily entails an annotation of topic relation, and not topic referent. Furthermore, since topics cannot function in a proposition without entering a topic relation (ibid.: 151, 130), there is merit in adopting topic relation as the object of topic annotation. Lambrecht seems to agree; regarding his example, “(Who went to school?) The children went to school,” he notes that

the best candidate [for a topic is] the presupposed open proposition “[x such that] x went to school,” concerning which the asserted proposition can be said to add a relevant new piece of information (Lambrecht 1996: 122).

Table 1 illustrates some examples of the application of this view of topic relation, along with the corresponding focus, and suggests that the phenomena are not entirely independent. This is the idea that will be developed further in the remainder of this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertion</th>
<th>TOPIC RELATION</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prawit ran.</td>
<td>x : Prawit did x</td>
<td>running-activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x : x ran</td>
<td>Prawit (referent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prawit RAN.</td>
<td>x : Prawit did x</td>
<td>running-activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE ran.</td>
<td>x : x ran</td>
<td>Prawit (referent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prawit’s SKINNY.</td>
<td>x : Prawit has the attribute x</td>
<td>skinny-attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prawit’s DEAD.</td>
<td>x : Prawit has aliveness-status x</td>
<td>dead-aliveness-status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prawit ran to the PARK.</td>
<td>x : Prawit ran to x</td>
<td>park (referent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They HAD great fun.</td>
<td>x : the corrected event-status of their great-fun-activity is actually x</td>
<td>completed-event-status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They had GREAT fun.</td>
<td>x : their fun had attribute x</td>
<td>great-attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is my HOUSE!</td>
<td>x : the type of thing that “this” entity of mine is, is x</td>
<td>house-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is MY house!</td>
<td>x : the relationship between myself and this house is x</td>
<td>ownership-relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS is my house.</td>
<td>x : the one house, selected from a set, that belongs to me is x</td>
<td>[deictic] (referent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS is my HOUSE.</td>
<td>x : the performative relationship between the deictic location and my house is x</td>
<td>one-and-the-same-relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is my house.</td>
<td>x : the corrected relationship between the deictic location and my house is x</td>
<td>one-and-the-same-relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. TOPIC RELATION examples

The approach to topic that was adopted was that of annotating a single open proposition which captures its presuppositional structure and its topic referents; topic annotations for this project were constructed according to this form. In the adopted approach, the topic quale of an asserted proposition is stated in terms of a proposition with a free variable which is taken to be contemporaneous with the assertion. Topic relations expressed in this way express subtypes of aboutness. The reference definition used for this project is:
TOPIC RELATION is an open proposition that expresses its canonical, contemporaneous presupposition, by using FOCUS-exclusive predications to express relationships between one or more FOCUS-exclusive bound variables.

The intuitive view of TOPIC RELATION is that it is the traditional TOPICAL REFERENT of a sentence, plus a relation or set of relations that describe the role that the TOPIC REFERENT is “presupposed to play... in the given proposition” (Lambrecht 1996: 151). In an ARGUMENT FOCUS proposition, the TOPIC relation may contain a non-FOCUSED predicate from the proposition itself. In this view PREDICATE FOCUS and SENTENCE FOCUS propositions are expressed in the same way, and one of several generic placeholder predicates is always imputed. This will be examined later on. TOPIC RELATIONS expressed in this annotation project have the form shown in (57).

(57) “(What did Supaphan ride?) Supaphan rode the [BUS]FOC.” { x such that Supaphan rode x }

I would be remiss in proceeding without mentioning that, while Lambrecht’s idea of stating TOPIC in terms of a presupposed open proposition was exciting, alas, he presented it in the context of a straw-man argument. Since his idea was adopted for this project I must briefly attempt to rebut Lambrecht’s arguments for dismissing it.

His first argument against the use of propositions with a free variable—that is, propositions that I denote TOPIC RELATIONS—to represent TOPICS is that such propositions are semantically incomplete and so “cannot be said to have [referents, and] therefore [that] the asserted proposition cannot be construed as being about its referent” (Lambrecht 1996: 122). Firstly, it’s not clear that the free variable in “x such that x went to school” is not a referent, any less so than “Supaphan,” just because it’s semantically unresolved. Considering that some types of referents are semantically compatible with the resolution of x and other types are not, it is not the case the free variable is completely unconstrained. Furthermore, defining the TOPIC RELATION as existing contemporaneously with its assertion—which is justified on the basis of the fact that, to the speaker of an assertion, there is no dichotomy between “new” and “old” information (more specifically, that a speaker begins an utterance with the presumption that he will have timely access to everything he will need to complete it)—enables full access to the resolution arguments of all free variables.

