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Qualitative analysis

7.1 Introduction

The theoretical framework described in earlier chapters has given rise to the postulation of five categories – the informational articulations – in the functional domain of information packaging. These articulations are not a random selection of relevant primitives, but form a paradigm: a structured system of elements that are in a mutually substitutional relationship. The parameters responsible for the structure in this paradigm are the dimensions of addressation and actualization, the two tasks that language users have to take into account in discourse knowledge management. Therefore, each articulation can be described by means of unique parameter settings, as was explained in section 6.3 above. The feature-based classification of informational articulations makes it possible to highlight their respective similarities and dissimilarities, and consequently predict likely and unlikely associations between them. As such, the theoretical framework allows for clear hypotheses regarding the potential expression of information packaging.

The underlying structure of linguistic expressions is reflected in their surface structure encoding. A widespread assumption about the relationship between the two is known as the iconicity principle (Haiman 1985), which dictates that recurrent similarity in form is indicative of proximity in meaning. For reasons explained in section 6.2, this study does not depart from specific surface structure phenomena. The main problem with such a bottom-up approach for the domain of information packaging is its pervasiveness in surface structure encoding, which makes it impossible to limit the scope of the investigation to a preset number of morphosyntactic constructs. Therefore, rather than moving from surface structure to information structure, this study is set up in the opposite direction: informational
categories are identified on the basis of external factors (primarily context), after which their encoding in surface structure is investigated. Given this top-down direction of the research, the reverse of Haiman’s iconicity principle will be assumed: (theory-based) proximity of the articulations is expected to result in recurrent similarity in form.

7.2 The informational paradigm

This section revisits the assumed paradigmatic structure of information packaging alluded to in chapter 6, which makes it possible to distinguish between groupings of articulations in clusters with different status: classes, which share one or more parameter settings, and non-classes, for which this is not the case. Classes and non-classes of articulations are expected to behave differently with respect to surface structure encoding, as will be hypothesized in the next section.

7.2.1 A brief recapitulation

In chapter 3, a model of discourse knowledge organization and discourse knowledge management was proposed. It has been argued there that presupposed discourse knowledge is kept at an address in the discourse bulletin board, where it forms a context set against which the contents of an asserted proposition is evaluated, and to which it is appended afterwards. A discourse referent (cf. Karttunen 1969) serves as the identifier of the address. In this set-up, discourse knowledge management is faced with two orthogonal tasks: the allocation of asserted knowledge to the proper address, and the actualization of the context set kept at that address.

In verbal communication, the Speaker aims to manipulate the discourse knowledge organization of the Addressee, typically with the intention to bring about some degree of harmonization between his interlocutor’s state of knowledge and his own. In order to achieve his communicative intention, the Speaker imposes a dual set of informational instructions on the representational content of his discourse act. These instructions tell the Addressee against the contents of which address the Speaker expects him to evaluate the propositional content that is asserted, and how it constitutes an actualization of the presupposed knowledge that the Speaker assumes that the Addressee possesses. In chapter 5, it has been proposed that these instructions be modelled at the Interpersonal Level in Functional Discourse Grammar. As they deal with the attribution of interpersonally motivated structure to the content of the Speaker’s message, information packaging is considered to be located inside the Communicated content of the Discourse Act.

Units of information packaging To model the process of allocation or addressation (cf. Jacobs 2001), two units are required. One conveys an instruction to the Addressee to look up a particular address, identified by a discourse referent. The layer conveying this instruction is Topic, the head of which may be instantiated by a Subact of Reference that evokes the discourse referent identifying the address. The
other layer conveys an instruction to evaluate for admission into the context set the
asserted propositional content. The layer conveying this instruction is Comment,
the head of which is instantiated by at least those elements in the assertion that
are deemed informative for the Addressee. Addressation triggers the inference of
a pragmatic relation of relevance between the identifier of the address and the
propositional content that is addressed there. When Topic and Comment co-occur,
they do so in a predicational configuration. Topic in this configuration serves as
the predicative element, predicating relevance of its Comment.

The process of actualization is modelled by means of a Focus operator, which
can have scope over (the denotation of) either of the informational units Topic
and Comment, or over (the denotation of) a Subact of evocation. The Focus
operator signals that the material in its scope constitutes an update of presumably
presupposed knowledge: it is a trigger for the Addressee to infer a pragmatic relation
of non-retrievability (and therefore, informativeness) between the Focus-marked
layer and the presupposed material. In a discourse act that has an intention to be
informative, at least one Focus operator is assigned.

Informational articulations In chapter 5, it has been argued that instructions regard-
ing addressation and actualization are modelled by means of frames, configurational
primitives that are taken from the lexicon. Following Vallduví (1992), these frames
are referred to here as informational articulations. They are composite (trinomial
in his terminology), in that units belonging to orthogonal dimensions of informa-
tion packaging jointly form a unified configuration. Therefore, the articulations
may differ in three respects: predicationality, constitution and locus of Focus (see
chapter 6). The formal representations of the articulations are listed in Table 6.1
on page 117.

7.2.2 Classes of articulations

The informational articulations can be grouped in different ways. Groups that
can be defined in terms of a shared value on one of the parameters of information
packaging – discussed in section 6.3 – will be referred to as classes. Six of these
can be defined, as is shown in (1):

(1) Classes of articulations
   a. Theticity-based:          A, B
   b. Categoriality-based:     C, D
   c. Topic-based:             A, C, D
   d. Comment-based:           B, C, D
   e. Address-based:           A, D
   f. Entry-based:             B, C

Classes based on [predicationality] The predicationality parameter divides the
articulations in two groups. The Entry-central and Address-central Categorical
articulations (C and D) are predicational, in that the Comment is predicated to be
relevant of the Topic. The Address-central and Entry-central Thetic articulations (A and B) are non-predicational, and a relevance relation consequently is lacking. These two classes will be referred to as categoricity-based and theticity-based, respectively. For the Identificational articulation, the predicationality parameter is not relevant.

**Classes based on [constitution]** The articulations that contain a Topic layer are the Address-central Thetic (A), and Entry-central and Address-central Categorical articulations (C, D). This class will be referred to as Topic-based. The articulations that contain a Comment layer are the Entry-central Thetic and Categorical (B, C) and Address-central Categorical (D) articulations. This class will be referred to as Comment-based.

**Classes based on [locus of Focus]** Finally, articulations can be grouped according to the locus of the Focus operator. The Address-central Thetic (B) and Categorical (D) articulations have a Focus operator on their Topic layer: they contain an instruction to identify a new address. For that reason, this class will be called address-based. The Entry-central Thetic and Categorical articulations (B, C) have a Focus operator on their Comment layer, which conveys an instruction to enter the asserted propositional content as a new entry. Therefore, this class will be called entry-based. In the Identificational articulation, the Focus operator attaches neither to the Topic nor the Comment layer, but to an evocational Subact. As such, locus of Focus is the only parameter that is relevant to the classification of the Identificational articulation (E). This has to do with the fact that the dimension of addressation, from which the other features derive, is irrelevant to E. That is, while the overwhelming majority of Identificational articulations is expressed as part of a Topic-Comment structure, in which the Comment consists of a presupposed and an informative part, it is also possible to convey Identificational focus as part of a message that consists of just a Topic or a Comment layer. As will be seen in section 8.3.2, its special position in the informational paradigm has consequences for the way in which E patterns with the other articulations in expression.

### 7.2.3 Non-classes of articulations

The six groupings of articulations that were discussed above constitute classes, in the sense that they have a shared value on at least one of the parameters that define the domain. In addition, a number of groupings is logically possible that are non-classes: groups, that is, which score differently on each of the parameters mentioned in Table 6.2. Four such non-classes can be distinguished:

(2) Non-classes of articulations

| a.   | ??-based: | A, B, C |
| b.   | ??-based: | A, B, D |
| c.   | ??-based: | A, C   |
| d.   | ??-based: | B, D   |
The first of these non-classes is the combination of the Address-central and Entry-central Thetic (A, B), and Entry-central Categorical (C) articulations. They score differently for predicationality (A and B being non-predicational, while C is predicational), constitution (B contains only a Comment layer, while A contains only a Topic layer) and locus of Focus (C and B have a Focus-marked Comment, while A has a Focus-marked Topic layer). Because they do not have a single common denominator, there is no criterion that would warrant their status as a class. The same is true for the non-class consisting of the Address-central and Entry-central Thetic (A, B) and Address-central Categorical (D) articulations, which is also a non-class. Likewise, there is no criterion that warrants the formation of a class consisting of the B and D articulations, and the same is true for the combination of the articulations A and C.

7.3 Limits to coding potential

This section investigates how the various informational articulations are expressed in surface structure. First, a hypothesis is introduced that predicts certain limits to the joint expression of articulations by means of a single coding strategy. This hypothesis is tested in the following two subsections, where it is shown that the languages of the sample largely conform to the prediction. Some counter-examples will also be discussed. The final section is dedicated to the expression of informational articulations by means of differentiated coding strategies.

