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Appendix

Introduction

This appendix contains the informatograms, similarity graphs, feature ordering schemas and underlying evidence for the informational configurations of the languages of the sample. Each section has two subsections: one in which the three figures mentioned above are listed, and one in which examples are given that illustrate the relevance of the established coding strategies as well as their coding potential. Numbers along the edges of the informatograms refer to the relevant example numbers in the corresponding section.

The examples follow the scheme for Interlinear Morphemic Translation originally proposed by Lehmann (1982) and updated as part of the EUROTyp project. Glosses for specific grammatical categories were taken primarily from appendix 3.2 of EUROTyp. Labels for language-specific categories were retained in their original form, but were abbreviated where the result was visually unpleasant otherwise. Where the original authors’ language-specific conventions for writing their language were particularly cumbersome (e.g. in Hixkaryana), these were converted to symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabet following the author’s comments on phonology.

In the examples used in this chapter, the informational segmentation of utterances is tentatively indicated by means of bracketing in the primary data. This approach is far from perfect, since the packaging of information in the assertion does not necessarily keep pace with segmental encoding in the expression. To give just two examples: non-evoked referents can serve as Topic of categorical assertions, which necessitates the use of $\emptyset$ to host the Topic interpretation; and constituents that express a Topical referent may interrupt a linear sequence that expresses the Comment relevant to that Topic. Obviously, at the Interpersonal Level this does not imply that the Topic itself occurs ‘inside’ the Comment, but merely that their expression is mingled. It must be stressed that neither notation has any theoretical implication. The use of $\emptyset$ does by no means imply the presence of a covert syntactic category, and the nesting of Topic and Comment bracketing likewise should not be taken to mean that Topic and Comment are in any way ‘layered’.

\(^2\)http://www-uilots.let.uu.nl/ltrc/eurotyp/.
Morphosyntactic elements that express the Topic are put between single square brackets (\[\]); when no overt element expresses the Topic, for instance in cases where the preceding context has ensured sufficient accessibility of the referent, a provisional \(\emptyset\) is included in the L1 line. The elements that express the Comment are included in double square brackets (\[\]), while the constituents that express an element in Identificational Focus are put between hooks (\{\}). The three domains indicated by brackets are labeled for extra clarity. Topic is indicated by \(\uparrow\), following Bittner (2007a). Construal of a new Topic, either in a thetic or categorical articulation, is indicated by \(\varpi\). Comment is indicated by \(\varpi\); when it is not the Comment that is informative (in Focus), \(\uparrow\) is used instead. Identificational Focus is indicated by \(\uparrow\).

Krongo

Krongo informational properties

Figure 1 gives the informatogram of Krongo, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering.

Krongo examples

**Narrative construction**  The first coding strategy is referred to as the narrative construction (Reh 1985: 193). It consists of a Subject-inflected copula followed by an optional lexical Subject, an optional narrative verb, an infinitival main verb and an optional lexical Object. The narrative construction appears to have a ‘distancing’ flavour, presenting the propositional content as a mental object outside the Addressee’s immediate sphere of perception, rather than as an eventuality with respect to which s/he is expected to relate. The typical usage of the narrative construction is illustrated in (1), where it is used categorically, to assert new information relevant to an active discourse address:

\[
\text{(1) (a mouse comes. It passes along Lion’s face)} \quad C
\]

\[
n\text{-áa} \quad [\text{tìkàamù}] \quad [\text{t-àssàlà kà-ìîfì}]\, . \quad \text{Conn:3N-Cop lion Inf-see Loc-mouse}
\]

‘Lion sees the mouse.’ (Reh 1985: 397/263)

In (62), the event of lion seeing mouse is presented as relevant to the Addressee’s knowledge about ‘lion’. The fact that a lexical expression is used to evoke an active referent is arguably due to its change of one thematic role to another. Second, the construction can be used to construe a new address in the Addressee’s discourse knowledge, as illustrated in (2):

\[
\text{(2) (Lion is resting under a tree. He is asleep.)} \quad A
\]

\[
m\text{-áa} \quad [\text{ìfì}] \quad \text{ádiyà.} \quad \text{Conn:3F-Cop mouse come(Inf)}
\]

‘(A) mouse comes (by).’ (Reh 1985: 397/262)
Figure 1  Krongo informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering.
In (63), ‘mouse’ is introduced in discourse, not just as a new referent, but as one to which future assertions are going to be relevant. A third informational context in which the narrative construction is encountered is that of thetic statements, in which an informative assertion is posited without relating it to an address in discourse knowledge. This happens frequently at the start of narratives, as is illustrated in (3):

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

Two alternative interpretations of (3) are conceivable. First, this assertion arguably can be classified as a categorical statement with a focal Topic, given the fact that ‘lion’ is a future Topic in discourse. However, at this point in the narrative it is not, nor is a relation of relevance construed between it and the event it is involved in. Another possibility would be to classify (3) as a presentational statement. One could argue that the predication is ‘semantically bleached’ and has the sole function of introducing ‘lion’ as a discourse address for the future evaluation of information, because ófìnyò ‘rest’ “is not interpreted as signalling a potential contrast with other verbs from the same lexical field which might have been used in its place” (Cornish 2004: 219). However, such an analysis would not do justice to the presence of an overt localizing expression. If the predication had as its only purpose to assist in the introduction of a referent without being informative in its own right, the use of the simple copular-existential verb áa ‘be’ and the omission of the localizing expression would have provided a far more economical context.3

Fourth and finally, the narrative construction is employed in cases of identifi- cational Focus on a single referent in the context of an otherwise presupposed propositional content. This is exemplified in (4) for the object i̞í̞ñij, ‘him’:

(4) (Wolverine is looking for someone to give the billy goats to for dinner so that he would get fat) E
m-áa ììì k-ììì (i̞í̞ñij)ì tìcìlić.
CONN:3F-COP 3SG.F INF-can LOC-INF:eat 3SG.M ADVRS
‘(then) she could eat him in turn.’ (Reh 1985: 387/148)

The predicate eat, as well as the involvement of ‘Wolverine’ and some unspeci- fied individual have all been activated in the context immediately preceding this utterance. It is the intended informational effect of (4) to signal the construal of a hitherto unpredictable relationship between a active referent and an active propositional content.

3Accidentally, this kind of argumentation shows how both the global development of the Addressee’s presuppositional state, as well as the specific use of semantic elements must be taken into account in order to successfully identify the informational articulation of individual utterances.
**Canonical construction**  The second coding strategy can be labelled the canonical construction. It consists of a main predicate prefixed with the obligatory Subject cross-reference marking and followed by an optional lexical Subject and Object. Regarding the division of labour between it and the narrative construction, it seems that statements which express eventualities that are crucial to the development of the story employ the narrative construction, whereas less important information may be expressed using either the canonical clause structure or the narrative construction. However, the two strategies differ in their coding potential: while the canonical construction and the narrative construction share the capacity to express Entry-central Thetic and Categorical statements, only the latter can be used to convey an Address-central Thetic articulation. In (5), an instance of a canonical clause with an Entry-central Categorical articulation is given.

(5)  (Wild Dog planted peanuts across a brook) C
\[ \emptyset \] [m-ọcídọ-ŋ bìtì]-
F-IMPF:FREQ:CUT-TR water
‘She crosses the water.’ (Reh 1985: 379/44)

In (6), an example is given where a canonical clause expresses an Entry-central Thetic statement:

(6)  (start of discourse) B
[m-àtùnà ìtòŋ ìttùmùntàaraŋ ŋ-áŋkwà-ŋ án-ùudà]-
F-PFV:FIND:TR rabbit hyena  CONN:M-IMPF:GO-TRR INSTR-meat
‘A rabbit meets a hyena that carries about some meat’ (Reh 1985: 376/2)

**Cleft construction**  A third coding strategy is clefting (Reh 1985: 187). It seems that clefting in Krongo is exclusively used to express identificational Focus on Actor referents in an otherwise presupposed event. An example is given in (7):

(7)  (Squirrel tells Wild Dog to check out Housedog) E
bììn-tììn-bò (i’ìñ)ì  y-áa àki-rì.
maybe-PRT-EMPH 3SG  CONN:M-COP eat(INF)-INTR
‘Maybe he was (who) ate (them).’ (Reh 1985: 381/87)

**Preposing**  The fourth and final coding strategy used for the conveyance of informational articulations is a preposing strategy by means of which a referential element, irrespective of its semantic role, is realized in the position preceding the inflected verb form. The data suggest that this strategy can be used in two informational contexts: to express identificational Focus on a referent in an identificational construction, and to introduce a new Topic in a Categorical articulation. The former is illustrated in (8), the latter in (9).

(8)  (she accidentally takes a beating and cries) E
It should be pointed out that the utterance in (9) does not just aim to construe \textit{ff\={a}-\=ti\={y}}, ‘tree’ as a new discourse address: the localizing expression does not merely serve to anchor this new address in discourse, but is a crucial piece of information that is highly relevant to the subsequent development of the action.

**Kayardild**

**Kayardild informational properties**

Figure 2 gives the informatogram of Kayardild and the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations. As the informatogram shows, Kayardild distinguishes six different coding strategies for the conveyance of informational articulations. No feature ordering is included for Kayardild, because the language exhibits neutral alignment (see chapter 8).

**Kayardild examples**

**Preverbal S construction** The preverbal S strategy in Kayardild is characterized by a Subject in left-most position, followed by the verbal predicate and, if applicable, its complements. The preverbal S strategy in Kayardild is used to convey assertions with an Entry-central Categorical articulation, as is illustrated in (1):

(1) a. (end of discourse segment) C

\[
\text{[bujuku]}_r \ [\text{kurri-j}]_r \ [\emptyset] \ [\text{ngudi-ja} \ \text{ri-in-ki} \ \text{mibur-i}]_r.
\]

\text{crane(NOM)} \text{look-AFFMT} \text{cast-AFFMT east-from-LOC eye-LOC}

‘Crane searched, from the east he cast his eye.’ (Evans 1995: 612/13)

b. (Cod was a Sweers person, a great big fellow) C

\[
\text{[niya]}_r \ [\text{raa-j} \ \text{thangakara} \ \text{wumburu-warri}]_r.
\]

\text{3SG} \text{spear-AFFMT shaft(NOM)} \text{spear-PRV}

‘He [Crane] speared (him) with a spearless shaft’ (Evans 1995: 624/11)

The same strategy is also used to convey Identificational Focus on Undergoers, illustrated in (2). Whether the same strategy is also used for Identificational Focus on other participants cannot be determined on the basis of the available texts.
Figure 2  Kayardild informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph
APPENDIX

(2) a. (Crane made a trap. Turtles are caught, trevally is caught) E
   \( \text{kawarrk-a} \)_\( \text{dii-j} \) \( \text{dathin-ki ngurrwarra-y} \)
   queenfish-NOM be_caught-AFFMT DEM-LOC fish_trap-LOC
   ‘QUEENFISH is (also) caught in that trap’ (Evans 1995: 615/30)
b. (Crane made a trap for fish but not dugong) E
   \( \text{bijarrba} \)_\( \text{dii-jarri} \) \( \text{dathin-ki ngurrwarra-y} \)
   dugong(NOM) get_caught-NEG DEM-LOC fish_trap-LOC
   ‘DUGONG don’t get caught in that trap’ (Evans 1995: 616/41)

Postverbal S construction
The postverbal S strategy is characterized by the immediate postverbal placement of the lexical Subject while the Verb occurs in sentence-initial position. As is illustrated in (3), this expression strategy is used only to convey Entry-central Categorical articulations:

(3) (She held it up to the east,) C
   \( \text{wakirii-ja} \) \( \text{niwan-da} \)[\( \text{wakath} \)]
   carry_under_arm-AFFMT 3SG:poss-NOM sister(NOM)
   ‘his sister carried it under her wing’ (Evans 1995: 612/12)

Left dislocation construction
This strategy is characterized by the extraclausal evocation of a core participant, separated by a pause from the clause proper. Clause-internally, a coreferential element occurs in canonical position. This strategy appears to be used exclusively to convey assertions with an Entry-central Thetic articulation, as illustrated in (4):

(4) (He lit his torch to attract the fish) B
   \( \text{yalulu, jungarra yalulu burri-j} \)[\( \text{yalulu} \) big(NOM) flame(NOM) come_out-AFFMT]
   ‘Flames, big flames came out’ (Evans 1995: 578/4)

It should be noted that yalulu ‘flames’ is not a referent that is relevant to the development of subsequent discourse. Rather, the assertion in (4) is posited in the discourse as an isolated occurrence.