It is also possible to rebut Lambrecht’s conclusion that these considerations disqualify “the asserted proposition [from being] construed as being about its referent” by noting that, in the absence of the very sort of open proposition he disqualifies, an asserted proposition cannot be construed as being about a referent either. Lambrecht admits as much when he notes that TOPIC RELATION “aboutness” must hold between a TOPIC REFERENT and its proposition (ibid.: 127). In short, without the assistance of being incorporated into a TOPIC RELATION, where it necessarily becomes associated with some form of predicate (see Section 4.6.5), it seems impossible for a TOPIC REFERENT, in isolation, to function as a “topic” for any proposition.

Finally, Lambrecht writes that “since the presupposition cannot be identified with a syntactic constituent... there is no structural element which can be identified as a TOPIC EXPRESSION” (ibid.: 122). To this point, I only note that it is not clear to me why the requirement should be necessary.

4.6.4 Unification of Focus Types

In 4.6.1.1, we saw that SENTENCE FOCUS is a special case of ARGUMENT FOCUS. But it is also the case that, when much of a predicate can be contextually presupposed, PREDICATE FOCUS can be stated in terms of ARGUMENT FOCUS. In (58), it is already well-established in the story that the boys are playing, which entails that the activity was necessarily being perceived as any of: fun, tedious, monotonous, unpleasant, etc. Even though the boys are coded with a pronoun, the sentence is not really about them (more on this follows below). Neither is the sentence about what the boys were doing, but it is rather about a characterization of an activity that we already know they are engaged in. The new information that is conveyed by this sentence is the “narrowing” of the numerous possibilities (Büring 1999: 145) by selection of the first as the resolution of the ARGUMENT FOCUS TOPIC RELATION { x such that the (presupposed) playing had the attribute x }. If we contrast this with the prototypical PREDICATE FOCUS TOPIC RELATION {...}

---

8 Multiple-FOCUS assertions are not investigated.
such that $x$ did $y$ } we see that ARGUMENT FOCUS is just more specifically isolating an attribute than PREDICATE FOCUS, which tends to conflate action with its attributes.

This discussion suggests that Lambrecht’s range of FOCUS types describes a cline according to the universality of the required presupposition. For SENTENCE FOCUS, where we willingly accommodate, at any time or place, the TOPOIC RELATION \{ $x$ such that $x$ happened \}, we are actually eliding the TOPIC because it is so familiar and common; it is not necessary to say, “[As for what happened,] TOP [Prawit ran after the bus,] FOC” because our experience suggests that, in utterances, things always happen—otherwise there is nothing to utter. Although such a TOPIC may seem gratuitous since it incorporates nothing motivated by the surface form, it certainly has pragmatic motivation and does embody a characteristic which may facilitate generalization in the discussion below.

Comparing PREDICATE FOCUS to SENTENCE FOCUS, I suggest that it is only slightly less universal to infer \{ $x$ such that Prawit did $x$ \}, than it is to infer \{ $x$ such that $x$ happened \}, because our cognitive sensibility seems to support a fundamental distinction between entities and events, such that the former chronically participate in the latter. To say that referent “Prawit” is the TOPIC in “Prawit [RAN after the bus] FOC,” is inconsistent with our predilection for accommodating the presupposition that subjects typically do things, because it excludes from the TOPIC this inherent characteristic of subjects. In this view, the TOPIC in the PREDICATE FOCUS example is more properly stated, \{ $x$ such that Prawit did $x$ \} which also intuitively agrees better with our primary annotation heuristic for TOPIC RELATION, namely the aboutness test. This sentence is clearly about “what Prawit did;” it’s not just about Prawit. That he took some action appears to be necessarily presupposed, and TOPIC RELATION more accurately captures aboutness.

Lastly on this cline, ARGUMENT FOCUS is the least-universal type because it incorporates the greatest amount of situationally-specific material into its TOPIC RELATION. In “Prawit ran after [the BUS] FOC,” I agree with Lambrecht’s characterization of the proposition as \{ $x$ such that Prawit ran after $x$ \}.