7.3.1 Prediction

It has been pointed out in section 7.1 that Haiman’s iconicity principle dictates a relation between similarity in form and proximity in meaning. It has also been explained there that the design of this study is strictly top-down, in the sense that surface structure distributions are treated exclusively as a consequence of the functional categories underlying them. This viewpoint is adhered to not just conceptually, but also methodologically: therefore, surface structure distributions cannot be exploited to identify underlying structure, as is often done under what seems to have become the default interpretation of the iconicity principle. Instead, the identification of underlying categories relies on context, a factor external to the form-function dichotomy, to the maximal extent possible.

While in such a design the iconicity principle loses its significance as a methodological guideline, it retains its importance as a motivation for the link between functional structure and surface structure. That is, iconicity also allows for the reverse assumption that proximity in meaning is likely to cause similarity in form. Remember that the design of this study is not concerned with the specific morphosyntactic behaviour of the coding strategies involved in the expression of information packaging, but rather with the coding potential of those strategies. The combination of this property in the design and the paradigmatic structure of the informational domain that was introduced in the previous section yields the following hypothesis:
**Limits to coding potential.** The coding potential of strategies in the domain of information packaging is constrained by the paradigmatic structure of that domain. A strategy’s coding potential will only comprise articulations that have one or more parameter settings in common.

Specifically, this means that we can expect strategies to have a coding potential that corresponds to the classes of articulations mentioned in (1). In what follows, such strategies will be referred to as theticity strategies, categoriality strategies, topic strategies, etc. On the other hand, we do not expect to find strategies whose coding potential comprises the non-groups of articulations mentioned in (2). The following sections investigate whether these expectations are met. The Identificational articulation, which has a special position in the paradigm in that most of the parameters are irrelevant to its characterization, is omitted from the discussion here. The behaviour of the Identificational articulation is discussed separately in section 8.3.2.

### 7.3.2 Coding potential and classes

#### 7.3.2.1 Theticity strategies

The coding potential of a theticity strategy ranges over the A and B articulations. There are three languages in the sample that have such a strategy: Hixkaryana, Greenlandic Inuktitut and Kambera.

**Hixkaryana** The default constituent order in Hixkaryana is O–V–S: the transitive Undergoer argument precedes the inflected verb, while the transitive and intransitive Actor arguments follow it. Also, Hixkaryana has an ‘evidentiality’ marker *tu*. In its unmarked position it follows the inflected verb but it can also occur following a preverbal referential expression, whether an Object or a Subject (Derbyshire 1985: 79). If we consider the contexts of expression in which this happens, it turns out that placement of *tu* on a preverbal referential expression is only done in three informational articulations. The first is that of a B articulation, as is illustrated in (3):

\[
(3) \begin{align*}
\text{(start of story)} & \quad B \\
\text{[oko-ymo umfekru tu y-ahos-atf'knu]\text{\_\_}, amnyehra.} & \\
\text{snake-AUG baby EVD 3>3-catch-DPC(COLL) long\_ago} & \\
\text{‘They caught a baby anaconda, long ago.’} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Hixkaryana, Southern Carib. Derbyshire 1965: 79/1)

In (3), the propositional content *x catching a baby anaconda* is introduced in its entirety, and serves as the narrative background against which the story evolves. All parts of it are informative: that is, the transitive predication is not just exploited as a vehicle to introduce the referent ‘baby anaconda’ as a future *Topic*. The propositional content is allocated to an address in the discourse organization.
that is not identified by a discourse referent; hence, no relevance is predicated. The
same strategy is also used to express an Address-central Thetic articulation. In (4),
a new discourse address is identified in this way:

(4) (start of myth) A
\[\text{wayamo} \uparrow \text{tu} \ n-eh\-ak\,\text{nuu}.\]
\[\text{jabuti} \quad \text{EVD 3-COP-DPC(NCOLL)}\]
‘There was a turtle.’

(Hixkaryana, Southern Carib. Derbyshire 1965: 44/1)

Here, no informative propositional content is asserted other than the identity of a
referent ‘about’ whom future information will be given.

Greenlandic Inuktitut has a coding strategy in which a predication is verbalized
so that one of its arguments is expressed as the intransitive verb. As can be seen
in (5), this strategy is used to express an Entry-central Thetic articulation (B), in
which the propositional content is asserted as the backdrop for the remainder of
the story:

(5) (Piuaatsuq was unable to continue) B
\[\text{nunaa} \quad \text{aput-qar-liir-riir-pu-qi} \quad \text{land:ABS(SG) snow-VR-INGR-already-IND-3SG}\]
‘snow was already on the land.’

(Greenlandic Inuktitut, Eskimo. Bittner 2007a: 13/2)

The same coding strategy can also be exploited to convey the A articulation, as is
illustrated by (6). The individual that is verbalized serves as the identifier of a new
discourse address, about which information is asserted in subsequent discourse.

(6) (end of discourse segment) A
\[\text{Qillarsuaq-kku-t=guuq [ningaa-qar-mi-pu-t]} \quad \text{Q.-ASSOC-PL=RPT son_in_law-VR-EXCL-IND-3SG}\]
‘among Qillarsuaq’s folk, there was a son-in-law.’

(Greenlandic Inuktitut, Eskimo. Bittner 2007a: 2/1)

Kambera features a coding strategy in which a Subject referent is expressed both
by means of a nominative prefix on the verb and by an independent referential
expression in postverbal position. This construction can be exploited to convey
a B articulation, as is illustrated in (7). As was also the case in the examples
given for Hixkaryana and Inuktitut, the informational intention of the Speaker is to
assert the propositional content in its entirety, without relating it to a pre-existing
address.
(7) (Umbu Mada never tells his father about his mother) B
\[ na-palu-ka-i \quad i \quad ina \].
3SG(NOM)-hit-1SG(ACC)-ITER ART mother
“Mum hit me again.” (he doesn’t say to him)

(Kambera, Malayo-Polynesian. Klamer 1998: 369/2)

The same strategy can be used to convey an A articulation, as is shown in (8). There, ‘the Jap’ is an important future Topic in the discourse.

(8) (we had plenty at home) A
\[ lupa \quad ba \quad na-laku \quad [na \quad \text{Nipong}] \].
until CONJ 3SG(NOM)-go ART Japan
‘until the Jap came.’

(Kambera, Malayo-Polynesian. Klamer 1998: 386/9)

7.3.2.2 Categoriality strategies

Categoriality strategies are those strategies that can be used to express Entry-central and Address-central Categorical articulations (C, D), while excluding Address-central and Entry-central Thetic articulations (A, B). In the languages of the sample, categoriality strategies are far more widespread than theticity strategies: seven of the fifteen languages have such a strategy.

Ma’di Ma’di has a Subject-initial constituent order, but certain referential expressions may be fronted to a position preceding the Subject. As is shown in (9), this fronting strategy is used to convey a C articulation:

(9) (so, how was this courtship handled in the past?) C
\[ [\text{Hóma}], \quad [\text{áñí vò báru}], \].
courtship 2PL go home
‘(For) courtship you went home.’

(Ma’di, Central Sudanic. Blackings and Fabb 2003: 709/295)

The assertion in (9) is clearly ‘about’ the earlier established Topic, ‘courtship’. In (10), it can be seen that the same construction can be used as well to convey an Address-central Categorical articulation (D). In this example, the Addressee is invited to imagine a situation in which someone does not abide by the custom to let quarrels rest in case of a death in the village. In this pretend play, a hypothetical referent ‘the child of your sister’ is introduced. Several informative statements are made about this referent, one of which simultaneous with its introduction in the discourse.

(10) (in case of a death, all quarrels should be put aside) D
\[ kí \quad dríá \quad dí\quad [áñá-á \quad ãmvóti\quad ã \quad báru \quad ní \].
but now DEM.PROX yet 2SG-POSS sister POSS child SPEC FOC death
k3-...k3-ä]]r. 3(n)-n-catch-obj
‘but now, the child of your sister, death gets to her (and he doesn’t even come to visit).’

**Slave**  Slave uses a relativiser sî to mark Topic referents that have a special informational status, essentially turning them into headless relative clauses. This not done for categorical assertions with a continued Topic, but happens frequently when a Topic is retrieved that had been established earlier in the discourse. Since activation status plays no role in the classification used in this study, such cases are classified here as Entry-central Categorical articulations. An example is given in (11).

(11) (The girl came over to the settler woman) C
[móla ts’êku sî], [kahxone dene gûlí gháeda]]r.
white woman REL suddenly person other 3:IMPF:see
‘The white woman saw a non-Chipewyan person for the first time.’

The same construction is used to introduce a new Topic and predicate information about it in a single assertion. An example is given in (12).