Postposing construction
This strategy resembles the left dislocation strategy in that a core participant is evoked extraclausally, but the clause-internal coreferential element is lacking. This strategy does not appear very frequently in the available data; where it does, it is invariably used to convey an Address-central Thetic articulation, as in (5). Note that the direction is not relevant information in the discourse: the abundant mention of compass directions is characteristic of Kayardild story-telling. The verbal predicate is semantically bleached.

(5) (Crane is fishing but doesn’t catch anything. Then) A
ee dan-da ri-in-da burri-j, [jungarr-a dibirdibi]ŋ
hey here-NOM east-from-NOM come_up-AFFMT big-NOM rock_cod-NOM
‘Hey, here comes from the east a big rock cod’ (Evans 1995: 623/98)

**Fronting construction** The fifth strategy used in Kayardild is one in which a referent other than the Subject is expressed in preverbal position. This strategy is used exclusively to convey Identificational Focus on that referent, as illustrated in (6). Interestingly, it seems that the preverbal position cannot be used to place Identificational Focus on the Subject referent.

(6) (Hey, my brother is sitting on Sweers Island again, Seagull said) D
[\[(rangurrnga)ʁ  dīi-ja\]ŋ niwan-da [kularrin-d]ŋ].
Sweers_Island(NOM) sit-AFFMT 3SG.POSS-NOM sibling-NOM
‘On Sweers Island her brother lived.’ (Evans 1995: 613/19)

**Separation construction** The separation strategy consists of separate extraclausal constituents that serve to evoke the referents and other denotations that play a role in the utterance, and a clause in which they are amalgamated and turned into a coherent predication. All denotations are extraclusally evoked prior to the construal of their semantic relationships. The strategy appears to be quite rare, but nevertheless occurs several times in the available data. It is used convey assertions with an Address-central Categorical articulation, as illustrated in (7):

(7) (Crane looks for his sister from the north and from the east) D
\[\[ngijin-da  wagath|ŋ, dīi-j, riya-thi Burririy, [B. dīi-ja
1SG.POSS-NOM sister sit-AFFMT east-DIST Burririy B. sit-AFFMT
ngijin-da  wagath]ŋ+.  
1SG.POSS-NOM sister
‘My sister, (she) lives, far in the east at Burririy, at Burririy my sister must be living.’ (Evans 1995: 613/14)

**Lango**

**Lango informational properties**

Figure 3 gives the informatogram of Lango, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering.

**Lango examples**

**The coherence strategy** In the coherence strategy, the main predicate is expressed as the infinitival complement of an inflected ‘coherence verb’. The Subject and Object are expressed in their respective canonical positions. It appears to be the strategy that is informationally most flexible. As is illustrated by (1) – (4), it can
Figure 3  Lango informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
be used to convey the Entry-central and Address-central Categorical, Entry-central Thetic and Identificational articulations, respectively.

(1) (Then Elephant tried to dig for water) C
\[\text{[}\text{pì} \quad \text{[}\text{tē} \quad \text{Lòvè}]\text{]}\text{.}\]
water 3SG.COH.HAB defeat:INF:3SG(OBJ)
'(but) the water defeated him' (Noonan 1992: 294/8)

(2) a. (end of discourse segment) B
\[\text{[}\text{lyèc} \quad \text{tē} \quad \text{nèkké} \quad \text{àgògoò}]\text{.}\]
elephant 3SG.COH.HAB kill:INF:3SG.OBJ chameleon
'And then Elephant killed Chameleon.' (Noonan 1992: 296/24)
b. (Chameleon grabbed the drum) B
\[\text{ékká} \quad \text{[mà[t: tē} \quad \text{bínò]}.}\]
and then fire 3SG.COH.HAB come:INF
'And then the fire came.' (Noonan 1992: 299/53)

(3) (long ago there was a drought) D
\[\text{ékká} \quad \text{[tòtò à} \quad \text{pákò}]\text{,} \quad \text{[}\text{tē} \quad \text{kèllò}\text{].}\]
and then mother ATTR.PRT girl 3SG.COH.HAB bring:INF
daughter-3SG.ASSOC
'And then the girl’s mother brought her daughter.' (Noonan 1992: 296/24)

(4) ('whoever bores water, he can marry my daughter') E
\[\text{lyèc} \quad \text{dò[y tē} \quad \text{pòòrò kùñpù pì}\text{.}\]
elephant then 3SG.COH.HAB try:INF dig:INF water
'Elephant then tried to dig for water' (Noonan 1992: 294/7)

**Canonical construction** The strategy is characterized by the basic SVO constituent order. It is used in Lango to convey assertions with Entry-central Thetic articulation as illustrated in (5).

(5) a. (start of discourse) B
\[\text{[}\text{nùwà} \quad \text{gìn ołàrò} \quad \text{pákò mé nòm}]\text{.}\]
long ago 3PL 3PL:compete:PF girl for marriage
'Long ago they competed to marry a girl' (Noonan 1992: 294/1)
b. (Elephant found out that the woman was pregnant) B
\[\text{[dàkò dò[y ìmè ènòwòyò òyàtè} \quad \text{òñwàlò]\text{.}\]
woman then REL 3SG:finish:PF 3SG:be_pregnant:PF 3SG:bear:PF
\[\text{ltòj}]\text{.} \quad \text{ékká} \quad \text{[atìn ìbèdò]}\text{.}\]
and then child 3SG:stay:PF
'And the woman who had been pregnant bore a boy and then the child lived.' (Noonan 1992: 296/27)
Reinforced Subject construction  The reinforced Subject construction is a construction with a pronominal copy of the Subject, which according to Noonan (1992: 151) is used to reestablish Topical referents that have been evoked previously in the discourse. However, the available texts suggest that this construction is rather used to introduce a new – albeit rather familiar – referent (in this case, ‘fire’) as the Topic, and in the same utterance give information about it. Note that mâtk ‘fire’ is a discourse referent here, relevant to the subsequent development of the narrative.

(Kite made a line of fire as he was ordered) D

3SG mâtk |ê tê wÄ

‘and the fire it burned’ (Noonan 1992: 298/44)

Pseudocleft construction  The pseudocleft construction consists of a headless relative clause that is equated to an NP. The strategy is rare, and appears to be used to convey Identificational articulations as illustrated by (7). Note that, syntactically, the construction shows parallels to the canonical strategy: a bipartite structure in which a Topic precedes its Comment.

(when the child grew up, his mother told him) E

REL 3SG:find:PF 3SG:kill:PF father:2SG:ASSOC elephant

‘who killed your father (was) ELEPHANT’ (Noonan 1992: 297/32)

Sri Lanka Malay (SLM)

SLM informational properties

Figure 4 gives the informatogram of Sri Lanka Malay, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that five coding strategies can be distinguished.

SLM examples

Canonical construction  The canonical strategy in SLM has two defining characteristics, Verb-finality and Subject-initiality, while constituents in between show some flexibility as to their respective ordering. The canonical strategy can be used in SLM to convey assertions with an Entry-central Categorical articulation: the examples in (1) illustrate this for topical referents with various activation statuses. (1a) shows a lexical Subject used to reactivate an established Topic; (1b) show the anaphoric use of a demonstrative, while the second clause in (1c) shows that complete omission of the Subject is also possible.

(a. (in the tree top there was group of monkeys) C
Figure 4  SLM informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
The same strategy is also used to convey Address-central Categorical articulations, in which a new discourse address is construed and information relevant to it is asserted in a single utterance. This is illustrated in (2):

(2) (start of discourse) D

\[ \text{Andare katha ara-biilang]} [\text{raaja mliiga=ka hatthu oorang koocak]}]. \]

A. \text{QUOT PROG-say} \text{king} \text{palace=LOC} \text{man} \text{joke}

‘Andare was a jester at the king’s palace.’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

Third, the canonical strategy can be used to convey the Identificational articulation, as is shown in (3):

(3) (we stay right here) E

\[ \text{karang} [\text{inni};] [\text{kithang=pe nigiri su-jaadi}]. \]

now \text{DEM.PROX 1PL-poss} \text{town} \text{PST-become}

‘Now this has become our town’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

The fourth informational articulation that can be conveyed by means of the canonical strategy is the Entry-central Thetic, as illustrated in by the complex Subject NP in (4).

(4) (end of discourse segment) B

\[ \text{suda} [\text{puthri=le biini=le ara-caanda aari=le su-dhaathang}]. \]

thus \text{prince=ASSOC wife=ASSOC PROG-meet day=ASSOC PST-come}

‘Thus came the day for the prince and wife to meet’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

**Fronting construction** The fronting strategy is characterized by the fact that a constituent precedes the Subject, which in the canonical clause is the left-most element. This can either be another core participant, a localizing expression or an element expressing discourse coherence. The fronting strategy is used to convey Address-central Thetic articulations that construe a new discourse address, as illustrated in (5):

(5) (the hat-seller sat down under a tree) A
In the top of that tree was a group of monkeys.’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

Also, the articulation is compatible with contexts in which a new discourse address is construed and information relevant to it is asserted in a single utterance. This Address-central Categorical use is exemplified in (6):

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

Third, fronting can be used to convey the Identificational articulation, both on core participants (7a) and complement-like elements (7b):

(7)  a. (after having gone to school, we stayed in this town) E
    [{luuwa-nigiri} {kithang=nang} ara-πi thraa suuka].
    outside-country 1PL=DAT PRS=go NEG like
    ‘Abroad we did not want to go’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

b. (another day, when they were picking berries, a big bird flew past) E
    [{banthu-an asa-mintha ara-naangis suara haTThu}]
    help-NMZ COMP-beg PROG-cry noise INDEF
    [derang=nang] su-dinggar].
    3PL=DAT PST-hear
    ‘A noise of crying for help they heard’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

**Extrucausal construction** The extrucausal strategy is characterized by the expression of a core participant preceding the clause in a prosodically separate position, without clause-internal resumption. It is not entirely clear which referents can be separated in this manner; the available texts suggest that it is only available for Subjects, which are then interpreted as Topic while the remainder of the clause conveys new information relevant to this Topic. In other words, the strategy is used to convey an Entry-central Categorical articulation, illustrated in (8):

(8)  (one day a desire overcame the prince to see Andare’s wife, (so)) C
    [puthri] [Andare=nang asa-panggel ana-biiILang, “Sedang Andare=pe
    prince A.=DAT COMP-call PST-say 1SG.DAT A.=POSS
    biini=yang ma-caanda suukka” katha].
    wife=OBJ INF-meet like QUOT
    ‘...the prince, (he) called Andare and said “I would like to meet your wife”.’
    (Nordhoff p.c.)
Framing construction  The framing strategy resembles the extraclausal strategy in that an element is placed in extraclausal position, but differs from it in that this element typically bears no relevance to the development of the narrative in subsequent discourse. Instead, it is meant exclusively to ‘frame’ the utterance by providing it with a (ideationally underspecified) spatiotemporal location, typically hatthu aari, ‘one day’. This strategy is employed to convey Entry-central Thetic statements, as illustrated in (9).

(9) (start of discourse) B
hatthu aari, [hatthu oorang thoppi ma-juwal=nang kampong=dheri
INDEF day INDEF man hat INF-sell=DAT village=from
kampong=nang su-jaalang pii]p...
village=DAT PST-walk go
‘One day, a man went from village to village to sell hats.’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

=jo construction  The fifth expression strategy in SLM that is used to convey information packaging is the use of the enclitic =jo, which can be used on participants in their canonical position. The presence of the enclitic conveys a specialized Identificational Focus interpretation, and can be used on referents in various semantic functions, witness (10a) – (10c):

(10) a. (so, (while) the king was planning to make a fool out of Andare) E
[(raaja=jo)u, [su-jaadi enco]u...,
king=FOC PST-become fool
‘...the king (himself) became a fool’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

b. (Now that we’ve done all this,) E
[(siini=jo)u ara-duuduk]u...
here=FOC PRS-stay
‘...here we stay’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

c. (start of discourse) E
[kithang]u, [(Kandy-ka=jo)u]u...
1PL Kandy-LOC=FOC
‘We are from Kandy.’ (Nordhoff p.c.)