To summarize these observations, I note the number of situationally-specific elements that are bound into each TOPIC RELATION: the SENTENCE FOCUS example makes reference to none; for PREDICATE FOCUS there is one (“Prawit”), and with ARGUMENT FOCUS there are two (“Prawit” and “run”). If a generalizable relationship does hold between FOCUS (as captured by Lambrecht’s three categories) and TOPIC RELATION (when the latter is uniformly expressed as a proposition with free and bound variables), then Lambrecht’s approach of de-emphasizing TOPIC in favor of FOCUS-centricity has appeal. It appears that, when universally applicable presuppositions are made explicit, a single approach to formulating TOPICS in terms of free and bound variables may sufficiently characterize information structure.

4.6.5 Obligatory Predicative Cues in Topic Relation

The harmonization of Lambrecht’s well-motivated FOCUS types discussed in the previous section leads to the conclusion that felicitous proposition must always entail, at a minimum, the presupposition that something happened. It may not be possible for a sentence to be “about” a referent without additionally presupposing, at a minimum, a degenerate form of implicit predication, a result that would explain the infelicity of bare NPs in many languages. This argument was introduced in the individual sections on FOCUS subtypes (4.6.1.1 - 4.6.1.3) and unification of FOCUS subtypes (Section 4.6.4); in this section, I detail it further.

Examining the range of open proposition forms in the FOCUS type cline that was developed in 4.6.4, we saw that the number of bound variables in the increases from zero, with SENTENCE FOCUS; to one, with PREDICATE FOCUS; and finally to two, with ARGUMENT FOCUS. This corresponds to SENTENCE FOCUS requiring the least presupposition and ARGUMENT FOCUS the most. Note, however, that these figures represented the number of bound variables
that explicitly appeared in the surface forms. For example, the SENTENCE FOCUS TOPIC RELATION \( \{ x \text{ such that } x \text{ happened} \} \) still has exactly one predicate, “happened,” and I have attempted to show throughout the analysis of information structure, that all TOPIC RELATIONS necessarily have a predicate.

A different approach towards establishing this same conclusion begins by noting that, in more elaborate forms of presupposition, entities have properties, states, or attributes or do things, but they never do nothing. When things do nothing, it is not worthy of comment and further, it appears that it is not possible to comment, without framing the occurrence of nothing as “something happening.” If all utterances necessarily have a FOCUS, as Lambrecht believes, then we cannot construct an utterance without a (recoverable) predicate. This confirms the observation that bare NPs in isolation are not felicitous in English and Thai (at least). In other words, for an assertion to have a simple REFERENT as a TOPIC necessarily presupposes that the TOPIC will either be in a state, have or acquire properties or attributes, or do something.

Lambrecht’s diagnostic for PREDICATE FOCUS hints at this; I have added emphasis to his diagnostic to illustrate my point: “(What did the children do next?) The children went to SCHOOL.” (Lambrecht 1996: 121). That all TOPICS entail some sort of predicate is also suggested by Lambrecht’s basic premise that all felicitous utterances must present new information. According to this, if nothing happened, then there’s nothing to say, so the very existence of an utterance implies that something happened. Even with an alternative diagnostic such as, “What about the children?” one cannot hide the presupposition that the children either did something, were in some state, or had some property, because this very diagnostic is a concise aboutness test for the assertions “They went [to school]FOC,” “They were [content]FOC,” or “They were [overweight]FOC.” These sentences are not about the children but rather are about what the children did or how they were.

This discussion is easily extended to states signaled by a stative; the diagnostic “What about Prawit?” is felicitous for the assertion “He’s dead,” which here confirms the TOPIC RELATION \( \{ x \text{ such that } Prawit \text{ is in state of aliveness} x \} \). Clearly the assertion is about Prawit’s state, and not Prawit himself. In other words, it is so overwhelmingly likely that subjects do things and have states and attributes, that any attempt to conceive of a PREDICATE FOCUS proposition which has its syntactic subject as its pragmatic TOPIC morphs into an ARGUMENT FOCUS assertion of the form \( \{ x \text{ such that } X \text{ is in state } x \} \), \( \{ x \text{ such that } X \text{ has the property } x \} \) or \( \{ x \text{ such that } X \text{ did } x \} \), and this latter form is—somewhat arbitrarily—dubbed PREDICATE FOCUS.