(12) (the children were taken hostage by the Chipewyan) D
hî’ta têk’á [bechile sî] [k’àtseleht’ine ts’ê t’s’êku ghá
now apart 3:younger_brother REL Chipewyan from woman with
whêda].
3SG:IMPF:live
‘Now (he who was the) younger brother lived with a woman from the
Chipewyan, (and the sister with a Ch. man).’
(Slave, Nuclear Na-Dene. Rice 1989: 1343/17)

**Kambera**  In Kambera, a referent can be evoked in an extraclausal position that precedes the actual clause, in which it is then re-evoked. Lambrecht (1994) notes that such constructions aim to achieve a separation of role and reference, whereby a referent with low activation status is first evoked separately (reference), and subsequently used in a predication (role). This is exactly what seems to be the case in Kambera, where this construction is used to convey D articulations as well as C articulations with an established Topic that needs to be retrieved. An example of the latter is given in (13). Here, ‘Umbu Mada’ is an established Topic that has not been evoked for a while. At this point in discourse, the attention shifts back to him.
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(13) (that is why she just keeps hitting him) C
\[ njadi [i Umbu Mada una nuna], [nda
thus ART Umbu Mada emph.3sg deic.3sg neg
na-pani-ma-nya ina ama-na]].
3sg(nom)-tell-emph-3sg(dat) mother father-3sg(gen)
‘... (but when his father returns,) this Umbu Mada here, he doesn’t tell
his father about his mother.’

(Kambera, Malayo-Polynesian. Klamer 1998: 368-9)

The same construction can also be used to introduce a new Topic in the discourse
and assert information about it. An example is given in (14).

(14) (no context) D
\[ jika jia-ha [da banda], [banda-nda-ma-nja].
if exist-3pl(acc) ART cattle cattle-3pl(gen)-emph-3pl(dat)
‘As for the cattle, it is ours [lit. if there is cattle, (it’s) our cattle].’

(Kambera, Malayo-Polynesian. Klamer 1998: 156/34)

Lezgian The canonical Lezgian clause can convey C and D articulations, but
no A and B articulations. The canonical clause has a Subject-initial, verb-final
constituent order, with the lexical Object occurring in preverbal position and any
remaining material occurring between the Subject and Object. In (15), an example
is given that conveys an Entry-central Categorical articulation (C). The antagonist
of the story, ‘wolf’, has been established as a Topic earlier on. This series of
statements gives more information about it. As can be seen in the second part,
realization of the topical Subject referent can also be suppressed.

(15) (I fired two bullets at the wolf) C
\[ wahshi cawu-z gadar xa-na,
[wild(abs)] [sky-dat throw acaus-aor]
‘The beast was thrown up,’
\[ \emptyset [axpa tlle-l aluq'-na].
then ground-suress fall-aor
‘... then fell on the ground (and did not move anymore).’

(Lezgian, North-Caucasian. Haspelmath 1993: 450/48)

Address-central Categorical articulations (D) can be conveyed in the same way. An
example is given in (16). Here, the referent ‘my neighbour’s dog’ is new to the
Addressee, but is employed as a Topic in the discourse for several discourse Acts.\(^1\)

\(^1\)It may be argued that, while new, the referent is accessible because DOG is in a poset
relationship of taxonomy with WOLF.
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(16) (What will this wolf do if it does not get anything else?) D
\[\text{zi qunfi-di-n} \quad \text{kits'-i}\] \[\text{[hi jemif xajit'ani ne-da]}\]  
1SG:GEN neighbour-SF-GEN dog-ERG which fruit INDEF eat-FUT  
‘My neighbour’s dog would eat any fruit, (once he even ate a cucumber).’

(Lezgian, North-Caucasian. Haspelmath 1993: 449/38)

Tidore  Constituent order in Tidore is semantically determined in the canonical order, whereby the Actor precedes the predicate and the Undergoer follows it. In addition, a coding strategy is available in which a referential expression is placed in a position preceding the Actor. Such framed referents (Van Staden 2000: 271ff) usually have a special activation status. With regard to information packaging, it seems that the framing strategy can be used to convey C as well as D articulations, as is shown in (17) and (18), respectively.

(17) (You’ve played quite enough tricks on me!) C
\[\text{ngona nde}\] \[\text{[ngoto fikir labilaha ngoto koro ngona nde]}\]  
2SG 3NHUM:here 1SG.A think better 1SG.A kill 2SG 3NHUM:here  
sone ka-re]  
‘As for you, I think I better kill you (so that) you die here.’

(Tidore, West-Papuan. Van Staden 2000: 420/86)

(18) (I will now read the main points of the news) D
\[\text{upacara . . . ena=re}\] \[\text{[ona gahi soma upacara . . .]}\]  
ceremony 3NHUM:here 3PL make ADD ceremony  
‘The ceremony held to remember scouting day they make by means of a flag ceremony in the cultural arena.’

(Tidore, West-Papuan. Van Staden 2000: 511/8)

Udihe  The sentence-initial position in Udihe may be used to realize referential expressions with a special status. One of the uses of this position seems to be to express topical referents. The coding strategy can be used both to convey Entry-central (C) and Address-central (D) Categorical articulations. An example of the former is given in (19), where the protagonist ‘Zuanchi’ has been evoked as a Topic at the very beginning of discourse. In the example, his name is predicated of him as relevant information:

(19) (his mother brought him home and wrapped him in clothes) C
\[\text{uti b’ata-wa}\] \[\text{[Zuuyfi-zi gegbi-yi-e-ti]}\]  
DEM boy-ACC Zuanchi-INSTR call-ITER-PST-3PL  
‘This boy they called Zuanchi.’

(Udihe, Tungus. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 872)
The same position can also be exploited to evoke new Topics. In (20), the referent ‘elephant’ has not been mentioned before. Note that it is arguably accessible on account of being in a relationship with (non-topical) referents mentioned in the preceding part of discourse (‘boar, livestock, people’).

(20) (Tiger kills boar and livestock. It kills people as well) D

\[ slono-zi \] tene \[ kuti yele-ini \] .

\text{elephant-instr contr tiger be_afraid-3sg}

\text{‘(But) for elephant tiger is afraid.’}

(Udihe, Tungus. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 869)

7.3.2.3 Topic strategies

Topic strategies are those coding strategies whose coding potential comprises the Address-central Thetic (A) and Categorical (D) articulations, as well as the Entry-central Categorical articulation (C). It excludes the Entry-central Thetic articulation (B). Four languages in the sample have a strategy with this coding potential.

Ma’di In Ma’di, the marker \(?i\) can occur in two positions, clause-finally as well as attached to a phrase. In the latter case, it signals that the \(?i\)-marked constituent is informative. The construction can be used to convey all articulations except the Entry-central Thetic one. Examples illustrating its coding potential are given below. First, (21) illustrates its use in a C articulation. The informative part is the Comment, which is marked with \(?i\).

(21) (this mouth-opening thing has been inflated like something on the black market) C

\[ ti \] awi \[ ijooo andr\"a\ë czc si ?i \] .

\text{mouth open absent past long src foc}

\text{‘Mouth-opening was absent in the past.’}

(Ma’di, Central Sudanic. Blackings and Fabb 2003: 688/133)

In (22), the strategy is used to convey a D articulation, with a new Topic:

(22) (Ito, and his brother Caragule) D

\[ 5dla d \] ?i \[ k\-m\ë din\] .

\text{story dem.prox foc 3(n)-go thus}

\text{‘This story, it goes thus.’}

(Ma’di, Central Sudanic. Blackings and Fabb 2003: 672/6)

In (23), a new Topic is introduced without information being asserted about it. The statement has an A articulation:
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(23) (end of discourse segment) A
bàdëni driádro [àʔi drí iʔomā dri dī ḍī]\ₚ.
later now 3PL POSS courtship POSS DEM.PROX FOC
‘now, (regarding) this courtship of ours.’

(Ma’di, Central Sudanic. Blackings and Fabb 2003: 708/290)

Begak The canonical clause structure in Begak is Verb-initial, followed by the Actor and Undergoer. It is compatible with Address-central Thetic (A) and Categorical (D) articulations as well as Entry-central Categorical articulations (C), but cannot be used to convey B and E articulations.

(24) (Mousedeer was jumping up and down, and then) C
[a-tindak rumo]-tread
3sg head child Civet
‘...he accidentally stepped on baby Civet’s head.’

(Begak, Malayo-Polynesian. Goudswaard 2005: 409/28)

In (25), we see how the same construction is used to convey the D articulation as well. The ‘tågwakwak fruit’ is an important Topic in the remainder of the story, and is introduced here for the first time. The propositional content here is highly relevant to the development of the story, and is not just instrumental in the introduction of the Topic itself. Hence, the articulation is Address-central Categorical (D) rather than Address-central Thetic (A).

(25) (so while P. was working the field,) D
[ratu’ bua’ tågwakwak sakko ttas langit]ₚ.
fall fruit tågwakwak from top sky
‘...a tågwakwak fruit fell from the sky.’

(Begak, Malayo-Polynesian. Goudswaard 2005: 422/3)

Finally, the canonical constituent order in Begak may be used to introduce a new Topic in an A articulation, as in (26).