Greenlandic Inuktitut

Greenlandic Inuktitut informational properties

Figure 5 gives the informatogram of Greenlandic Inuktitut, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that four coding strategies can be distinguished.
Figure 5  Greenlandic Inuktitut informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
Greenlandic Inuktitut examples

Canonical construction The canonical strategy in Greenlandic Inuktitut is characterized by its verb-finality; although it is typically also S-initial, this is not a defining property. Even though most canonical clauses have SOV basic constituent order, this is not necessarily the case since overt case-marking is used to distinguish between Subject, Object and Oblique referents. The order of the core participants in the preverbal slot is determined by non-semantic considerations, and it appears that Topicality is the decisive factor. As can be seen from the difference between (1e) and (1a), the Topical referent precedes any non-Topical referents in the preverbal slot.

As can be seen in (1), the main informational articulation conveyed by the canonical strategy is the Entry-central Categorical articulation, in which a previously irretrievable relationship is established between a Topical referent and a Comment. The typical case is illustrated by (1a) and (1b) which illustrate a continued and a retrieved Topic, respectively. The fact that ‘Piuaatsuq’ is lexically evoked in (1a) is caused by the change of case between the expression at hand and the preceding context: as can be seen in (1c) (intransitive) and (1d) (transitive), if no case change occurs, independent evocation of the Topical referent can be omitted from the expression.

(1) a. (Piuaatsuq was very upset) C
   [Piuaatsuq p=mi] P.-ERG(sg)=because Q.(ABS) love-INTS-IND-3SG>3SG
   ‘...because P. loved Q. very much’ (Bittner 2007a: 27/1)
b. (End of lengthy aside in which P. figures. New segment) C
   [Piuaatsuq] P.(ABS) duration-AUG-AUG-INSTR(PL)
   siku-suaq-ni=it-pu-q ‘Piuaatsuq spent a very long time out on the ice’ (Bittner 2007a: 8/1)
c. (Piuaatsuq spent a very long time on the ice) C
   [Ø] seagull-INSTR(PL) live-NR-VR-IND-3SG
   ‘(he) lived of seagulls’ (Bittner 2007a: 8/2)
d. (Piuaatsuq found an abandoned home. Feeling his way in,) C
   [Ø] sleeping_platform-3SG>3SG examine-INGR-IND-3SG>3SG
   ‘...he began to examine its sleeping platform’ (Bittner 2007a: 8/2)
e. (Sooty’s mother gave birth in an abandoned coal barrel) C
   baby-3SG>3PL child-ERG(PL) find-IND-3PL>3PL
   ‘the pups the children found’ (Bittner 2007b: 2/1)

The canonical strategy can also be used to convey the Adress-central Categorical articulation, as is illustrated in (2). This example construes ‘Qillarsuaq’ as a new
Topic, and in the same utterance predicates new information over it that is relevant to the subsequent development of the narrative. It should be noted that the referent is not entirely new; ‘Qillarsuaq’ has been mentioned before, but in non-Topical capacity, and over fifty assertions ago.

(2) (end of discourse segment) D

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[Qillarsuaq]}_T & \quad [\text{[ima=iliur-sima-pu-q]}]_T \\
\text{Qillarsuaq.ABS(SG) so=do-PFV-IND-3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘(Meanwhile) Qillarsuaq had done as follows’ (Bittner 2007a: 27/1)

Third, the canonical strategy can convey the Address-central Thetic articulation as well. In (3), ‘the pups’ are introduced as a new Topic; unlike in (2), however, what is predicated about them is not relevant information to the subsequent development of the narrative.

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[piaraq-i]}_T & \quad \text{miiraq-t} \quad \text{nassaari-pa-it}.
\text{baby-3SG>3PL child-ERG(PL) find-IND-3PL>3PL}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The pups were found by the children.’

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

Finally, the canonical strategy, given the proper context, can be used to convey Identificational Focus. Consider (4), where the location of the birth, an ‘abandoned coal barrel’, is the only information in the utterance that is not contextually retrievable:

(4) (but instead of the kennel where they meant her to give birth,)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[\emptyset]}_T, \quad [\text{[nappartaq-mi aamarsuaq-t siqqug-niq-t-nik}} \\
\text{barrel-LOC(SG) coal-ABS(SG) crush-NR-PL-INSTR(PL)} \\
\text{imaq-lik-mi}_T \quad \text{... irni-sima-pu-q]}_T \\
\text{content-with-LOC(SG) \ give_birth-PFV-IND-3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘... she gave birth in an abandoned coal barrel.’ (Bittner 2007b: 2/3)

**Postposing construction** Bittner (2005, 2007a,b) remarks that the postverbal slot in Greenlandic Inuktitut is used for referents with special informational status. In her terminology, the slot is used to introduce **new backgrounded referents**, which are typically picked up by the subsequent utterance as its Topic. Elsewhere in the literature, these referents are referred to as **new Topics** (Dik 1997a; Bolkestein 1998). Both labels are somewhat confusing, because upon their first mention, these referents are not topical, nor backgrounded in the canonical sense of the term. It would be more correct to refer to them as **expectant Topics**. The expectant Topic is typically part of the comment of an Entry-central Categorical articulation, as is illustrated by (5):

(5) a. (Sooty’s owner has lost control over the sled) C
The second articulation that can be expressed by means of the postverbal strategy is the Address-central Thetic articulation. This is unsurprising, since it is the case in many languages that expectant Topics and new Topics are very closely related. Two examples are given in (6). In (6a), a predicate of ‘appearance on the scene’ is used that is representationally empty (tusa, ‘hear about’); in addition, the Addressee himself does not serve as the Topic of the utterance, because the interlocutors are not included in the Communicated Content of the utterance. In (6b), an intransitive example is given.

(6) a. (end of discourse segment) A

\[
\text{maanna=lu tusa-ssa-v-at \quad [nukappiara-q Tuuma now=CONJ hear\_about-FUT-IND-2SG>3SG boy-ABS(SG) T. savaatilikkurmiu]ₚ. sheep\_herding\_folk:dweller 'Now you shall hear about the boy Tuuma who dwelt with the sheep-herders.' (Fortescue 1985: 176)}
\]

b. (no context given) C

\[
\text{kinguninnuga takkup-pu-t \quad [angut-it marluk]ₚ \quad then appear-IND-3PL man-ABS(PL) two 'Then, two men showed up.' (Fortescue 1985: 182)}
\]

**Cleft construction** According to Fortescue (1985: 74ff), the commonest cleft construction used in Greenlandic Inuktitut is a prototypical cleft of the kind illustrated by (7):

(7) \[
\text{maalia-m=una mattak tama-at niri-sima-gi-a M.-REL=DEM mattak all-3SG eat-PF-PTCP-3SG>3SG 'Maalia is who ate all the mattak' (Fortescue 1985: 74)}
\]

Clauses like (7) are essentially an equation of two referential expressions: one that identifies a referent, and one that denotes the event in which that referent figures. In a prototypical cleft construction, the clefted predication is marked in some way as a non-predicating syntactic element (substantivized); in Greenlandic
Inuktitut, this dependency is signalled by the use of participial mood (-gi-), and by the relativiser on the Noun expressing the clefted referent (Greenlandic Inuktitut is a double-marking language according to Koptjevskaja-Tamm (1993: 113), that marks relations both on the head and the dependent). According to Fortescue, the demonstrative enclitic una marks the focal status of the clefted referent.

No contextualized instances of a canonical cleft were attested in the data. We do find a construction that is similar, but in which the predicate is not substantivized by means of nominal morphology. It is illustrated in (8):

(8) (Ahead of them, they saw something black)  
\[
\text{taanna=una [urniq-niar-pa-at].} \\
\text{there=DEM approach-TENT-IND-3PL>3SG} \\
\text{‘that was where they were trying to go’ (Bittner 2007b: 38/9)}
\]

Note that the preceding clause has been discussed in (4) above as a clause that introduces an expectant Topic. Indeed, as we can see here, the Destination argument of the predication in (8) is presented here as a Topic, about which relevant information is communicated. Furthermore, the location (‘perilous, water-logged ice’) remains the Topic of the next series of utterances as well. The construction can also be used to introduce a new Topic in an Address-central Thetic articulation (A), as in (9):

(9) (no context)  
\[
a-ana [oujurtuliiraq aggir-pu-q]. \\
D-DEM motor_boat come-IND-3SG \\
\text{‘there is a motorboat coming’ (Fortescue 1985: 75)}
\]

**Verbalization construction** The final strategy that Greenlandic Inuktitut employs to convey information packaging instructions is what I tentatively called ‘verbalization’. Again, as with the cleft-like construction discussed in (6) above, it is not entirely certain whether this is a single strategy, or a set of very similar ones.

The defining property of the verbalization strategy is that it realigns the syntactic structure of the utterance and the semantic structure of the predication underlying it, in such a way that one of the referents is recast as a (intransitive) verb. In (10), this strategy is put to use to convey a Entry-central Thetic articulation:

(10) a. (Piuaatsuq was unable to continue)  
\[
\text{nuna aput-qar-liir-pu-q].} \\
\text{land:ABS(sg) snow-VR-INGR-already-IND-3SG} \\
\text{‘snow was already on the land.’ (Bittner 2007a: 13/2)}
\]

b. (end of discourse segment)  
\[
\text{ukiuq-ru-pu-q.} \\
\text{winter-VR-IND-3SG} \\
\text{‘Winter fell.’ (Bittner 2007a: 14/1)}
\]

The same strategy is also used to convey identificational Focus. In the case of (11)
below, the whole predication, namely the event of Piuuaatsuq finding something rock-like, but not quite, has been asserted in the previous utterance. In the utterance at hand, only the identity of the Undergoer is instantiated:

(11) (Piuuaatsuq found something that didn’t seem to be a rock) E
    illu-u-mi-pu-q.
    house-VR-EXCL-IND-3SG
    ‘Wow, it was a house!’ (Bittner 2007a: 14/4)

Finally, we see how the same strategy is used to introduce a new Topic into the discourse in (12):

(12) (end of discourse segment) A
    Qillarsuaq-kuu-t=guuq ningaa-qar-mi-pu-t
    Q.-ASSOC-PL=RPT son_in_law-VR-EXCL-IND-3SG
    ‘Among Qillarsuaq’s folk, there was a son-in-law (named Piuatsuq)’
    (Bittner 2007a: 2/1)

Lezgian

Lezgian informational properties

Figure 6 gives the informatogram of Lezgian, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that three coding strategies can be distinguished.

Lezgian examples

**Canonical construction** The canonical strategy in Lezgian is characterized by what I will tentatively label a SXOV constituent order. Tentatively, because Haspelmath warns that “most of the properties that often serve to identify subjects in other languages do not uniquely identify subjects in Lezgian.” (Haspelmath 1993: 294). Notwithstanding the author’s claim that Lezgian has a very flexible constituent order, the canonical SOV order is by far the most frequent in the available texts, with oblique adjuncts occurring between the Object and the Subject almost without exception.

The canonical construction is informationally very flexible, and can be used to express an Entry-central Categorical articulation, as is illustrated in (1):

(1) (But this time the beast did not get to steal another melon) C
    a. [za]_[ada-l dalba=dal q’we gylle]
    1SG:ERG 3SG(NT)-SUPESS one_after_another two_bullet(ABS)
    aq’haj-an] PF
    fire-PF.
    ‘I fired two bullets after another at it.’
Figure 6  Lezgian informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
In (1a), we see a typical Entry-central Categorical articulation, in which the speaker predicates the event of him firing at the wolf as relevant information about himself. Then, the Undergoer of the previous predication is chosen as the informational vantage point of the next assertion. The use of the periphrastic anticausative does not depend on considerations of information packaging; rather the potential Actor referent in this predication (‘two bullets’) is obviated for its lack of volition and animacy, and as a result, ‘the wolf’ remains as the most plausible Topic of the assertion. Finally, in (1c), we see that the Actor argument can be omitted from the expression (arguably only if its casemarking and Topic status remain constant with regard to the preceding context).