Therefore, for this project, if a predicate is not available in the “old” information, i.e., in the case of PREDICATE FOCUS where the assertion’s predicate is reserved for the resolving the free variable as the FOCUS of the assertion, then a well known placeholder is imputed. Contemporaneousness allows a TOPIC RELATION to be formulated while taking into account predicative cues may be inaccessible to the hearer prior to the time of utterance, in effect allowing it to “peek” at the FOCUS predicate, to ensure that the imputed placeholder is semantically compatible but more general than the free variable (FOCUS) predicate.

Recall the proposed the diagnostic context “(What about the children?)...” which reveals no information about the intended form of the proposition. The speaker clearly knows what she intends to say prior to saying it, and it is this fact that permits the principle to assert that the TOPIC RELATION is singular and well-formed. The result is that the TOPIC RELATION—by construction—contains a predicate that is compatible with the free variable predicate. I also showed in that paragraph how “do” is more general than “go,” as shown by the diagnostic pair: “(What did the children do?) They [went to the zoo]FOC.”

It is not an arbitrary requirement that TOPIC RELATIONS have a predicate, for it seems impossible to craft an utterance that does not—at least collaterally—invoke an unfocused predicate, that is, that does not place into the presupposition either: a predicate that is already in the discourse common ground and which it is not the goal of the utterance to elaborate (i.e. old, as in “It was [MIEW]FOC who ran,” where the TOPIC RELATION \( \{ x \text{ such that } x \text{ ran} \} \) makes reference the predicate ‘ran’), or a placeholder predication that performs the crucial role of situating the TOPIC referents with respect to each other and the free variable. The actual FOCUS of the proposition substitutes for the placeholder by answering the felicitous diagnostic question: “Who was it who ran?”

---

9 It’s possible that, in adopting aboutness as our test for topichood, we have unintentionally incorporated a pragmatic quirk of the word “about” into our approach, since it’s not obvious why the same word should pragmatically permit all of—states, attributes, and actions—to be associated with entities.
Well known placeholder predications take the form: \{ x such that X did x \}, \{ x such that X has attribute x \}, \{ x such that X is in state x \}. We should not let the SENTENCE FOCUS diagnostic “What happened?” mislead us here, as it conflates these placeholders, giving the impression that TOPIC RELATION’s predicative cue is perhaps unavailable or non-existent, a problem whose solution is again provided by the contemporaneosness principle: the fact that a unique placeholder can always be recovered from the utterance after the fact seems to suggest that the speaker must have intended to disambiguate “What happened?” along one of these lines. In any case, I was not able to conceive an assertion that felicitously answers “What happened?” without selecting (or implying) exactly one placeholder predication.

This analysis may be especially important in Thai, where predicative adjectives allow the syntactic conflation of actions with attributes. We saw this in (58), a predicative adjective sentence, where the single word สนุก /sànûk/ “fun” encodes two pragmatic functions: first, the experience by some subject of an activity, and second, the attribute that this activity is enjoyable. In ARGUMENT FOCUS, only the latter function should be associated with the FOCUS, while the predicative pragmatic function should be in the TOPIC RELATION. Since the word is a single lexeme, such a designation cannot be approximated by bracketing surface constituents in the Thai orthography. And one last unrelated point on the pitfalls of bracketing: in (55), we see that the designation of the lexeme “house” as “FOCUS” encourages the misperception that the FOCUS quale corresponds to the referent, a particular sand house (or pile of sand) in the world, when it in fact invokes neither, but rather only the set of qualities and properties of that we associate with “house-ness.”

5 Summary and Results

This concludes the methodology review of this project, the fully supervised (manual) annotation of a small Thai-English bitext for large-scale syntactic structure and information structure. The corpus that was developed for this project is available at the website http://www.thai-language.com/id/590220/information-structure. The materials include the full English and Thai texts of the story, and the breakdown of each annotation unit with its accompanying annotations. This small gold standard corpus may have wide application as a training or evaluation resource in a broad range of Thai language natural language processing (NLP) tasks. Work is already underway to use the corpus as a reference in the development of a new approach to automatic sentence alignment, a critical task in statistical machine translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>primary syntactic constituent type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>argument</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*topic-comment (all)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4824</td>
<td>0.7619</td>
<td>1.0388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*s-comp (all)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1448</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td>0.1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*copula (all)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.5834</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>4.1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*canonical (all)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>0.0506</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*benefactive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1448</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td>0.1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*imperative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2896</td>
<td>2.0417</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*interjection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5758</td>
<td>1.3333</td>
<td>6.1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*passive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6389</td>
<td>1.3333</td>
<td>0.1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*question</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7205</td>
<td>1.6410</td>
<td>0.2245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Focus type manifestation of primary syntactic constituent types