(26) (The tågwakwak fruit broke, and) A
[buruy ulun]ₚ.
stand person
‘...(there) stood a person.’

(Begak, Malayo-Polynesian. Goudswaard 2005: 422/5)

Greenlandic Inuktitut As in Begak, the canonical constituent order in Greenlandic Inuktitut may be used to convey A, C and D articulations. An example that conveys an Entry-central Categorical articulation is given in (27). The referent ‘Piuaatsuq’ is the established Topic about whom information is asserted.
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

(27) (Piuaatsuq was very upset) C


P.-ERG(SG)=because Q.(ABS) love-INTS-IND-3SG>3SG

‘...because P. loved Q. very much’

(Greenlandic Inuktitut, Eskimo. Bittner 2007a: 27/1)

In (28), we see that the same construction can be used to convey an Address-central Categorical articulation (D). The referent ‘Qillarsuaq’ has been mentioned before, but only in passing as part of a Comment about ‘Piuaatsuq’, and long ago in the story. At this point, he is re-evoked as a new Topic.

(28) (end of discourse segment) D

\[ Qillarsuaq \]_p [ima=iliur-sima-pu-q]_p.

Qillarsuaq.ABS(SG) so=do-PFV-IND-3SG

‘(Meanwhile) Qillarsuaq had done as follows.’

(Greenlandic Inuktitut, Eskimo. Bittner 2007a: 27/1)

Finally in (29), the use of this coding strategy to convey an A articulation is illustrated. The propositional content that is asserted about the new Topic ‘the pups’ is irrelevant to the further development of the story, which justifies its classification as an Address-central Thetic (A) articulation, rather than an Address-central Categorical (D) one.

(29) (Paakujuk’s mother gave birth in an abandoned coal barrel) A

\[ piaraq-i \]_p miiraq-t nassaari-pa-it.

baby-3SG>3PL child-ERG(PL) find-IND-3PL>3PL

‘The pups were found by the children.’

(Greenlandic Inuktitut, Eskimo. Bittner 2007b: 2/1)

Hixkaryana The canonical constituent order in Hixkaryana can be used to convey Address-central Thetic and Categorical articulations, as well as Entry-central Categorical articulations. Relevant examples are given in (30) – (32):

(30) (Hmph, he made) C

\[ n-oseryehok-ek\omega\nu ]_p, [fofrye]_p.

3-upset-DPC(NCOLL) sloth

‘He was upset, sloth.’

(Hixkaryana, Southern Carib. Derbyshire 1965: 28/13)
LIMITS TO CODING POTENTIAL

7.3.2.4 Comment strategies

Coding strategies whose coding potential ranges over the Entry-central Thetic and Categorical articulations (B and C) as well as over the Address-central Categorical articulation (D) form the class of Comment strategies. These strategies exclude the conveyance of Address-central Thetic articulations (A), which do not have a Comment layer. Four languages in the sample exhibit strategies with this coding potential.

Sri Lanka Malay

The canonical coding strategy in Sri Lanka Malay can be used to convey the B, C and D articulations. The coding strategy consists of sentence-initial expression of the lexical Subject, and sentence-final expression of the main predicate. The example in (33) illustrates the use of this strategy to convey a C articulation. The Topical referent ‘the man’ has been established earlier in the discourse, and is now retrieved to serve as the allocation site for further information:

(33) (after the man fell asleep, the monkeys took the hats) C

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oorang} \mid \text{su-baawung} \mid \text{thoppi pada=yang ana-caari} \\
\text{man PST-rise hat PL=OBJ PST-search}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The man got up (and) searched for the hats.’

(Sri Lanka Creole Malay. Nordhoff 2009)

This construction can also be used if the topical referent is new. An example is given in (34) below, where ‘Andare’ is introduced for the first time, and simultaneously information is supplied that is relevant to him. The data is insufficient to determine whether the canonical coding strategy can also be used to convey Identificational articulations.
(34) (start of discourse) D
[Andare katha ara-biilang] [raaja mliiga=ka hatthu oorang]
A. QUOT PROG-say king palace=LOC INDEF man joke
'Andare was a jester at the king’s palace.'

(Sri Lanka Creole Malay. Nordhoff 2009)

Finally, the canonical construction can be used to convey an Entry-central Thetic articulation (B). The statement in (35) is used to introduce a new circumstance that serves as the background to the next stretch of discourse:

(35) (end of discourse segment) B
suda [puthri=le biini=le ara-caanda aari=le]
thus prince=ASSOC wife=ASSOC PROG-meet day=ASSOC
su-dhaathang] [su-dhaathang] [su-dhaathang]
pst-come
'Thus came the day for the prince and wife to meet.'

(Sri Lankan Malay. Nordhoff 2009)

**Lango**

Lango has a comment strategy. However, the language is peculiar in that no Address-central Thetic articulations (A) could be identified at all in the available data. The examples below illustrate the use of the canonical Lango clause structure to convey a B, C and D articulation, respectively.

(36) (end of discourse segment) B
[lyècte te nèkké ògògò] [lyècte te nèkké ògògò]
elephant 3SG.COH.HAB kill:INF:3SG.OBJ chameleon
'And then Elephant killed Chameleon.'

(Lango, Nilo-Saharan. Noonan 1992: 296/24)

(37) (Then Elephant tried to dig for water) C
[pì] [pì] [te lòyèf] [pì] [te lòyèf]
water 3SG.COH.HAB defeat:INF:3SG(OBJ)
'(but) the water defeated him.'


(38) (long ago there was a drought) D
ékkà [tòtò à ñákkò] [tòtò à ñákkò]
and then mother ATTR.PRT girl 3SG.COH.HAB bring:INF

(39) (long ago there was a drought) D
dékkà [tòtò à ñákkò] [tòtò à ñákkò]
and then mother ATTR.PRT girl 3SG.COH.HAB bring:INF
Kambera  Kambera has a variety of cleft-like constructions, compatible with a variety of informational uses. One of these involves a complex embedding of the original predication in a new construct, with the seeming goal to create a higher-order Subject-Predicate configuration that can be exploited for informational purposes. A fuller discussion of the construction itself is given in the appendix. This strategy is compatible with the Entry-central Categorical articulation, as in (39):

(39)  (Umbu Ndilu is at a loss:)  C
[yena][+yena ngangga] na-ida na-pa
DEIC.3SG NEG eat-EMPH-3SG.CONT-ITER-IMPF DEIC.3SG
‘This one, she isn’t eating anymore, (this stepmother, his wife).’

(Kambera, Malayo-Polynesian. Klamer 1998: 375/22)

Here, the established Topic ‘stepmother’ is retrieved in the newly created ‘subject’ position, and new information is predicated about it. In (40), the same construction is used to convey a Entry-central Thetic articulation.

(40)  (end of discourse segment)  B
njadi [ana hakola-naa-nya-ka {una yena-ngga}]
so DIM school-3SG(GEN)-3SG(DAT)-PFV EMPH.3SG DEIC.3SG-MOD
{i Umbu Mada} nù ]p+n.
ART(PN) Umbu Mada DEIC
‘So (it happens that) this one, Umbu Mada is about to reach school-age.’

(Kambera, Malayo-Polynesian. Klamer 1998: 369/3)

Finally, the strategy can be used to convey an Address-central Categorical articulation as well. In (41), the Speaker’s father is introduced as a new Topic, and new information is asserted about him in the same statement.

(41)  (but when Rambu E was born,)  D
ama òh-nya-nya-ka paì-ràma la toko Sumba
father OBJ.REL-call-3SG(GEN)-3SG(DAT)-PFV CTR-work LOC shop Sumba
‘Dad was whom he called to work in the Sumbanese toko.’

(Kambera, Malayo-Polynesian. Klamer 1998: 385/5)
7.3.2.5 Address strategies

Address-based strategies are those whose coding potential comprises the Address-central Thetic and Categorical articulations (A and D), and excludes their Entry-central counterparts (B and C). Three languages in the sample have strategies with this coding potential.