The same construction may also be used to convey Identificational Focus. Consider (2):

(2) (In the forest, gardens are sown) E
\[i\ \text{bustan}-\text{r-a}, \quad \text{gat-u-n} \ 	ext{\chiali-jar},
\text{DEM garden-PL-INESS melon-PL(ABS) summer-GEN melon-PL(ABS)}
\text{afni-jar, buran-ar}\}_2 \quad \text{ca-zwa}\]...
\text{cucumber-PL(ABS) pumpkin-PL(ABS) sow-IMPF}

‘In these gardens, melons, summer melons, cucumbers and pumpkins are sown’ (Haspelmath 1993: 447/3)

The notion of sowing as well as the location have been activated in the previous assertion; what this assertion aims to achieve, is to instantiate what exactly is sown. Finally, the canonical order can be used to construe a new Topic and provide relevant information about it in the same assertion, as can be seen in (3). Here, the Agent of the predication (‘my neighbour’s dog’), who has not been mentioned before, is construed as the Topic of the assertion:

(3) (What will this wolf do if it does not get anything else?) D
\[zi\ \text{qun\text{"u}-di-n} \quad \text{kits’i-i}, \quad \text{hi} \ 	ext{jemif xajit’ani ne-da}\]$_r$.
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)’
(Haspelmath 1993: 449/38)

**Fronting construction** The fronting construction is characterized by the fact that another referent than the Actor argument of the predication is expressed as the left-most constituent. This strategy can be used to convey an Entry-central Thetic and Categorical articulation, as illustrated in (5) and (4), respectively. Also, the
fronting construction can be used to convey Identificational Focus on a referent (6).

(4) (But first let me cut you a good melon;)
\[
[q^h {\text{san qarpuz}}, \; {\text{bustan}}_\text{di-z} \; {\text{tfi}}_\text{da}]_e!
\]
good melon gardener-SF-DAT know-FUT
‘Good melons a gardener knows about!’ (Haspelmath 1993: 448/18)

A second example in (5) illustrates a case of fronting where the strategy appears to be employed in order to bar a Topic interpretation of the Agent referent. At the same time, however, the location ‘in the huge old forest’ is not relevant to the subsequent discourse, and serves as a mere frame to posit this situation as a point of departure for the narrative.

(5) (start of discourse)
\[
[\text{deh zaman-di-n zurba tam-a} \; {\text{tfi}} \; \text{kolchoz-di-q}^b \; \text{jeke}]
\text{old time-SF-GEN huge forest-INESS 1PL:GEN kolchoz-SF-POESS big belgen-ar awa}]_v.
\text{patch-PL(ABS) COP}
‘In the huge old forest, our kolchoz owns large patches of land’ (Haspelmath 1993: 446/1)

Finally, it seems that this strategy can convey Identificational Focus. The difference between this example and the one in (4) is, that the Undergoer argument i kar ‘this thing’, is not the left-most constituent in the clause, which together with its lack of typical Topic properties (such as animacy, activatedness) seems to conspire against its being interpreted as the Topic of the utterance.

(6) (by day, the dogs are sound asleep)
\[
[\text{akwa-r hal-ar-aj,} \; [(i \; \text{kar})_v] \; (\text{isanawur-di-z})_v \; q^b {\text{san tfi-da}}_e].
\text{see-PTP state-PL-INEL DEM thing(ABS) wolf-SF-DAT good know-FUT}
‘Apparently, this thing the wolf knows well.’ (Haspelmath 1993: 450/44)

Extraclausal construction A third construction that can be identified – although admittedly, it is attested very sparsely in the available data, and may well be less systematic than the preceding constructions – is one in which one referent is evoked extraclausally, then to be repeated in its canonical position inside the clause. The construction seems to be used exclusively to convey Adress-central Thetic articulation:

(7) (Uncle B. hissed in my ear ‘look!’, and as we looked)
\[
[\text{hi-m jat'ani}_v, \; [\text{sa wahlfi hajwan}]_v \; \text{kul-ar-aj eqef'-na}
\text{which-NT.SG.ABS INDEF one wild animal bush-PL-INEL emerge-AOR}
‘…a something, a wild animal emerged from the bushes’ (Haspelmath 1993: 448/22)
Concluding remarks Although three coding strategies relevant to the expression of information packaging can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty, the general picture in Lezgian appears to be that referent activation (section 2.4.4) has a farther-reaching impact on grammar. This ties in with Haspelmath’s own remark that “the order of arguments with respect to each other seems to be determined by information structure rather than by grammatical relations. Given information tends to precede new information and the Subject simply is most often given information” (Haspelmath 1993: 301, emphasis mine). In fact, the influence of referent management on constituent ordering in Lezgian is so great that, on the basis of the available material, the alternative conclusion may be reached that Lezgian does not distinguish between different coding strategies to convey different articulations at all. The three ‘strategies’ discussed above all be different instantiations of a single macro-strategy of the kind ‘old before new, Verb comes last’, in which permutations are due entirely to the recency of mention of the referents concerned. If analysis were followed, Lezgian would classify as a language with unipartite informational alignment. The same problem presents itself in other languages of the sample, notably Udihe which is discussed in the next section. A more definitive classification of such languages cannot be arrived at without a thorough examination of more – preferably oral – data than is provided in the respective grammars.

Udihe

Udihe informational properties

Figure 7 gives the informatogram of Udihe, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that four coding strategies can be distinguished.

Udihe examples

Canonical construction The canonical expression strategy in Udihe exploits SXOV constituent order, which (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 840) hesitantly qualifies as the basic constituent order on account of its frequent occurrence. A spatiotemporal framing expression may precede the Subject, which itself may be left unexpressed if its referent is sufficiently recoverable from the preceding context. The canonical construction is used to convey assertions that have a Entry-central Categorical articulation, as is illustrated in (1). Pronominal and lexical evocation of the Topical referent are exemplified in (1a), while a non-evoked continued Topic is given in (1b). In (1c), the Topical referent is expressed as the Possessor of the Subject referent:

(1) a. (Otter dove and brought up a bunch of fish) C
   [utra] [tuge-zi olokto:-ni]_p_ [g’ai]_s_ [diga-ilı]_s_ .
   DEM:DIST:NOM quick-INSTR cook.PST-3SG crow eat-3SG
   ‘He cooked (dinner) quickly, Crow eats.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya
Figure 7  Udihe informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
APPENDIX

2001: 897)

b. (Now where can he [Crow] be, Otter thought)
   \[\emptyset\] [\textit{joxo do-lo-ni ise-si-gi-ni]\textsubscript{5},
   \textit{pot inside-LOC-3SG see-IMPF-ITER-3SG}
   \textquote[\textit{He [Otter] looks inside the pot, ...}]{(Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 899)}

c. (the tiger is the size of the Manchu bear)
   \textit{[iyakta-[ni], soligi-zi p’aligi-zi kede-pepe oz-i]\textsubscript{5}.}
   \textit{fur-3SG orange-INSTR black-INSTR stripe-ADJR make-PRS.PART}
   \textquote{Its coat has orange and black stripes [lit. ‘...makes stripy with orange and black’]}{(Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 868)}

Another usage of the canonical construction is illustrated in (2), where it is employed to convey an Entry-central Thetic articulation. This statement describes the appearance of ‘hares’ from all directions. Even though one of them is the Topic of subsequent discourse, the assertion is not considered to be Categorical; rather, the purpose of the utterance in (2) solely appears to be the description of the event, without relating it to any Topic.\footnote{It is uncertain whether the singular verbal inflection (-\textit{ni}) is relevant in this respect as well. As is noted in Lambrecht (2001b), many languages employ ‘desubjectivization’ devices such as suspension of agreement to signal theticity. On the other hand, the singular inflection here may result from the use of a distributive derivation, and hence be semantically motivated.}

(2) (a hare singing a song to call other hares from various locations) B
   \textit{[tukca eme-kte:-ni]\textsubscript{\textit{5}}. \textit{tu: eme-kte:-ni.}}
   \textit{hare come-DSTR.PST-3SG all come-DSTR.PST-3SG}
   \textquote{Hares come from all directions. They all came.}{(Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 905)}

Another example of a Thetic articulation is the existential statement in (3), which sets the scene for a monologue about ‘tigers’. Of similar expressions, Nikolaeva and Tolskaya (2001: 619) mention explicitly that Subject referents in them are not the Topic.\footnote{Nikolaeva and Tolskaya (2001) translate existential constructions of this type as ‘there are few tigers’. This does not seem entirely correct, since both the postnominal position of the adjective and its lack of case and number marking seem to suggest that it is used predicatively rather than attributively (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 175ff, 846ff). It is uncertain how this relates to the authors’ claim that the referent in such constructions is not a Subject syntactically. It may be that this construction needs to be reanalysed as an ascriptive predication, in which the occurrence of the existential copula \textit{bie} is warranted by the fact that the property ascribed is contingent on its referent as in an individual level predication (Jäger 1997).}

(3) (start of discourse) B
The third articulation that can be expressed using the canonical construction is Address-central Thetic, as illustrated in (4):

(4) (start of discourse) A
Sukpai river-DAT one-ADJR-FOC child live-PST-3SG
‘On the river Sukpai in the taiga a child was born.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 871)

(5) (start of discourse) A
Chinese-PL live-PST-3PL
‘The Chinese lived (there).’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 872)

Finally, the construction can also be used to convey Identificational Focus on elements that occur canonically in the position immediately preceding the inflected verb. Two examples, with Identificational Focus on an Undergoer referent and the complement of a non-verbal predication, respectively, are given in (6) and (7):

(6) (the cat hunts mice, the marten hunts squirrels in the forest;) E
tiger CONTR boar-ACC hunt-3SG
‘The tiger hunts BOAR.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 869)

(7) (in our woods tigers are few;) E
warm place-DAT CONTR many
‘...in warm places many.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 868)

Example (8) illustrates the expression of an Instrument referent in preverbal position in order to convey Identificational Focus.

(8) (explaining why hare’s ears are black) E
[Kanda mafa]₇ [[p’aligi tamu-zi]₇ cinge-da:-ni]₇, (to:
Kanda old man black stick-STR hit-VR.PST-3SG fire
tamu-zi-ni]₇.
stick-STR-3SG
‘Old man Kanda hit (it) with a black stick, with a fiery stick.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 907)

In the absence of overt mention of the Undergoer (‘hare’) in this example, it is difficult to determine whether use is made of the canonical strategy or a marked
strategy here. I have decided to classify it as the former, because the Undergoer referent is assumedly omitted on account of its high activation state. The situation referred to above illustrates clearly that information packaging conspires with other aspects of functional structure (in particular referent activation state, coherence and semantic valency) to arrive at a particular surface structure. A similar phenomenon occurs in many presentational constructions; the preferred semantic rendering of these constructions is by means of an intransitive predication, which enables the only argument to occupy a position that would otherwise require the use of a special morphosyntactic operation.

**Postverbal construction** Nikolaeva and Tolskaya (2001: 840) note that Udihe is a V-final language. Nevertheless, the postverbal position may host referential expressions under a number of specific circumstances. First, the postverbal position may host referents that need to evacuate their canonical position in order for remaining elements to receive a special interpretation; this is the case for Identificational Focus on the denotation of the predicate (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 844), a category that is not considered in this study. Second, the postverbal position is employed to ‘detopify’ Subjects referents (which are the preferred Topic), and thus enable an Entry-central Thetic interpretation. This is illustrated in (9):

(9) (the kettle began to boil, while Otter sat opposite of it) B

\[
\text{[joxo culi xuix-ku-niee g’ai]}\text{.}
\]

\text{pot through dive-pst-3sg crow}

‘Crow dove into the kettle.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 899)

In (9), ‘Crow’ is not used as a Topic; the previous assertions all concerned Otter, as well as the next part of the story. It seems that here, the use of a Thetic articulation is motivated by the unexpected turn of events that this assertion means to get across: Crow cannot swim, and indeed this event proves a fatal mistake on the part of the protagonist. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya (2001: 840) call this the ‘urgent news report’, and it seems that narratological and informational considerations conspire in the use of the postverbal Subject here.