Having independently annotated the text for syntactic features and information structure, correlative studies were possible. The dataset enables many more quantitative studies than were possible within the scope of this work. Here, I investigate only the broadest characteristics in the data, and it is hoped that the dataset will be used by other researchers in Thai syntax, information structure, and statistical applications to test their hypotheses and further develop their respective fields.
The primary investigative methodology used for this analysis is a chi-squared correlation of syntactic features with information structure phenomena. In the first chart, the primary syntactic constituent structure types are displayed with chi-squared values against each of the three Lambrecht FOCUS types, as judged. Each annotation unit is represented exactly once in this chart. We note strong correlation between ARGUMENT FOCUS and the COPULA pattern. We also see high correlation between the TOPIC-COMMENT pattern and ARGUMENT FOCUS.

Table 3 shows ad-hoc subject features versus FOCUS type. Dummy subject appears to imply ARGUMENT FOCUS. A surprising result is that of the impersonal pronoun, but we note that N=3. Surprisingly, overt pronouns don’t seem to be predictive in this corpus. Pronoun drop is slightly biased for ARGUMENT FOCUS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject feature</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>focus type</th>
<th>argument</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject=back</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3184</td>
<td>0.4469</td>
<td>2.4965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=drop</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.2166</td>
<td>1.1211</td>
<td>0.3944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=dummy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7821</td>
<td>3.5754</td>
<td>0.4098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=gerund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3184</td>
<td>0.6844</td>
<td>0.2346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=impersonal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9553</td>
<td>1.3408</td>
<td>7.4896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=left</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4588</td>
<td>0.4469</td>
<td>0.2346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=pronoun</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.4461</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>1.6947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=right</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3184</td>
<td>0.4469</td>
<td>2.4965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject-2=drop</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject-2=dummy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6211</td>
<td>0.1732</td>
<td>0.1181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Focus type manifestation of ad-hoc subject features.

Table 4 isolates the movement features for specific study. The feature verbal-adjunct=front strongly biases for predicate focus. Table 5 shows that, within the TOPIC-COMMENT syntactic pattern, subject FRONTING, as marked by the fronting particle, favors ARGUMENT FOCUS. Finally, Table 6 summarizes the information structure manifestations of the remaining grammatical and specialty features that were annotated in the study corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>movement features</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>focus type</th>
<th>argument</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*topic-comment (all)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0570</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>0.1059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object=front</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.5890</td>
<td>5.2963</td>
<td>6.5185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep-phr=front</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0727</td>
<td>0.6420</td>
<td>0.0557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serial-predicate=front</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>0.8025</td>
<td>1.0377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=back</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6420</td>
<td>0.1605</td>
<td>3.2600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal-adjunct=front</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.2492</td>
<td>11.5933</td>
<td>3.1853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=left</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1997</td>
<td>0.1605</td>
<td>0.1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=right</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6420</td>
<td>0.1605</td>
<td>3.2600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Focus type manifestation of TOPIC-COMMENT subtypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic-comment subtypes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>focus type</th>
<th>argument</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*topic-comment=possessor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1143</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*topic-comment=secondary-cause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1143</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*topic-comment=subject</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0914</td>
<td>0.1143</td>
<td>0.1143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Focus type manifestation of (syntactic) TOPIC-COMMENT subtypes.
6 Conclusion and Future Work

This work suggested many interesting sub-projects. A deeper and more rigorous methodology for Thai syntactic annotation, facilitated by a precision grammar of the language is a priority for future work. An oversight was the omission of an ad-hoc feature to record NEGATION. This would have been valuable because it appears that NEGATION obtains special ARGUMENT FOCUS treatment. A more rigorous corpus-based characterization of the Thai FRONTING marker would be helpful. Further work is also needed to develop a consistent approach to Thai predicative adjectives with regard to ARGUMENT FOCUS versus PREDICATE FOCUS treatment.