**Hixkaryana** In the canonical case, Subject referents follow the inflected verb in Hixkaryana. They can also be expressed in preverbal position, however, in what appears to be the canonical Object position. When expressed there, these Subject referents cannot be marked with the ‘evidential’ marker *tW* that we have seen before. This strategy can be used to convey A articulations, as in (42):

(42) *(It was light)*  
\[\text{kamumur}_r\equiv n-ehf-ak\text{onu}._m\]  
\text{sun}  \quad 3\text{-COP-DPC(NCOLL)}  
‘The sun was (there).’ *(Derbyshire 1965: 16/5)*

In (42), ‘the sun’ is an important Topic in the remainder of the story, which is introduced in an existential statement. Since its existence is not relevant information, but is only used instrumentally to introduce the topical referent itself, this statement qualifies as conveying an A articulation. The same construction can also be used to convey a D articulation, as in (43):

(43) *(start of discourse)*  
\[\text{kurumu}_r\equiv [n-anotom-ef'konu]_m\]  
\text{vulture}  \quad 3\gt3\text{-employ-DPC(COLL)}  
‘The vultures enslaved him.’ *(Hixkaryana, Southern Carib. Derbyshire 1965: 28/1)*

**Greenlandic Inuktitut** Greenlandic Inuktitut allows for referential expressions to be fronted and marked with a demonstrative element. The construction bears some resemblance to one of the cleft constructions in Inuktitut (cf. Fortescue 1985), but is different in that the verb is inflected is not substantivized. The construction can be used to introduce a new Topic in an Address-central Thetic articulation (A), as in (44):

(44) *(no context)*  
\text{a-ana}  \quad [\text{oujurtuliiraq}]_r\equiv aggir-pu-q.  
\text{D-DEM motor_boat}  \quad \text{come-IND-3SG}  
‘there is a motorboat coming.’ *(Greenlandic Inuktitut, Eskimo. Fortescue 1985: 75)*

Also, the construction can be used to convey an Address-central Categorical articulation (D). In (45), the propositional content THEY HAD TO GO TO X is asserted of
a new Topic, the (underspecified) destination ‘there’.

(45) (Ahead of them, they saw something black) D
\[taanna\text{-}una \parallel \text{urniq-\text{-}niar-pa-at}\].
there\text{-}DEM approach-\text{-}TENT-\text{-}IND-3PL\text{-}3SG
‘that was where they were trying to go.’

(Greenlandic Inuktitut, Eskimo. Bittner 2007b: 38/9)

**Udihe** The preverbal position in Udihe is reserved for elements with special informational status. Statements that use this coding strategy predominantly seem to convey A and D articulations; examples are given in (46) and (47), respectively.

(46) (Kanda lies on the river bank, pretending to be dead) A
\[ele: \text{skike-gie} \parallel \text{emem-zi:}\]
soon evening-\text{-}ITER.PRS.PART one hare come-\text{-}PST.PART-\text{-}INSTR.SS
\[\text{kæ-li}._\]
near-PROL
‘In the evening, a hare came along.’

(Udihe, Tungus. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 904)

In (46), the referent ‘hare’ is mentioned as a Topic for the first time. The construction can also be used to convey a D articulation:

(47) (The Chinese lived there) D
\[\text{namu bugasa-tigi-ni} \parallel \text{eze-\text{-}ti} \parallel \text{igbez-\text{-}ni}\].
sea island-LAT-3SG czar-3PL chase.PST-3SG
‘To an island their king chased (them).’

(Udihe, Tungus. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 872)

In (47), the referent ‘their king’ is established as a new Topic. The informative propositional content X CHASING THEM TO AN ISLAND is predicated of this Topic in the same statement; therefore, it qualifies as an Address-central Categorical articulation (D), rather than a Thetic one.

**Sri Lankan Malay** Sri Lankan Malay has a fronting strategy that can be used to convey A and D articulations. While in the canonical SLM constituent order, the Subject is placed sentence-initially, in cases of fronting another referential phrase precedes the Subject. An example where this strategy is used to convey an A articulation is given in (48), where the ‘monkeys’ are introduced as a new Topic for the subsequent stretch of discourse.
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

(48) (the hat-seller sat down under a tree) A
ini      pohong atthas=ka [mooyeth hatthu kawan]₂₇ su=aada.
DEM.PROX tree top=LOC monkey INDEF group PST-be
‘In the top of that tree was a group of monkeys.’

(Sri Lankan Malay. Nordhoff 2009)

In (49), the same strategy is used to convey a D articulation. ‘The prince’ is a new
Topic in this statement.

(49) (Andare was a jester in the king’s palace) D
hatthu aari [puthri=nang]₁ [Andare=pe biini=yang ma-diyath=nang
INDEF day prince=DAT A.=POSS wife=OBJ INF-watch=DAT
hatthu sukahan su-dhaathang]₁.
INDEF favour PST-come
‘One day, a desire overcame the prince to see A.’s wife.’

(Sri Lankan Malay. Nordhoff 2009)

7.3.2.6 Entry strategies

Finally, the entry strategies are those coding strategies of which the coding potential
comprises the Entry-central Thetic and Categorical articulations (B and C), while
excluding their Address-central counterparts A and D. Four languages in the sample
have such strategies.

Tidore The canonical clause structure in Tidore can be used to convey B and C
articulations, but no A and D articulations. Examples are given below. In (50),
new information is asserted about the ongoing Topic ‘the woman’:

(50) (She did not speak) C
[mina]₁ [duga sango una sarat]₁.
3SGF only answer 3SGM sign
‘She only answered him with signs.’

(Tidore, West-Papuan. Van Staden 2000: 363/42)

In (51), the same strategy is used to convey an Entry-central Thetic articulation:

(51) (what’s this now?) B
[gorango goli una si]₁.
shark bite 3SGM first
‘A shark bit him.’

(Tidore, West-Papuan. Van Staden 2000: 368/86)

Krongo In Krongo, the canonical clause structure has the coding potential of an
Entry-central Thetic articulation. In (52), the canonical clause is used to convey a
B articulation:

(52) (start of discourse) B
\[m-\text{âtûná} \ i\text{ttóy} \ ã\text{ttûmântàrâ} \ ã\text{nkwà-} \ ã\text{n-úûdà}\_\text{p}.\]
F-PFV:find:TR rabbit hyena CONN:M-IMPF:go-TRR INSTR-meat
‘A rabbit meets a hyena that carries about some meat.’

(Krongo, Nilo-Saharan. Reh 1985: [376/2]

The event in (52) is introduced out-of-the-blue, and serves as the background against which the story evolves. In (53), the same construction is shown to convey the Entry-central Categorical articulation as well. Here, ‘wild dog’ is an established Topic which new information is proffered:

(53) (Wild Dog planted peanuts across a brook) C
\[m-\text{ôcidó-} \ ã\text{biít}i\_\text{v}.\]
F-IMPF:FREQ:cut-TR water
‘She crosses the water.’

(Krongo, Nilo-Saharan. Reh 1985: 379/44)

**Ma’di** Ma’di allows for the occurrence of bare predicates. Their interpretation is compatible with the Entry-central Thetic articulation (B), as in (54):

(54) (Caragule performed a water-dance) B
\[bá \ ã\text{mvû} \ ã\text{êjí}. \ [\text{vî]}\_\text{ëjí} \ ã\text{gê} \ ã\text{kû}.\]
people 3-drink water thirst water 3-reach neg
‘The people drank water. Thirst. The water was not enough.’

(Ma’di, Central Sudanic. Blackings and Fabb 2003: 676/648)

The event-referent ‘thirst’ denotes a situation that is not ‘about’ any established Topic, but which is not a Topic itself either. For this reason, the statement in (54) has been classified as a B articulation. Similarly, bare predicates can be used to convey an Entry-central Categorical articulation when there is no change of Topic, as in (55):

(55) (Encantation: ‘I am Caragule. It is me.’) C
\[\emptyset \ [\text{têndêrê}]\_\text{p}.\]
huge_upright_strong
‘Huge, upright and strong.’


**Kambera** Nominal clauses can be used in Kambera for stylistic and narrative reasons. In addition, it seems that this strategy is used to convey only B and C articulations, but not D and A articulations. An example of an Entry-central Thetic articulation conveyed by a nominal clause is given in (56). The Speaker
introduces a circumstance out of the blue, which serves as background and cause to the subsequent development of the story.

(56) (Thus it went on, you know) B
lupa [tèka-du-na-nya-ka]
until arrive-EMPH-3SG(GEN)-3SG(DAT)-PFV illness 3SG
hidu nyuna nuna na
wife-3SG(GEN)
‘until illness arrived at her, his wife.’

(Kambera, Malayo-Polynesian. Klamer 1998: 370/6)

In (57), the same construction is used to convey a C articulation. The Topic slot is left uninstantiated here because the Topic ‘Umbu Mada’ is the same as in the preceding discourse.

(57) (So he about reaches school-age, this Umbu Mada) C
[∅], [uru-uruh-ma-na-nya-ka]
RED-organise-EMPH-3SG(GEN)-3SG(DAT)-PFV ART horse
na njara
‘He is looking after his horse (all the time).’

(Kambera, Malayo-Polynesian. Klamer 1998: 369/4)

7.3.2.7 Intermediate summary

In the preceding subsections, we have seen that all classes of articulations, defined on the basis of the proposed paradigmatic structure of information packaging, are indeed reflected as the coding potential of strategies attested in one or more languages of the sample. Furthermore, if we compare the total number of strategies that exhibits each of the coding potentials (bottom row in Table 7.1), we see that the classes CD and BC are notably more frequent as coding potential than the other classes.

The assumed information packaging paradigm also predicts that no strategies should occur with the coding potentials mentioned as non-classes in (2). In the next section, this prediction will be checked.