However, not all postverbal Subject referents are non-Topical. Indeed, it seems that the same position can also be employed to express Topical Subjects that are salient to an extent. In (10), a Categorical example is given where ‘Otter’ had been established as a Topic in the previous discourse, and is now resumed at the start of a new episode.\(^6\)

(10) (Direct speech: Otter offering Crow to make dinner) C

\[
\text{[kawa do-lo-ni joxo-i toxolo-gi-e]}\text{.}
\]

\text{house inside-loc-3sg pot-rfl put_on_fire-iter-pst.part otter}

‘Inside the house, Otter put the pot on the fire.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 899)

---

\(^6\)The lack of accusative marking on the Object in (10) is explained by the occurrence of a reflexive marker which makes further indication of its semantic function unnecessary. Cf. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya (2001: 757ff).
Another case of ‘salient’ Subjects constitute presentational constructions (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 844), where the Subject tends to be expressed postverbally as well. However, two observations are in order here. In the first place, it must be stressed again that presentation is a representational, not an informational category; the informational value of a presentational construction need not always be the construal of a new discourse address. A case in point is (2) above, where new referents (‘hares’) are introduced onto the scene without any intention of their ever becoming Topics in the narration. This lack of a rigid one-to-one correlation between certain semantic representations and informational articulations illustrates the necessity of context in order to categorize separate assertions. Even though it is tempting to interpret the authors’ observations concerning the status of postverbal Subjects as if these are instances of Adress-central Thetic (or Categorical) articulations, given that no corroborration can be found in contextualized data, I will refrain from doing so.

Another case of postverbal Subject is illustrated by the example in (11). The context of this utterance is a long-lasting custom of Crow and Otter to have dinner at Otter’s. Crow is determined to return the favour:

(11) (Otter came to Crow’s) E
eme-mie [jxo-i toxolo-gi-e-ni]_{c}, xaisi. 
[\(g’ai\)]_{d}, too
‘When it [Otter] came, Crow put the pot on the fire as well.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 898)

This case is noteworthy, because it presents one of the few instances of Identificational Focus not within the Comment of the assertion, but within the Topic. In order to understand why this is so, it should mentioned that the event of ‘x coming over to y and putting a pot on the fire’ has been evoked a short while ago, using the exact same strategy (only with the two core participants in reverse semantic function). The only thing that is informative (hence, focal) in this assertion, is the involvement of ‘Crow’ as the Agent of the predication. Crucially, it is not its topicality that is focal, since it had already been established as such. This is arguably reflected by the peculiar placement of the additive particle xaisi, ‘too’, which normally precedes but now follows the presupposed part of the predication (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 438).

A final case of postverbal placement of a referent does not concern the Subject, but identificational Focus on a Location:

(12) (turtles don’t live in fast waters;) E
[waqba]_{c} [bagdi-mi (toqo uli-le)]_{d}.
turtle live-INF quiet water-LOC
‘...turtles live in Quiet waters.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 900)
It seems that, all in all, the postverbal position is used for highlighting referents that are salient both for reasons of activation state (10) and identificational Focus (11), (12). Regarding the placement of non-Subject referents in postverbal position, Nikolaeva and Tolskaya (2001: 23) note that this is a structural feature that may have arisen recently under the pressure of intensive language contact with Russian.

**Preverbal construction** Nikolaeva and Tolskaya (2001: 840) note that the preverbal position is the dedicated position for Identificational Focus. Notwithstanding the two cases discussed above, this seems true in general. The typical constituent in preverbal position is the Object, as has already been illustrated in (6). However, also the Subject may be expressed in this position. Typically, this is done by expressing another referent which would have occurred between the Subject and the inflected verb in the canonical strategy, to postverbal position. In the examples below, for instance, the Latīve and Prolatīve adjuncts are realized postverbally, while the canonical placement of such elements is preceding the preverbal Object (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 556):

(13) (Elk proposes a running contest to Frog. They took off;)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[exi-gde]} & \quad \text{[xetige-\(\text{\text{-}e}\)-ni]} \quad \text{ogbe xeje-tigi-i}. \\
\text{Frog-CONTR} & \quad \text{jump-ITER-PST-3SG} \quad \text{Elk} \quad \text{forehead-LAT-3SG} \\
\text{‘Frog jumped onto Elk’s forehead.’} & \quad \text{(Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 875)}
\end{align*}
\]

The articulation that is conveyed is an Address-central Categorical one: ‘frog’, while having been evoked before, is construed as a Topic for the first time in this assertion, and relevant information is predicated in the same utterance. A similar example is given in (14), where ‘czar’ is introduced as a new discourse address:

(14) (The Chinese lived there)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[namu bugasa-tigi-ni]} & \quad \text{eze-ti} \quad \text{igbe:-ni}. \quad \text{[(wa-za\(\text{\text{-}a}\)-z\(\text{\text{-}a}\)]2} \\
\text{sea} & \quad \text{island-LAT-3SG} \quad \text{czar-3PL} \quad \text{chase-PST-3SG} \quad \text{kill-FUT-INTR} \\
\text{igbe:-ni}. & \quad \text{[omo mi\(\text{\text{-}g}\)a} \quad \text{ni\(\text{\text{-}z}\)-we}]. \\
\text{chase-PST-3SG} & \quad \text{one} \quad \text{thousand} \quad \text{man-ACC} \\
\text{‘To an island their czar chased (them), (he) chased them so that they were not killed, one thousand men.’} & \quad \text{(Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 872)}
\end{align*}
\]

The utterance in (15) conveys an Address-central Thetic articulation. Note that, in contrast to (2), the ‘hare’ in this assertion is a particular individual, crucial to the further development of the story. Furthermore, the rest of the predication is not informative, since the temporal location of the event (ele: siki\(\text{\text{-}gie}\), ‘later that evening’ has been activated in the immediately preceding discourse.

(15) (Kanda lies on the river bank, pretending to be dead)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ele: siki\(\text{\text{-}gie}\)} & \quad \text{[omo tukca]} \quad \text{emen-z\(\text{\text{-}i}\)} \\
\text{soon evening-ITER.PRS.PART} & \quad \text{one} \quad \text{hare} \quad \text{come-PST.PART-INTR.SS}
\end{align*}
\]
kae-li.
near-PROL
‘In the evening, a hare came along.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 904)

**Fronting construction** The last construction is one in which a referent is fronted to sentence-initial position for special treatment. This is most clear in cases where the referent precedes any spatiotemporal adjuncts which normally occur in that position, as in the Address-central Categorical articulation in (16) below:

(16) (end of discourse segment) D
[keige] [zugdi-du, siye-we, waktsa-ini]... [kahni] [ba: cat house-DAT mouse-ACC hunt-3SG marten place xuon-di-ni, oloxi-we, wakca-ini]...

The fronting construction can also be used to convey an Entry-central Categorical articulation with a Topic other than the Subject, as in (17):

(17) (his mother brought him home and wrapped him in clothes) C
[uti b’ata-wa, Zuanchi-instr call-ITER-PST-3PL.
‘This boy they called Zuanchi.’ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 872)

It is important to stress that (17) is not an instance of the canonical strategy; as is illustrated in (10) and (11), not all categorical statements have their Topical referent in sentence-initial position. Hence it follows that Udihe is Subject-initial rather than Topic-initial; hence cases like (17) are not instances of the canonical, but of some marked expression strategy.

**Ma’di**

**Ma’di informational properties**

Figure 8 gives the informatogram of Ma’di, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that fourteen coding strategies can be distinguished.

To preserve legibility, no example numbers were included in the schema.

**Ma’di examples**

**Canonical construction** Ma’di has two basic constituent orders that reflect a past-nonpast distinction. The canonical order of both paradigms can be used to express the Entry-central Categorical articulation, as is shown in (1)-(3). The examples
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in (1) and (2) illustrate the assertion of a (series of) past affirmative and negated present predications which use the uninflected SVO order, while (3) illustrates the assertion of a present affirmative predication that makes use of the inflected SOV order.

(1) (The people were called)
   a. dríá [bá] \(\rightarrow\) [\(\bar{3}\)-\(\text{gf}\) \(\text{á}\) \(\text{ámvú}\)]\(_{\text{a}}\)
      now people 3-say 3PL 3(SUB)-dig plot
   b. [\(\emptyset\)] \(\rightarrow\) [\(\bar{3}\)-\(\text{gf}\) \(\text{núsù gá}\)]\(_{\text{a}}\)
      3-reach half LOC
   c. mgbê [\(\text{éjíví}\) \(\bar{5}\)-\(\text{zā}\) [\(\text{bá}\)] \(\text{kp}\)]\(_{\text{a}}\).
      immediately water_thirst 3-overpower people CMP
   ‘Now the people said they would dig a field, they reached half, immediately thirst overpowered the people.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 672/10)

in (1a), ‘the people’ are evoked lexically as the Topical referent of the assertion by means of an adjoined NP, arguably because their semantic function has changed with respect to the previous clause. In (1b), evocation of the Topical referent is suppressed, whereas in (1c), where another change of function has occurred, it is evoked lexically again. Another thing that (1c) illustrates is the fact that the correlation between (adjoined) Subject and Topic in Ma’di is not very strong, and can be overridden given the right context.

(2) (she hides it from you; and so)
   [\(\text{nī}\)] \(\rightarrow\) [\(\text{nī} \: \text{āná-à} \: \text{éřì} \: \text{nī} \: \text{kàká-} \: \text{nī} \: \text{kō}\)]\(_{\text{a}}\).
   2SG.DIR know 3SG-POSS home-SPEC 3SG.SP kin-SPEC 3SG.SP NEG
   ‘You don’t know her home, her kin.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 720/376)

(3) (if a person dies,)
   [\(\text{āvù \: \text{āřì}\)}] \(\rightarrow\) [\(\text{ká} \: \text{bá} \: \text{nī} \: \text{āsì} \: \text{‘-ē-dú} \: \text{dákū}\)]\(_{\text{a}}\).
   dead accept 3SG people DEF.SPEC heart NPST-VEN-take a_lot
   ‘...receiving-the-dead it gives people a lot of heart-ache.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 694/179)

The second articulation that the canonical construction can express, is Entry-central Thetic. Again, examples of both inflectional paradigms are given in (4) and (5):

(4) (If she returns home,)
   \(\text{[ádi} \: \text{indrí ārōnî} \: \text{‘-kkō]}\)\(_{\text{a}}\)
   INDEF goat female NPST-catch
   ‘...female goats are caught [lit. they catch female goats]’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 702/239)

(5) (The people drank water. They were thirsty.)
‘The water was not enough.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 676/648)

With regard to (4), the context makes clear that the referent expressed by the impersonal Subject pronounal áđì, which is a disfavoured topic candidate by default, indeed plays no role at all in the preceding nor in the following context. The expression merely serves to posit the event in the development of the narrative, introducing the referent ‘female goats’ that is instrumental in the subsequent predication. As regards (5), ‘the water’ is also a dispreferred topic referent by default, nor can the narrative be interpreted as being ‘about’ it at any stage.

Third, the canonical strategy can be used to convey Address-central Categorical articulations, as is illustrated by (6) and (7):

(6) (The dry season had begun.)

‘Now Ito’s brother Caragule called six hundred people to cultivate him a field.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 672/8)

(7) (in a discussion about kinds of payments during courtship)

‘At times a ‘violation fine’ will certainly be paid [lit. they will certainly pay a fine].’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 727/436)

Both ‘Ito’s brother Caragule’ in (6) and ‘violation fine’ in (7) are introduced in the discourse for the first time, both are Topics in the subsequent context, and about both relevant information is given upon their first mention. Fourth and finally, the canonical construction can be used to convey Identificational Focus on postverbal NPs of whatever kind, as is illustrated in (8):

(8) (...or you kill him with your hand,)

‘...or you kill (him) with a spear.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 699/214)

‘Bare Noun’ construction  The ‘bare’ strategy makes use of bare nominals. The construction can convey two articulations, illustrated in (9) and (10): Entry-central Thetic and Categorical, respectively.