In this study, correlations between syntactic and information-structural phenomena were confirmed in a small text-only Thai-language corpus. It seems reasonable to speculate that authors who produce texts—in any language—that are not intended to be read aloud necessarily draw more heavily on syntactic information structure effects, amplifying their occurrence in a way that ultimately serves to motivate the evolution of a distinct register that we recognize as unnatural for spontaneous spoken communication. For this reason, it would be interesting to compare the results of this study with comparable syntactic phenomenon figures for a corpus of spoken Thai.

As for cross-linguistic information structure, it would be interesting to continue study the sufficiency and utility of the unified predicate-bearing TOPIC representations. Particular attention should be paid to integrating SENTENCE FOCUS with the other focus subtypes. One conclusion of this work is that a comprehensive unified approach to information structure annotation which proceeds along these lines may be within reach.

Related work would examine more carefully the idea that it is impossible for an assertion to be “about” a non-predicated “naked” TOPIC REFERENT, on the basis that such an entity has no TOPIC RELATION to mediate its appearance in the assertion. This summarizes the view presented here that only a TOPIC RELATION (open proposition) may bear aboutness. I also attempted to connect this idea to an interdependent argument, namely, that any utterance implies that something happened, and conversely, if nothing has happened, there is nothing that can be said “about” that, without invoking an artificial frame around it. While fanciful, such work might yet capture a powerful generalization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grammatical, specialty</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>argument</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*s-comp=*canonical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7759</td>
<td>1.0529</td>
<td>0.0469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*s-comp=*copula</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2586</td>
<td>0.3276</td>
<td>0.8305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9011</td>
<td>1.3103</td>
<td>0.0718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*benefactive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0345</td>
<td>0.3630</td>
<td>0.0718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*copula</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6264</td>
<td>1.6379</td>
<td>2.0690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*copula=drop</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.7517</td>
<td>1.9655</td>
<td>2.4828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*imperative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0690</td>
<td>2.1602</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*interjection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3276</td>
<td>1.2875</td>
<td>4.9093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*question</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3621</td>
<td>1.7647</td>
<td>0.0716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superlative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9011</td>
<td>0.0735</td>
<td>0.2593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject=gerund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2586</td>
<td>1.3802</td>
<td>0.4138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Focus type manifestation of grammatical features and breakdowns of S-COMPLEMENT and COPULA subtypes.

This work suggested many interesting sub-projects. A deeper and more rigorous methodology for Thai syntactic annotation, facilitated by a precision grammar of the language is a priority for future work. An oversight was the omission of an ad-hoc feature to record NEGATION. This would have been valuable because it appears that NEGATION obtains special ARGUMENT FOCUS treatment. A more rigorous corpus-based characterization of the Thai FRONTING marker would be helpful. Further work is also needed to develop a consistent approach to Thai predicative adjectives with regard to ARGUMENT FOCUS versus PREDICATE FOCUS treatment.

In this study, correlations between syntactic and information-structural phenomena were confirmed in a small text-only Thai-language corpus. It seems reasonable to speculate that authors who produce texts—in any language—that are not intended to be read aloud necessarily draw more heavily on syntactic information structure effects, amplifying their occurrence in a way that ultimately serves to motivate the evolution of a distinct register that we recognize as unnatural for spontaneous spoken communication. For this reason, it would be interesting to compare the results of this study with comparable syntactic phenomenon figures for a corpus of spoken Thai.

As for cross-linguistic information structure, it would be interesting to continue study the sufficiency and utility of the unified predicate-bearing TOPIC representations. Particular attention should be paid to integrating SENTENCE FOCUS with the other focus subtypes. One conclusion of this work is that a comprehensive unified approach to information structure annotation which proceeds along these lines may be within reach.

Related work would examine more carefully the idea that it is impossible for an assertion to be “about” a non-predicated “naked” TOPIC REFERENT, on the basis that such an entity has no TOPIC RELATION to mediate its appearance in the assertion. This summarizes the view presented here that only a TOPIC RELATION (open proposition) may bear aboutness. I also attempted to connect this idea to an interdependent argument, namely, that any utterance implies that something happened, and conversely, if nothing has happened, there is nothing that can be said “about” that, without invoking an artificial frame around it. While fanciful, such work might yet capture a powerful generalization.
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