7.3.3 Coding potential and non-classes

In addition to the six classes of articulations that the paradigmatic structure of the informational domain allows for, four non-classes were mentioned in section 7.2.3. Coding strategies are not expected to range over these non-classes, because they have no parameter settings in common. Nevertheless, a number of ‘illegitimate’ strategies are attested in the languages of the sample. A summary is given in Table 7.2; the individual languages are discussed in the remainder of this section.
### Table 7.1  Class-based coding potentials as attested per language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>ACD</th>
<th>BCD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hixkaryana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlandic Inuktitut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayardild</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krongo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezgian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udihe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movima</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan Malay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma’di</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.2  Non-class-based coding potentials as attested per language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>ABD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hixkaryana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlandic Inuktitut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambera</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayardild</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krongo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezgian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udihe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movima</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan Malay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma’di</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.3.1 Non-class 1: AC

Greenlandic Inuktitut and Tidore have a coding strategy that can be used to convey both the A and C articulations.

**Greenlandic Inuktitut**  In Greenlandic Inuktitut, this strategy makes use of the postverbal position:

(58) (Piuaatsuq had a hard time) C

\[
[\varnothing], \ [\text{irnumagi-nirpaa-pa-i} \ \text{kiinni-niri-paa-pa-i}] \ . \\
\text{worry-most-IND-3SG>3PL kamik-3SG>3PL}
\]

‘(but) he worried most about his kamiks [boots].’

(Greenlandic Inuktitut, Eskimo. Bittner 2007a: 8/4)

In the canonical constituent order, the Undergoer referent ‘kamiks’ would have occurred in preverbal position. The reason why it is placed in post-verbal position has to do with its future saliency in the discourse; ‘kamiks’ is what could be called an **expectant Topic**, which apparently is a relevant functional category in Greenlandic Inuktitut. However, in the context of this research, the statement in (58) is classified as a simple Topic-Comment assertion (C): it conveys new information about an established Topic (‘Piuaatsuq’).

The same coding strategy is also used to create a new discourse address, i.e. to convey an A articulation. In (59), the referent ‘Tuuma’ is the protagonist of the story. It is introduced as part of a predication that does not denote relevant information about ‘Tuuma’. Therefore, the statement is classified as an Address-central Thetic articulation:

(59) (end of discourse segment) A

\[
\text{maaanna=lu tusa-ssa-v-at} \ [\text{nukappiara-q Tuuma}]
\]

\[
\text{now=CONJ hear_about-FFUT-IND-2SG>3SG boy-ABS(SG) T.}
\]

\[
\text{savaatilikkuriqiu}_{\text{r}}, \\
\text{sheep_herding_folk:dweller}
\]

‘Now you shall hear about the boy Tuuma who dwelt with the sheep-herders.’

(Greenlandic Inuktitut. Fortescue 1985: 176)

**Tidore** Tidore has a coding strategy in which a referent is evoked by multiple juxtaposed coreferential expressions, optionally separated by a pause. The strategy can be used to convey a C articulation, as is illustrated in (60). The referent ‘them seven in the lake’ is an established, active Topic in the conversation.

(60) (Jafar Sadik broke off a branch) C

\[
\text{wo-tongo=ge} \ [\text{ona ngai-tomdiit toma talaga ma-doya}}
\]

\[
\text{3SGM.A-break=there 3PL CLF-seven LOC lake 3NHUM.POSS-inside}
\]
The same strategy is used to introduce a new Topical referent, as in (61). Note that
the predication used to introduce this referent is not informative, as it predicates a
trivial property of its denotatum, which is not relevant in the context of discourse.
For this reason, the statement is not classified as Address-central Categorical
articulation (D), but as a Thetic one instead.

\[(61) \quad \text{(end of segment)} \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{suru } \text{ua=} \text{ge}, \quad \text{gufu roi } [\text{gufu sang } \text{rimoi}], \quad \text{yo-soro} \\
\text{long neg=} \text{there fly } \text{fly}_\text{around fly bluebottle one } 3\text{NHUM.A-fly}
\text{ino.} \\
\text{this}_\text{way} \\
\text{Before long, a fly was flying around, a bluebottle fly was flying this way.}
\end{array} \]

(Tidore, West Papuan. Van Staden 2000: 397/362)

Discussion It has been argued before that the Address-central Thetic articulation
and the Entry-central Categorical articulation do not constitute a class because
they do not share a parameter setting to the exclusion of all other articulations:
the property they have in common (i.e., a positive value on the constitution
parameter \( \pm \text{Top} \)) is also shared by the Address-central Categorical articulation.
The question then is whether an alternative explanation is available for the fact
that two languages appear to have a coding strategy with AC coding potential.
Two potential explanations come to mind, both of which result in a reanalysis of
the coding potential of these strategies.

One is that the occurrence of AC strategies in Tidore and Greenlandic Inuktitut
has to do with the fact that both the postposing strategy in the latter and the
preposing strategy in the former target a referent that has a ‘special’ status. The
postposing strategy in Greenlandic Inuktitut is used to express referents that
are new Topics (in its A reading) or future Topics (in its C reading), while the
preposing strategy in Tidore is used to express new Topics (in its A reading) and
retrieved Topics (in its D reading). More importantly, neither strategy is used to
convey ‘normal’, continued Topical referents in the C reading. The above gives
rise to the speculation that established Topics and Focal Topics constitute the
prototypical members of a continuum in which future Topic and retrieved Topic
are also individuable categories in some languages. This is represented tentatively
in Figure 7.1.

Apparently, retrieved Topic patterns with Focal Topic patterns in Greenlandic
Inuktitut, just as future Topic does in Tidore. Viewed in this way, the articulation
conveyed by both strategies is not that of Entry-central Categorical, but rather that
of Address-central Categorical articulation. That is, the perceived coding potential
of the postposing and preposing strategies in Greenlandic Inuktitut and Tidore is not AC, but rather AD, or Address-based (see section 7.3.2.5).

Alternatively, the apparent occurrence of AC-strategies may relate to the frequency of Discourse Acts that aim at Topic maintenance as opposed to those that aim at Topic creation in natural language discourse. It can be assumed that Topic maintenance is overall more frequent in human communication than Topic creation: the creation of a large number of discourse addresses, each containing very little information, would be very poor use of limited processing capacity. Therefore, it is likely that in any random stretch of discourse, the articulations are not distributed evenly, but that Entry-central Categorical (and possibly, Entry-central Thetic) articulations are more frequent than Address-central articulations. In light of this skewed distribution, it is possible that the apparent coding potential that is identified on the basis of a limited amount of text does not correspond to the actual coding potential of a strategy. In the case of the AC strategies in Tidore and Greenlandic Inuktitut, it may be that these strategies can also be used to convey the Address-central Categorical articulation (D), but that this use simply has not come to light in the limited corpus that was available. That is, these strategies may need to be reclassified as Topic-based strategies of the kind discussed in section 7.3.2.3, a class that is predicted on the basis of the paradigmatic structure of the informational domain.\footnote{Although the assumedly skewed distribution of established versus newly created Topics in natural discourse makes the problem especially salient for the apparent AC-strategies, a similar argument in principle applies to all classifications proposed in this study; the coding potential of any coding strategy may need to be readjusted as more data is examined. This highlights the necessity for the current study to be repeated on a larger scale, with more data from more genres in more languages.}

7.3.3.2 Non-class 2: BD

None of the languages in the sample has a coding strategy with a coding potential that comprises only the Entry-central Thetic and Address-central Categorical articulations.
7.3.3.3 Non-class 3: ABC

Four languages of the sample – Krongo, Udihe, Movima and Slave – have a coding strategy whose coding potential comprises the Address-central and Entry-central Thetic (A, B), and the Entry-central Categorical (C) articulations. After a brief presentation of the data, the last part of this section will consider a possible explanation.

Krongo In Krongo, the so-called narrative construction can be used to convey any articulation except the Address-central Categorical (D). The examples in (62), (63) and (64) illustrate how the strategy can be used to convey the C, A and B articulations, respectively.

(62) (a mouse comes. It passes along Lion’s face) C
     n-áa [tikàamù], [t-àsàlà kà-nífi].
     CONN:3N-COP lion INF-see LOC-mouse
     ‘Lion sees the mouse.’
     (Krongo, Nilo-Saharan. Reh 1985: 397/263)

In (62), ‘Lion’ is an established Topic. In (63), the same strategy is used to introduce a new Topic in an A articulation:

(63) (Lion is resting under a tree. He is asleep.) A
     m-áa [nífi]ádiyà.
     CONN:3F-COP mouse come(INF)
     ‘(A) mouse comes (by).’
     (Krongo, Nilo-Saharan. Reh 1985: 397/262)

In (64), the strategy is used to convey a B articulation. The difference in articulation between (63) and (64) depends on the informativity of the remainder of the predication. While the sole purpose of the predication X COMING BY is to introduce the referent ‘mouse’, the predication X RESTING UNDER A TREE is information relevant to the development of the story.