(9) (Caragule performed a water-dance)
people 3-drink water thirst water 3-reach NEG 'The people drank water. Thirst. The water was not enough.' (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 676/648)

(10) (Encantation: ‘I am Caragule. It is me.’) C
   ['têndêrê'] P.
   huge_upright_strong 'Huge, upright and strong.' (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 708/288)

It is not entirely clear whether ví in (9) is a Noun or an Adjective. I analysed it here as the former: if it is the latter, it may also be the case that (9) and (10) both reflect instances of a Categorical articulation of a non-verbal predication without an overt Subject.

Fronting construction  Blackings and Fabb (2003: 541) point out that Object and PPs may be fronted to a position preceding the adjoined Subject in order to make it interpretable as a topic. This is shown in (11) and (12) for an uninflected and inflected predication with Categorical articulation, respectively. Note that both are ‘Chinese-style Topics’, in the sense that they fulfill no coded semantic function in the predication they are relevant to:

(11) (so, how was this courtship handled in the past?) C
   [iêbômá] r. [âñjí vû bàrû] P.
   courtship 2PL go home
   ‘(For) courtship you went home.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 709/295)

(12) (while discussion bed-cleansing) C
   [gûmbêrê drî drû] r. [nî àdû `îdê àôj] P.
   bed_cleansing pred.ptc 2SG what npst-do foc
   ‘For bed-cleansing what do you do?’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 685/109)

Another use of fronting appears to be introduction of new Topical referents in Address-central Categorical assertions, as in (13):

(13) (in case of a death, all quarrels should be put aside) D
   kî drîá dî ̀zî [âná-à āmvôtî ̀a bàrû ] nî ] r. [drû]
   but now dem.prox yet 2SG-poss sister poss child spec foc death
   kû `kô-à] P.
   3(N)-npst-catch-obj ven-go(3) even see-obj rfl neg
   ‘but now, the child of your sister, death gets to her (and he doesn’t even come to visit).’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 696/192)

Third, fronting is also used to express Identificational Focus of the fronted constituent. A case in point is (14); as becomes apparent from the surrounding context, the entire predication of someone paying ransom to someone else had already
been activated at the moment of the speaker’s uttering (14), and only the relation between the location ‘from Sudan’ and the (activated) predication is non-retrievable and therefore focal:

(14) (it is indeed the case that you and me came here in 1989) E
    [sùdùni gà sì] r [è-vò ì̃f] r.
    Sudan LOC SRC VEN-go(PL) SPEC FOC
    ‘From Sudan is (whence) we came.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 680/73)

Note that the occurrence of ì̃f in cases like these is a result from syntax, rather than a conscious choice by the speaker. That is, the verb cannot be the final constituent in the clause; the occurrence of ì̃f can be seen as a repair strategy employed by the speaker to avoid violation of the termination constraint (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 146ff).

**Postposing construction** Normally, the adjoined Subject precedes the inflected verb. However, the order may also be reversed as in (15) which conveys an Entry-central Thetic articulation. Note that Subject postponement is a typical detopicalization strategy in many S-initial languages (cf. Lambrecht 2001b).

(15) (start of story) B
    [òdù zi sì àłù èsù vò méli] r.
    day INDEF.ART SRC once find(3) earth dry_season
    ‘One day once, it was the dry season [lit. the dry season found the earth].’
    (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 672/7)

**Copying construction** The copying strategy is exclusively used to convey Identificational Focus on the main predicate of the clause. In order to achieve this interpretation, a copy of the verb is placed in clause-final position. The copy carries a low tone indicating specificity, and is not inflected or otherwise marked. An example is given in (16):

(16) (in discussing ways how someone might accidentally get killed) E
    [nì] r [mgbà màdù nà (mgbà) 2sg beat person AFM beat-FOC]
    ‘Either you beat that person to death, . . . ’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 699/211)

**Cleft construction** Cleft constructions in Ma’di are basically non-verbal predications, in which the non-verbal predicate (and optionally, also the Subject) is a referentialized main clause. This can either be achieved by using a subordinate verb form as in (18), or by simply attaching a determiner to the clause as in (19). A combination of both is also possible, as is illustrated in (17) below. Interestingly, while cleft constructions are typically associated with Identificational Focus, in Ma’di they appear to be used exclusively to convey Entry-central Categorical arti-
culations. The referential phrase mostly refers back to a recent chunk of discourse, as in (17):

(17) (Some girls turn away their suitors) C
| ̰d̰ \-i-sáá̰ | | má-u- ndṟ-ḻ | bô̰nḏì- 1sg.see-1sg-childhood def.spec.eye src
DEM.PROX FOC-even
\nAFFMT DEM.DIST.DEF FOC
'This as well is what I have seen as a kid [lit: with the eyes of childhood].'
(Blackings and Fabb 2003: 716/352)

A similar example is (18), where the Subject referent is probably also the immediately preceding discourse, but where it is not explicitly evoked:

(18) (24,000 pounds for an eloped girl) C
| ø | [à̰̱-u-ü̱g̱w̱-ḻ | dṟi̱ḏṟo-mâ̱g̱é̱ṉḏo- dṟò- ̰d̰ |
3pl.poss npst-call-sr now black-market pred.ptc DEM.PROX
\nFOC
'That’s what they ask as their black-market price these days.' (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 728/438)

In (19) an example is given in which both the Subject and the non-verbal predicate of the superordinate construction are clausal. This is a fine example of accommodation, since much of the information that is embedded in the clausal Subject assumedly is non-retrievable to the Addressee, while it is presented as though it would be.

(19) (I will ask you about one other ritual that is among us) C
| ṯa- ě̱-ẕá̱-ṟ̱ | ̱m̱á̱- ḻè- ḵ̱-ȳ̱ | i̱j̱̱o- ṟi | ̰ḏì |
1pl.(excl) want n-3-do absent dem.dist.def 2sg
| ni | thing npst-explain-on-it dem.dist.def foc
'This thing that pains us and that we want an end to, is what you (should) explain us something about.' (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 687/126)

Scope of negation Normally, the Topical referent escapes negation (Strawson 1971; Reinhart 1981; Payne 1990, 1992). A ‘thetic’ scope of negation that includes also the adjoined Subject NP, can be achieved in Ma’di by manipulating the respective order of negative marker and the ‘evidentiality’ marker rá. Compare the two examples in (20) that convey an Entry-central Categorical and Entry-central Thetic articulation, respectively:

(20) (no context)

a. [spí ɔ̱-dù- ǐ̱ẕí- rá- kò] \nOpi 3-take woman AFFMT NEG
'This is not what Opi certainly takes a woman' (Blackings and Fabb
b. \[\text{Opi } 3\text{-take woman NEG AFFMT}\]

‘Opi certainly does not take a woman’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 582/230)

**lè construction**  Blackings and Fabb analyse the particle \(lè\) as a ‘relevance predicate’. It can also occur with an isolated NP, in which case the interpretation is ‘what about …?’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 232ff). When used on NPs that are embedded in complete sentences, the informational interpretation is that of a Entry-central Categorical articulation with a Topic that has special significance or emphasis. An example is given in (21):

(21) (the people took off, grumbling, and said) C

\[
\text{ito } 2\text{sg as for 2sg.POSS millet 3(DIR)-yield 'Ito, as for you, your millet must yield.' (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 677/51)}
\]

**nì construction**  According to Blackings and Fabb (2003: 559ff), \(nì\) is a Focus particle used to convey Identificational Focus on Subject NPs in their canonical position. This is indeed by far its most frequent use, as the examples in (22) and (23) illustrate:

(22) (but we are not allowed to eat this) E

\[
\text{people big(PL) 3-NPST-eat-OBJ FOC 'elders eat it.' (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 708/283)}
\]

(23) (because Caragule knew full well that) E

\[
\text{Ito 3SG.SPEC brother call(3) FOC 'these people, he hadn’t called; his brother Ito called (them).'} (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 676/45)
\]

Note that the examples above share the fact that another constituent than the focussed Subject serves as the Topic of the utterance. In (22), an adjoined Object NP is missing, but the pronominal suffix \(?à\), obligatory in the inflected paradigm, can be interpreted as such. In (23b), the Topical Object referent is omitted altogether.

If no other referent can be construed as the Topic, it seems that \(nì\)-marked NPs can also convey Address-central Categorical articulation. An example is given in (24), where the Topical referent ‘Mr. Christopher Anyama’ is introduced into the discourse and information relevant to him is given in the same assertion:
A third usage of this strategy is to introduce special circumstances under which an event may take place. Following Haiman (1978), who argues that conditionals often serve as Topics, these cases may likewise be analysed as Address-central Categorical assertions:

The *áò* construction (1) The particle *áò* occurs clause-finally like *ni*, but is employed to convey Identificational Focus on adjoined Object NPs according to Blackings and Fabb (2003: 553ff). Closer inspection of the discourse material reveals that this is only the case when the adjoined Object NP occurs in canonical preverbal position in the inflected paradigm, as illustrated in (26) and (27):

In all other cases, assertions marked with *áò* convey the Entry-central Categorical articulation. These cases have been classified as a separate strategy (see next paragraph).

The *áò* construction (2) In all other environments than the one discussed above, *áò* conveys Entry-central Categorical articulations. Since the distribution appears to be fully systematic in this respect, I analysed both as separate constructions. The
'other environments’ are all cases of áū in the ‘uninflected’ paradigm, illustrated in (28) and (29), as well as cases of áū in the inflected paradigm with fronted Object, as in (30):

(28) (now [the case of] a woman, she goes to leave her husband) C 3-take man another foc
‘She takes another man.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 707/275)

(29) (all these wrongs multiplied in the camp here) C even Kuku def.spec system impr-catch foc
‘Or maybe the Kuku system was adopted (for them).’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 703/247)

(30) (nowadays, they don’t give suitors anything anymore) now handkerchief pl indef npst-sew-obj foc
‘Now, they sew handkerchiefs (for them)’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 721/382)

Clause-final ʔī construction Although Blackings and Fabb (2003) describes the clause-final occurrence of the marker ʔī as its primary use, this appears to be exceptionally rare in the available texts. Moreover, when ʔī does occur clause-finally, it more often seems to be a consequence of syntactic rules (especially the constraint on unmarked postverbal definite Objects) than a result of informational considerations; examples of this have been discussed earlier. Even in cases where clause-final ʔī is not cause by purely syntactic requirements, its scope cannot be determined with absolute certainty because no instances were found in which it immediately follows the verb: other constituents intervene, which allow for two distinct analyses, clause-final ʔī and ‘local’ ʔī. A good example of this is (31) below, which according to Blackings and Fabb (2003: 573) may be given an Entry-central Thetic interpretation under the clause-final analysis. Given the right context, however, the same construction may also be interpreted as a case of local ʔī on the PP ebōù gā, ‘to work’, leading to an Identificational articulation.7

(31) (no context) B/E
1sg npst-go work loc spec foc
‘(It’s that) I am going to work / I am going TO WORK’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 573/176)

7In the Thetic interpretation, ʔī may be interpreted as a ‘predification operator’, converting the entire sentence into the higher-order predicate of an ‘it’s that . . . ’-construction.
'Local' ḫ construction  In addition to its clause-final occurrence discussed in the previous section, ḫ most frequently occurs ‘locally’, attaching to adjoined NPs or lexical PPs with special informational significance. Often, this concerns the first evocation of referents that are to become Topics later on in discourse, as in the Address-central Thetic articulation illustrated in (32):

(32) (new discourse segment) A
bàdènì driádrö [āʔí drí ŋōmā drí dī ḫ]ə.
later now 3PL poss courtship poss dem.prox foc

‘Now, this courtship of us [our people].’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 708/290)

The sole function of (32) is to introduce the referent ‘courtship’, which is the subject of the next part of the conversation. However, the same strategy can also be used to evoke a new Topical referent and predicate information relevant to it in the same clause, as in (33):

(33) (Now, regarding this ritual,) D
[indʒəndʒí zbáá ḫ náši pí lè ānì kū rì ḫ]ə [náši pí
girl.PL indef.PL foc maybe 2SG want 3SG neg def foc maybe 2SG
pāâ sûrú ‘-ıtèède rá]ə.
2SG.Poss tribe npst-show affmt
‘some girls, maybe the one that you do not fancy, maybe you introduce
(her to) your tribe.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 719/372)

Third, local ḫ can be used to convey an Entry-central Categorical articulation. In view of what has been remarked in section (30), it should be noted that this example, given an appropriate context, could probably also convey Thetic or Identificational articulation:

(34) (this mouth-opening thing has been inflated) C
mouth open absent past long src foc
‘Mouth-opening was absent in the past’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 688/133)

Fourth, as has been argued when discussing (31) above, local ḫ can also be used to convey identificational Focus on the constituent it attaches to.

‘Subject-Ḫ construction  A final strategy in Ma’di again involves the particle ḫ, but now attaching to Subject-adjoined NPs in postverbal position. The articulation it conveys in such cases invariably is Identificational Focus on the Subject referent, as illustrated by (35) and (36):

(35) (but as for you, our brother-in-law,) E
it is YOU who gathered us here.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 690/143)

(36) (for chair-taking-in, you will give a hoe) E

That’s what is called chair-taking-in.’ (Blackings and Fabb 2003: 710/305)

Slave

Slave informational properties

Figure 9 gives the informatogram of Slave, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that seven coding strategies can be distinguished.

Slave examples

Canonical construction  The canonical strategy in Slave consists of the use of basic constituent order, which is Subject-initial and Verb-final. The Object tends to occur in preverbal position, but intervening adjuncts do not trigger another informational interpretation. An example of the canonical expression strategy conveying an Entry-central Categorical articulation is given in (1):

(1) (That is how it was.) C


‘The manager talked with his workers.’ (Rice 1989: 1351/95)

The Subject may also be expressed pronominally, as in (2) and (3). Note that (3) conveys an Identificational articulation: the entire predication, save the identity of the oblique referent as its Actor, was given information at the time of this assertion being uttered.

(2) (a woman with blonde hair came out from there) C


‘She put clothes on the clothes-line.’ (Rice 1989: 1235/2)

(3) (the brother lived with a Chipewyan woman, and) E
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The lexical Subject may be omitted if the referent can be retrieved from the context, as in the identificational articulation in (4).

(4) (Since the whites did not give them anything to make clothing of,) E

\[
\text{Pekwé–caribou only clothing thus-PL.HUM(SBJ)-3:IMPF:do}
\]

‘...they thus made only caribou clothing.’ (Rice 1989: 1338/18ff)

Subject continuity plays no role in the decision whether or not the Subject is expressed pronominally. Unlike in many of the other languages discussed so far, the pronominal Subject referent need not have served as Subject in the preceding clause. The lack of a Subject continuity criterion leads to cases of potential ambiguity, as in (5):

(5) (they lived like that among the Chipewyan)

\[
\text{hi–t’a now really go-k’êked’yú really keep really evd}
\]

‘They [the Chipewyan] kept them [the siblings] really well.’ (Rice 1989: 1343/19)

In (5), ‘the Chipewyan’ figured in the preceding clause as an oblique referent, while ‘the siblings’ were the Subject of that clause. Both change their semantic function in (5). The ambiguity that is caused by this lack of continuity can only be resolved in the wider context of the story, which makes the reverse interpretation of the Subject and Object referents in (5) highly unlikely. Also, the canonical construction is used to convey an Entry-central Thetic articulation, as in (6), and Address-central Thetic articulation, as in (7) and (8):

(6) (start of discourse)

\[
\text{Peyi dem got’s’e–agr:from Pekúhn’i–then ìets’ego–nonspec:impf:recp:kill bad agr:impf:be}
\]

‘In those days they killed each other and it was bad;’ (Rice 1989: 1342/1ff)

(7) (the Dene girl saw a white people’s house for the first time)

\[
\text{hailé Peyi gots’è sía ts’éeku dek’ate bek’îghá pro:pst dem agr:from evd woman rfl:among 3:head:hair dekwoi 3:IMPF:be_yellow 3:PF:go_out evd}
\]

‘Then a woman with blond hair came out from there.’ (Rice 1989: 1348/73)

(8) (end of discourse segment)
Reduplication construction  The reduplication or topicalization strategy (Rice 1989: 1197ff) consists of the use of basic constituent order: in addition to the Subject, the lexical Object is also cross-referenced on the inflected verb. Topicalization serves a number of different pragmatic purposes. On the one hand, it may be used to construe a less preferred Topic candidate as the Topic of the utterance; on the other, topicalization is used to evoke new referents that are in a POset-relation to other referents (either explicitly evoked, or implied in the discourse context). It should be repeated that POset membership in the classification used here is not treated as an aspect of information packaging, but of discourse coherence. Even though POset membership greatly facilitates the occurrence of referents in particular informational roles on account of its bridging role which improves the accessibility to the referent’s denotation, it should not be equated with it. Hence, while there is a conspicuous correlation between POset membership and Identificational Focus, POset-related referents may also be introduced as part of an assertion that is also informative otherwise, in which case it would be classified as having a Categorical articulation.

Although Rice claims differently, topicalization in Slave is mostly used to convey Entry-central Categorical and Identificational Focus articulations, and does not serve to introduce new Topics. A case in point is (9), where bewki ‘its front’ is contrasted here with betla ‘its back’ in the subsequent clause, both of which are members of the POset DIMENSIONS of 3-D OBJECTS. Nevertheless, in (9a) the remainder of the assertion is also informative, which justifies its classification as a Categorical articulation. In (9b) on the other hand, the action of TYING TOGETHER xU is given information on account of its having been mentioned in the preceding clause, and only the identity of the POset-related Undergoer (not even its semantic function) constitutes new information.

(9) (they tie string to the middle of the shoe. Then)

a. [∅]. ['bewki te-ki-hshá].
   3:head togetherAdv-(3)PL>3SG-3:IMPF:tie and
gots’ë

b. [∅]. [(betla kʷila) te-ki-hshá].
   3:back also togetherAdv-(3)PL>3SG-3:IMPF:tie
   ‘...they tie its front and its back together.’ (Rice 1989: 1335/7)

Something peculiar is going on in (10), where the Objects are members of the POset of SNOWSHOE PARTS. In the second clause, Subject number should have been marked overtly. It is not: moreover, the Object affix -ye- implies a singular, not a plural Subject, which is clearly not compatible with the context of the utterance.

(10) (If the skin has dried, they make holes for the string. After that)
APPENDIX

a. [∅]_T [(tl’uhgō)₃ ki-k’enikīle]₉-
babiche (3)PL>3SG-3:IMPF:place

b. [∅]_T [(beʔekʷ’a)₃ kʷ’ila ye-k’enikīle]₉-
3:crosspiece too (3SG)>3SG-3:IMPF:place

‘they place babiche and its crosspiece as well.’ (Rice 1989: 1336/12)

The only case in which topicalization is used to convey a Categorical articulation rather than Identificational Focus on the topicalized referent is the topicalization of the complement of the incorporated postposition -ka- given in (11). Topicalization of complements of incorporated postpositions behaves as Object topicalization (Rice 1989: 1203).

(11) (the whites did not gives them anything. This being so,) C
[∅]_T [suré ?ekʷ’ì ka-na-go₃-ke-hwhe]₉-
really caribou(OBL) for-HAB-(3)>3PL-PL.HUM(SBJ)-3:IMPF:search
‘. . . they looked for caribou really hard.’ (Rice 1989: 1338/20)

As regards the topicalization of Subjects and non-incorporated oblique referents, Rice (1989: 1200) mentions that this is mostly a theoretical construct. Since Subject person is obligatorily cross-referenced on the verb, and non-incorporated obliques cannot be cross-referenced at all, the distinction between topicalized and non-topicalized instances is impossible to tell, even more so because linear ordering is not a defining property of the construction. As is illustrated in (12) and in (3) discussed earlier, ‘canonical’ Subject NPs and PPs can be identically focussed on account of being in a POset-relationship, respectively:

(12) (they place babiche and its crosspiece as well. After that) E
a. [(ts’éekukuk)₉]_T [(tl’uhgō dá-ke-yegha]₉-
woman babiche(OBL) closepp-PL.HUM(SBJ)-3:IMPF:lace

b. ?eyi tl’uhgō ?ot’e nîdé
DEM babiche 3:IMPF:be_done if

c. [(deneyu`)₉]_T [(yekehìe nezo]₉-
man 4:sol 3:IMPF:be_good
?a-ke-hʔi]₉-
thus-PL.HUM(SBJ)-3:IMPF:do

‘the women lace the babiche. Once that babiche is done, the men make the sole.’ (Rice 1989: 1336/14)

PP – Obj order What is the canonical order of the Object NP and oblique referents cannot be established with much certainty. Nevertheless, it seems that their respective ordering reflects informational considerations. That is, in case of identificational Focus the focal referent always occurs as the left-most constituent. Consider (13):

(13) (once the wood has the desired size) E
a. $[\emptyset]$ $[tl’u \ t’áh \ k^w_í \ ke-n¯ilú]_r$.
   string INSTR snowshoe head PL.HUM(SBJ)-3:IMPF:hang and

b. $\text{gots’ê} [\emptyset]$ $[\text{?a-kì-yeh’ì}]$ $\text{gotl’ìhòò}$
   thus-(3)PL>3SG-3:IMPF:do AGR:after

c. $[\emptyset]$ $[\text{?ah} \ (\text{tani})_g \ \text{gots’ê} \ tl’u \ yéé]$
   snowshoe middle too string in
   $\text{ke-ke-nìjá }]_r$.
   $\text{up}_\text{adv}-\text{PL.HUM(SBJ)}-\text{IMPF:tie}$

‘Once it is that big, they hang the tip of the shoe with string and after
they do thus they tie up the middle of the shoe with string as well.’ (Rice
1989: 1335/5)

In (13a), the entire act of the Bearlake people hanging the tip of the shoe with
string is informative, and is interpreted as an Entry-central Categorical articulation.
In (13c), the only new element is the identity of (part of) the Undergoer referent.
That part occupies the left-most position in the clause. More examples are given in
(14) and (15): also relevant in this respect is (4) discussed earlier, which conveyed
identificational Focus on the material the clothes are made of.

(14) (Caribou was the main thing they lived on. If there was no caribou,) $E$

   $[\emptyset]_r$ $[\{\text{t’are} \ \text{gokedí}]_r.$
   fish by_means_of 3PL:live

   ‘...they (would) live on FISH.’ (Rice 1989: 1338/21)

(15) (nowadays, they only hunt with guns) $E$

   $\text{goweri}$ $[\text{na}]$ $[\{\text{deneke}]; [\{\text{beká t’á} \ zo} \ ?ek^w_é \ \text{takahdee}]_r.$
   3:before long person:PL spear INSTR only caribou 3PL:kill:PL:HAB:IMPF
   ‘Long ago, people killed caribou only with spears.’ (Rice 1989: 1337/2)

Cleft construction Fourth, there is a strategy that strongly resembles clefting. An
example conveying Identificational Focus is given in (16), which is syntactically an
equation of two NPs headed by a demonstrative (the practice of the Chipewyan
to sell the scalps of their victims to the whites as animal furs has been discussed
extensively in the preceding discourse):

(16) (The woman was the wife of the store manager) $E$

   $[\{\text{?eyi bedene}¥]_g \ ?eyi \ sìa \ \text{bets’ê dene} \ \text{kwìlwé tsáwé nàedi}]_r.$
   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.’ (Rice
   1989: 1349/81)

Extraclausal NP + yá construction A fifth strategy is the construction in (17),
which conveys an Identificational articulation. The construction consists of an

---

8Incidentally, note that here we have a POset relation without the Object being
topicalized
extraclausal NP, followed by the marker yá:

(17) (she told the manager all about it;)

\[ ?\text{eyi t'eere}, \, [?\text{eyi yá}], \, [(\text{bek'aoweredado})_2 \, \text{hé goade}]_2 \, \text{dedi.} \]

DEM girl DEM TOP manager with 3:PF:talk EVD

‘That girl, she talked with the manager.’ (Rice 1989: 1350/90)

There is considerable emphasis at work in this example, probably because the referent ‘the girl’ has not been evoked lexically for quite some time, while another female participant, ‘the settler woman’, has. What may also play a role is that it is much more logical for the settler woman to talk to the manager (which is her husband) than it is for the Slave girl. In the light of remarks made in Lambrecht (1994), it is likely that the same construction can also be used to introduce new Topical referents. Indeed, an Address-central Thetic example is given in (18) (classified as such because of the semantically bare predicate, and the fact that the time of occurrence is entirely irrelevant to the development of the story): note, that the referent sah ‘bear’ is entirely new, despite of being marked with a (non-deictic) demonstrative. This may be a signal to the Addressee to construe the referent as somehow familiar.