(64) (start of discourse) B
     n-áa [tikàamù ófùnyò kí-flá kúbú].
     CONN:3N-COP lion rest(INF) LOC-tree under
     ‘Lion is resting under a tree.’
     (Krongo, Nilo-Saharan. Reh 1985: 397/261)

Udihe The canonical constituent order – Subject-initial, Verb-final, with the Object immediately preceding the Verb and optional spatiotemporal expressions in pre-Subject position – in Udihe allows expression of the A, B and C articulations. An example of this strategy conveying an Entry-central Categorical articulation
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

(C) is given in (65):

(65) (Otter dove and brought up a bunch of fish) C

\[
\text{uta}_\text{t} \quad \text{tuge-zi} \quad \text{olokto-ni}_\text{t}, \quad \text{g’ai}_\text{t} \quad \text{diga-ili}_\text{t}.
\]

DEM:DIST.NOM quick-INSTN cook.PST-3SG crow eat-3SG

‘He cooked (dinner) quickly, Crow eats.’

(Udihe, Tungus. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 897)

The Entry-central Thetic articulation can be conveyed by what appears to be the same construction:

(66) (start of discourse) B

\[
\text{minti} \quad \text{ba-di-fi} \quad \text{kuti} \quad \text{wats’a} \quad \text{bie}\_\text{t}.
\]

1PL place-DAT-1PL.INAL tiger few COP.PRS.HAB

‘In our woods tigers are few.’

(Udihe, Tungus. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 868)

Finally, (67), illustrates how the same strategy is used to convey the A articulation. The ‘Chinese’ are the Topic of the first part of the story.

(67) (start of discourse) A

\[
\text{niyka-ziga} \quad \text{bagdi-e-ti}\_\text{t}.
\]

Chinese-PL live-PST-3PL

‘The Chinese lived (there).’

(Udihe, Tungus. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 872)

**Movima** In Movima, the canonical coding strategy is predicate-initial. The order in which core arguments follow the predicate is determined by their respective position on the Nominal Hierarchy. When two arguments rank equally, the Speaker can use constituent ordering in the post-predicate field to express pragmatic distinctions. While the data is insufficient, it appears that the post-verbal position is used to express established Topical and other given referents, while the second argument position is used to express referents that are new, focal or otherwise special. While several discourse particles appear to play a role in the presentation of information in narratives, the available data is insufficient to consider their contribution. In (68), an example is given of the canonical strategy used to convey a C articulation:

(68) (and we walked through the forest) C

\[
\text{te} \quad \text{mana-je}=\text{is} \quad \text{pa:ko}_\text{t} \quad \text{os} \quad \text{ru:ru}\_\text{t}.
\]

and find:DR=ART.PL dog ART.NT.PST jaguar

‘...and the dogs came across a jaguar.’

(Movima. Haude 2006: 562/3)
In (68), ‘the dogs’ are the established Topic about which new information is asserted. The new referent ‘jaguar’, which is to be used as a Topic itself later on in the discourse, is expressed in absolutive position following the predicate. In (69), the same construction can be seen at work to convey a B articulation:

\[(69) \text{(Our dogs were many)} \quad \text{B} \]
\[\text{tfe} \quad [\text{ilomi}=j'i \ n-os \quad \text{fap}_{\text{mo}}]_{\text{p}}. \]
\[\text{and walk}=1\text{PL OBL-ART.NT.PST forest} \]
\[\text{‘and we were walking through the woods . . . ’} \]
\[(\text{Movima. Haude 2006: 562/2)} \]

The predication in (69) gives background information about the circumstances in which the actual story, a party of dogs attacking a jaguar, took place. The ‘we’ in this statement is not a Topic, since neither this assertion nor the ones preceding or following are ‘about’ the Speaker and his company. In (70), we see that the same strategy is used to introduce a new Topical referent into the discourse:

\[(70) \text{(start of discourse)} \quad \text{A} \]
\[\text{[kaw-poj is pak{o} di' pak{o}=j'i]}_{\text{p}}, \]
\[\text{many-TR.animal ART.PL dog REL dog}=1\text{PL} \]
\[\text{‘Many (were) the dogs that (are) our dogs → we had many dogs.’} \]
\[(\text{Movima. Haude 2006: 114)} \]

**Slave** In Slave, the canonical SOV constituent order can also be used to convey Entry-central Thetic and Categorical articulations, as well as Address-central Thetic ones. An example of the former is given in (71):

\[(71) \text{(That is how it was.)} \quad \text{C} \]
\[\text{[tariyune bek’aweridao], [dechilekueke ta goide dedi]}_{\text{p}}. \]
\[? \text{manager RFL.PL:worker among 3:PF:talk EVD} \]
\[\text{‘The manager talked with his workers.’} \]
\[(\text{Slave, Nuclear Na-Dene. Rice 1989: 1351/95)} \]

In (71), ‘the manager’ is an established Topic, about whom new information is asserted in this statement. In (72), a B articulation is conveyed by means of the canonical strategy, while (73) illustrates how the strategy can be used to introduce a new Topic in an A articulation.

\[(72) \text{(start of discourse)} \quad \text{B} \]
\[\text{[?eyi gots’ë’ tek{h}i te’s’ego]}_{\text{p}}. \]
\[\text{DEM AGR:from then NONSPEC:IMPF:RECP:kill bad AGR:IMPF:be} \]
\[\text{‘In those days they killed each other and it was bad.’} \]
\[(\text{Slave, Nuclear Na-Dene. Rice 1989: 1342/ff)} \]
(73) (the Dene girl saw a white people’s house for the first time) A 
haïlé ṭeyi got’s’e ści[a [ts’eeku dek’ate bek”īghá 
PRO:PST DEM AGR:from EVD woman RFL:among 3:head:hair 
dekwoi[t] [kadéhtla dedi]–
3:IMPF:be_yellow 3:PF:go_out EVD 
‘Then a woman with blond hair came out from there.’

(Slave, Nuclear Na-Dene. Rice 1989: 1348/73)

Discussion
Like the combination of Address-central Thetic and Entry-central Categorical articulations (AC) discussed in section 7.3.3.1, the combination of Address-central and Entry-central Thetic and Entry-central Categorical does not have a common feature setting that makes them constitute a class in the informational paradigm.

A possible explanation relates to the complexity of the Address-central Categorical articulation and the supposed violation of processing restrictions it entails (Chafe 1986). As has been remarked at various points in this study, the D articulation is challenging to the Addressee, because it instructs him to identify a new address and simultaneously assert information relevant to this new address. For this reason, many languages prefer to achieve the same effect by using two separate articulations, segmenting the message in a Topic-creation part (equivalent to an A articulation) and a Topic-maintenance part conveying the information (equivalent to a C articulation). In surface structure, this leads to constructions that Lambrecht (1994) refers to as separation of role and reference, whose function is to neutralize the dual informational task that the Speaker imparts. It may be the case that the apparent ABC-strategies in Krongo, Udihe, Slave and Movima are not so much motivated by that particular coding potential, but simply incompatible with the duality that is inherent in the D articulation. Put otherwise, these coding strategies would be ‘all-inclusive’ strategies, if it were not for the fact that they are incapable of conveying an Address-central Categorical articulation.

If this is the case, we would expect these strategies to be morphosyntactically ‘unitary’. This appears to be the case: the strategies with ABC coding potential are the canonical strategies in Udihe, Slave and Movima, in which the normal constituent order is employed and in which no special positions, embedding constructions or segmental markers are exploited to achieve some kind of segmentation. In Krongo, the narrative construction (Reh 1985: 193ff) can be interpreted as presenting the sentence in a single post-copular slot, which would also clearly qualify as a unitary strategy.

Furthermore, we would expect the strategies that are capable of conveying the Address-central Categorical articulation in those languages to be ‘dual’.\(^3\) To some

\(^3\) It must be stressed that the notional pair dual – unitary is used here in a very loose, intuitive sense, somewhat parallel to the better-known monoclausal – biclausal distinction. Neither makes reference to specific classes of morphosyntactic or phonological constructs. Examples of prototypical dual strategies would be dislocation constructions with an extraclausal constituent, but also certain cleft constructions. Examples of prototypical
extent, the construction that Krongo, Udihe, Slave and Movima use to convey Address-central Categorical articulations can indeed be analysed as such. Krongo and Movima, both of which have V-initial basic constituent order, present the clearest cases, as the strategies they use to convey D both employ the use of the preverbal position, which in those languages may be understood to be outside the core clause. In Slave, the strategy that can convey D makes use of a headless relative clause, which essentially embeds a identificational construction (he who is an X) in a Categorical articulation. This, too, is clearly a dual structure. Udihe, finally, expresses the D articulation by means of two strategies, both of which express the Focal Topic in sentence-initial position. While exploitation of this position does not necessarily seem to result in a ‘dual’ structure in this language, it is notable that the referent that is used as Focal Topic is often segmentally marked.

In sum, while this is definitely something that should be investigated more systematically, the data seems to favour the second analysis of ABC-strategies. That is, they present cases of strategies that are most likely informationally neutral, but simply incapable of expressing the Address-central Categorical articulation. This is due to the specific morphosyntactic behaviour of the language, in conjunction with the tendency for D articulations to be expressed by means of coding strategies that are ‘dual’.

7.3.3.4 Non-class 4: ABD

None of the languages in the sample has coding strategies with this type of coding potential.

7.3.3.5 Intermediate summary

On the basis of the hypothesis, four combinations of articulations are expected not to occur as the coding potential of strategies. In total, six of the fifteen languages in the sample exhibit coding strategies whose coding potential constitutes such a non-class. This may seem like a lot of counterevidence to the hypothesis in 7.3, but it should be remarked that these six strategies form only 7% of the total number of strategies identified across the sample (which is eighty-two; cf. Table 8.1).

Furthermore, two of the four non-classes are not attested at all. No language in the sample has coding strategies with a coding potential ranging over the Address-central and Entry-central Thetic (A, B) and the Address-central Categorical articulations (D); likewise, no coding strategies were attested with a coding potential ranging over the B and D articulations. Two languages – Tidore and Greenlandic Inuktitut – have coding strategies that can be used to convey A and C articulations, but not B or D. It has been argued that this can be explained by the special status of retrieved Topics and future Topics in those languages, which may justify a reclassification of the Entry-central Categorical articulations expressed by those strategies as Address-central Categorical ones, thereby effectively removing them as counter-examples. The other apparent violation of the hypothesis concerns unitary strategies would be ‘regular’ sentences, but also holophrastic utterances.
strategies capable of conveying A, B and C articulations, attested by four languages (Udihe, Krongo, Movima, Slave). The occurrence of these strategies has been attributed to the fact that the D articulation imposes special requirements on the strategies by means of which it can be conveyed, requirements which are not met by the strategies that exhibit the ABC coding potential. This leads to a potential reclassification of those strategies as informationally neutral ABCD strategies, from the coding potential of which D is omitted for reasons related to processing, rather than to information packaging proper.

7.3.4 Differentiated coding strategies

The previous two subsections were concerned with the expression of informational articulations by means of flexible coding strategies. Now, we will turn to the expression of articulations by means of differentiated coding strategies, that can only be used to convey a single articulation. A summary of all differentiated strategies is given in Table 7.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hixkaryana</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlandic Inuktitut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayardild</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krongo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezgian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udihe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan Malay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma’di</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3 Differentiated coding strategies as attested per language

Distribution of differentiated strategies One observation that stands out is the fact that the overall number of differentiated coding strategies for the Address-central Thetic and Categorical articulations (A and D) is considerably lower than the number of differentiated coding strategies for the Entry-central Thetic and Categorical articulations (B and C).
This is remarkable because of the assumed ‘salience’ of the respective articulations. In particular, Topic creation (which is achieved by means of the A and D articulations) presumably is more salient than Topic maintenance (achieved by means of the C articulation). Speakers tend to construe a limited set of Topics in the course of a communicative exchange, because the simultaneous maintenance of too large a number of context sets in the discourse knowledge organization would diminish the speed at which new assertions can be evaluated. Given the organizational importance and lower frequency of Topic creation, it is reasonable to expect a preference for new Topics to be expressed by dedicated formal means, so as to minimize the chance that their intended construal is misinterpreted by the Addressee. Opposed to the specialness of Topic creation, it is generally accepted that the Entry-central Categorical articulation (C) is the least special one (cf. Lambrecht 1994: 132). To make informative assertions that are relevant to established Topics is the most frequently used strategy for Speakers to harmonize their Addressee’s discourse knowledge with their own. Given the high frequency of C articulations in natural discourse, it is reasonable to expect a less strong preference for such articulations to be expressed by means of a differentiated strategy. In this line of reasoning, Event-central Thetic (B) articulations occupy an intermediate position. They are special in that they lack the Topic-Comment structure of C articulations, but less so than Address-central articulations (A and D), in that they do not construe new discourse addresses.

In view of the above, one would expect the A and D articulations to exploit differentiated coding strategies more often than the C articulation. However, the opposite seems to be the case in the languages of sample: three and two instances of differentiated A and D strategies are attested, respectively, while nine differentiated C strategies occur, in six of the fifteen languages of the sample. A possible explanation for this skewed distribution is that factors other than specialness favour the availability of a differentiated coding strategy. The most obvious one would be the avoidance of informational ambiguity, especially where Topic status is concerned. That is, we would expect the occurrence of differentiated C strategies in contexts where there is potential confusion about the topicality of one or more referents in the assertion. Potential confusion arises when multiple referents in the Speaker’s Discourse Act are equally eligible as the Topic of the assertion, or when a less obvious Topic candidate is to be selected at the expense of a more eligible one. An example of the latter is given in (74), where the argument of the existential verb akay would be the preferred Topic of the assertion. However, as the Speaker intends to maintain the current Topic for a while, a relevance relation is explicitly
predicated to hold between the existence of the Civets’ child and ‘Mr. and Mrs. Civet’ themselves. Note that the Civet couple have no clear semantic function in the predication, which would make them a very unlikely Topic without the presence of the marker ton.

(74)  (The Civets wanted to go fishing with a creel) C

jadi [iro gamo ronggong ton, akay anak],
so COLL couple Civet TOP EXIST child
‘So as for the Civets, there was a child,’

(Begak, Malayo-Polynesian. Goudswaard 2005: 406/7)

**Identificational strategies**  Table 7.3 also clearly shows that the number of differentiated coding strategies used to convey the Identificational articulation (E) is high. Ten languages in the sample have at least one dedicated E strategy, five of which even have more than one. This is related to the function of the Identificational articulation, which is to signal a non-retrievable semantic entity that instantiates a slot in an otherwise presupposed structure. It seems that many of the strategies that are used to convey this articulation are sensitive to the semantic function of the entity in the predication. Slave, for instance, employs two differentiated E strategies. One – a preposing construction – is used when the slot-filling entity is a PP that expresses a non-core argument or complement. The other – an equative construction involving an NP and a headless relative clause – is used when the slot-filling entity is a core argument.

(75)  (nowadays, they only hunt with guns) E

goweri aa [deneke], [(beká t’á zo) ßek’ê t’akehdeer].
3:before long person:PL spear INSTR only caribou 3PL:kill:PL:hab:impf
‘Long ago, people killed caribou only with spears.’

(Slave, Nuclear Na-Dene. Rice 1989: 1337/2)

(76)  (The woman was the wife of the store manager) E

[(t’eyi bedenel) ßeyi sjá bets’ê dene kwihvé tsávé náedi].
DEM 3:husband DEM EVD 3:to person scalp fur 3:impf:pass:sell
‘It was her husband to whom the human head skins were sold.’

(Slave, Nuclear Na-Dene. Rice 1989: 1349/81)

### 7.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, we have examined the surface structure encoding of the five core informational articulations that were defined on the basis of the theoretical framework provided in the previous chapters. In particular, we have focused on the way in which multiple articulations may be combined in the coding potential of a single strategy.
Ample support has been found for the hypothesis provided in section 7.3, which predicted that the coding potential of coding strategies prefers to combine articulations that constitute a class in the information packaging paradigm. A large majority of the flexible coding strategies of the sample languages supports this prediction. Moreover, of the few apparent counterexamples, the majority can be accounted for in accordance with the hypothesis as well. It seems, then, that a qualitative analysis of the encoding of information packaging distinctions in the languages of the sample provides support for the theory of information packaging proposed in the previous chapters.

With regard to the classes of articulations, Table 7.1 reveals that strategies with categoriality-based (CD) and address-based (AD) coding potential are notably more frequent in the sample than strategies with another coding potential. In conjunction with the low number of differentiated D-strategies (Table 7.3 above), this may be an indication that the Address-central Categorical articulation (D) is less ‘stable’ than the other four articulations, in that it tends to associate more consistently with one of the other Topic strategies (the Address-central Thetic articulation or the Entry-central Categorical articulation). In the next chapter, we will see a similar tendency emerge from a quantitative analysis of the data.

Nevertheless, it must be stressed that the data presented so far make it clear that all four core articulations (A, B, C and D) are relevant in their own right to the description of the languages in the sample. There is only one language in the sample in which the Entry-central and Address-central Categorical articulations (C and D) share the exact same means of expression: this is Tariana, where both articulations can be conveyed by means of the ABCDE-strategy and the CD-strategy, and by nothing else. In the same vain, the Address-central and Entry-central Thetic articulations (A and B) share the exact same coding strategies in only two languages (Tariana and Movima). But except for these two cases and these three languages, no two other articulations share the exact same means of expression. This differentiation in surface structure encoding constitutes clear proof of the fact that the articulations are non-conflatable.

---

6Raw frequencies cannot be taken at face value in this study because of the lacking representativity of the sample that was used. This observation has to be treated with the utmost caution.