(18) (start of story)

\[ \text{éé dla } ?\text{eyi sah yá thaa t’õh gõhdli } \, ?\text{yie } ?\text{ajá.} \]

yes FOC DEM bear TOP long ago AGR:be_cold in 3:IMPF:come

‘Yes, that bear once came in the winter long ago.’ (Rice 1989: 394/6)

**la construction** The marker *la* was already introduced in (18), where it serves to signal a particular narrative setting (story-telling). In fact the use of this particle ranges over a wide variety of interpersonal categories, of which Focus is just one. The kind of Focus appears to be sentential, resulting in an Entry-central Thetic articulation as in (19):

(19) (end of discourse segment)

\[ [\text{xéhts’ê } \text{la } \, ?\text{agodedade}]_\text{FOC.} \]

evening FOC 3:IMPF:PROG:become

‘It was becoming evening.’ (Rice 1989: 1347/57)

A second example shows how larger constructs with *la* can be embedded under matrix verbs to convey the same articulation:

(20) (it looked like there were rocks scattered about)

\[ [?\text{eyi } \text{la } \, \text{móla } \, kó } \, \text{gõtá } \, ?\text{á}]_\text{FOC.} \, ?\text{agõht’e.} \]

DEM FOC white_person house 3:IMPF:be_there EVD 3:IMPF:be_thus

‘It’s (the case that) that is where the whites had their houses.’ (Rice 1989: 1347/62)
**si'-i** construction  The relativiser *si*-i is used to convey Address-central Categorical articulations with Focus on the new Topical referent, which invariably appears to be the Subject. Note that referents thus focussed are in fact expressed as the complement of a headless relative clause:

(21) (back in the days they [vague] killed each other) D
gots’e [k’átseleht’ineke si’i]r [dene kegho]r.
and Chipewyan REL people 3PL:IMPF:kill
‘(they who were the) Chipewyan killed people.’ (Rice 1989: 1342/1ff)

(22) (the children were taken hostage by the Chipewyan) D
hit’a tek’a [bechile s’i]r [k’átseleht’ine ts’e ts’eeku ghá
now apart 3:younger_brother REL Chipewyan from woman with
wheda]r.
3SG:IMPF:live
‘Now (he who was the) younger brother lived with a woman from the
Chipewyan, (and the sister with a Ch. man).’ (Rice 1989: 1343/17)

Also, it is used to convey Entry-central Categorical articulations with a Topic that has to be retrieved over a long distance. An example is given in (23), where ‘the girl’ has been the Topic of the past eleven assertions.

(23) (The girl came over to the settler woman) C
[móola ts’eeku si’i]r [kahxone dene gúlú gháeda]r.
white woman REL suddenly person other 3:IMPF:see
‘The white woman saw another person for the first time [a person of a
different tribe]’ (Rice 1989: 1349/79)

Note, that *si’i* marking occurs both on transitive and intransitive Subjects.

**Kambera**

**Kambera informational properties**

Figure 10 gives the informatogram of Kambera, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that nine coding strategies can be distinguished.

To preserve legibility, no example numbers were included in the schema

**Kambera examples**

**Canonical construction**  The canonical strategy in Kambera is characterized by the fact that nothing fills the prepredicative position, and by the lack of an overt Subject DP. It conveys an Entry-central Categorical articulation or Identificational Focus on the Object referent, which appears in immediately postpredicative position. The Subject is the (continued) Topic.
Figure 10  Kambera informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
As is illustrated by (1) and (2a), the canonical construction can be used to convey categorical articulations with both intransitive and transitive predications. The example in (3) shows a categorical articulation with a non-verbal predication that has absolutive Subject alignment. The use of the construction to convey Identificational Focus on the Object referent is exemplified in (2b).

(1) (Umbu Mada is busy looking after his foal)  
\[
\text{\[\emptyset\]} \quad \text{\[na-ana \quad laku \ na\-h\-u \ pa-k\-\-\-u\-nya \quad uhu-na\]\n}
\text{3SG(NOM)-DIM go \ there SR-cut-3SG(DAT) rice-3SG(GEN)}
\]
‘He goes out there a bit to cut his grass for him.’ (Klamer 1998: 369/4)

(2) (Umbu Ndilu is at a loss:)  
\[
a. \quad \text{\[\emptyset\]} \quad \text{\[na-namu-nya \quad na \ kuru \ uma-na\]\n}
\text{3SG(NOM)-remember-3SG(DAT) ART wife-3SG(GEN)}
b. \quad \text{\[\emptyset\]} \quad \text{\[na-hili \quad namu-nya \quad \{na \ ana-na\]\n}
\text{3SG(NOM)-again remember-3SG(DAT) ART child-3SG(GEN)}
\]
‘He cares for his wife, but he also cares for his child.’ (Klamer 1998: 382/55)

(3) (those meats were of our own cattle,)  
\[
tapi \quad \text{\[\emptyset\]} \quad \text{\[tobu \quad wini-nja\]\n}
\text{but slaughter secret-3PL(DAT)}
\]
‘...but slaughtered secretly.’ (Klamer 1998: 384/3)

**VSO strategy**  What I labelled the VSO strategy is characterized by a Nominative Subject proclitic on the main predicate, and a lexical Subject in postpredicative position. This strategy lends special emphasis to the postpredicative Subject NP. For transitive predications like (4) and (5), the postpredicative Subject conveys Identificational Focus on the referent:

(4) (that meat was of our own cattle, but slaughtered in secret)  
\[
\text{\[nda \ na-pi-a-nya \quad \{Nipong\]\n}
\text{NEG 3SG(NOM)-know-MOD-3SG(DAT) Japan} 
\text{ma-tobu-[nja]\n}
\text{S.REL-slaughter-3PL(DAT)}
\]
‘The Jap didn’t know who slaughtered them.’ (Klamer 1998: 384/3)

(5) (no context)  
\[
\text{\[na-tinu-nya \quad \{nyuna\}\n}
\text{3SG(NOM)-weave-3SG(DAT) 3SG ART.SG sarong}
\]
‘SHE weaves the sarong’ (Klamer 1998: 85/89)

---

9Pronominals in Kambera are clitics that adjoin to a particular phrasal constituent, not affixes attaching to a stem (cf. Klamer 1998: 47). The placement of the adverbs ana and hili in (1) and (2b) is fully canonical.
It appears that the same strategy can also be used to convey the Entry-central Thetic articulation, witness (6). It is a bit puzzling what should be the relation between those two articulations, especially since the Categorical articulation appears to be excluded.

(6) (Umbu Mada never tells his father about his mother)  B
\[
[\text{na-palu-ka}-i \quad i \ \text{ina}]_{\text{a}}.
\]
\begin{tabular}{lp{6cm}}
3SG(NOM)-hit-1SG(ACC)-ITER ART mother \\
"Mum hit me again" (he doesn’t say to him)' (Klamer 1998: 369/2)
\end{tabular}

For intransitive predications, the postpredicative Subject referent appears to be not just focussed, but also constitutes a new Topic as illustrated by (7) and (8). I have analysed these cases as Address-central Thetic articulations on account of the fact that the predicates are semantically bare. The absence of a nominative proclitic in (8) is explained by the fact that the Subject referent ama bokul ‘wise men’ is non-specific (see also Klamer 1998: 68).

(7) (we had plenty at home)  A
\[
lupa \text{ ba } [\text{na } \text{ Nipong}]_{\text{f}}
\]
until CONJ 3SG(NOM)-go ART Japan
‘until the Jap came’ (Klamer 1998: 386/9)

(8) (end of discourse segment)  A
\[
\varnothing-\text{ngad\text{"a}l nú } [\text{ama } \text{ bokul}]_{\text{f}}
\]
gather DEIC father big
‘Wise men gather there’ (Klamer 1998: 371/8)

**SVO 1 construction**  This is what I will tentatively label the ‘preverbal nominative S’ strategy. It has nominative-accusative alignment, and the Subject NP is realized in preverbal position. This construction only conveys Identificational Focus on the Subject NP. In addition, the existence of a POset relation in the discourse appears to be obligatory.

(9) (so I was lucky enough to have something decent to wear)  E
\[
[\text{mbuta-na } \text{ na } \text{ tau}]_{\text{a}}; [\text{na-pəkɪ } \text{kambala}]_{\text{a}}.
\]
complete-3SG(GEN) ART person 3SG(NOM)-wear kambala
‘ALL the OTHER people wore kambala (sacks).’ (Klamer 1998: 385/7)

(10) (all our friends the young girls went into the coffee house,)  E
\[
[\text{nyungga}]_{\text{a}}; [\text{nda ku-tama-a } \text{ la } \text{ rumah kopi}]_{\text{a}}.
\]
\begin{tabular}{lp{6cm}}
1SG NEG 1SG(NOM)-enter-MOD LOC house coffee \\
‘...but I didn’t enter into the coffee house.’(Klamer 1998: 386/10)
\end{tabular}

**SVO 2 construction**  This is what I will tentatively label the ‘preverbal accusative S’ strategy. The Subject NP is realized in prepredicative position, but is cross-referenced on the predicate by means of an accusative enclitic instead of a
nominative proclitic. In contrast with the examples discussed above, this construction exclusively appears to convey Entry-central Categorical articulations that have the prepredicative Subject referent as their non-focal Topic.

(11) (after a while, they Japanese came back again) C tapi [na ama-nggu], [mbada la toku Suma-ya-ka].
    but ART father-1SG(GEN) already LOC shop Sumba-3SG(ACC)-PFV
    ‘...but my father already was (off) to the Sumbanese toko.’ (Klamer 1998: 387/12)

(12) (we cut it like grass and steamed it and ate it with meat) C [da tolung nu-da], [banda wiki-ma-ma-nja].
    ART meat DEIC-3PL cattle self-1PL(GEN)-EMPH-3PL(DAT)
    ‘those meats were of our own cattle’ (Klamer 1998: 384/3)

One or two strategies? Despite the systematic interpretive distinction between nominative and absolutive preverbal Subjects, the question should be addressed we are dealing with two distinct expression strategies between which a Kambera speaker can make a conscious choice, or with a single one (S – Pred), the information packaging of which is conditioned by the way the predication is aligned. In other words, how can we distinguish cause from consequence in the methodology adopted by the present study? In order to settle this issue, it needs to be determined what the status is of case marking in Kambera. Is it dictated by some semantic feature inherent in the denotation of the speaker’s communicative intention, or is it a manipulable syntactic parameter that can be exploited to convey construction-specific functional structure?

The evidence seems to favour the latter option. First, Kambera has a highly flexible parts-of-speech system, in which most lexical elements are precategorial and most phrases are functionally underspecified (cf. Klamer 1998: 115). That is, a given element can be combined with a genitive pronominal to denote an entity, or with a nominative (and accusative) pronominal to denote an action. Moreover, both entity-denoting and action-denoting phrases can be associated with an article to produce a referential phrase, or with TMA marking to yield a predicate.

Thus, the association of lexical elements with syntactic environments does not appear to be constrained by inherent semantic features. In addition, Klamer (1998: 161ff) observes that verbal predicates may be take nominative as well as ergative alignment in order to reflect control and specificity of the Actor. In this light, it is reasonable to assume that alignment is a consciously controlled parameter, exploited either to convey semantic or informational features, and not a lexically determined one.10 From this in turn we can conclude that both prepredicative

10In the generative paradigm, Woolford (2006) has recently introduced a distinction between ideosyncratic lexical case and semantically determined inherent case. Although a considerable step forward with regard to earlier accounts of Case Theory in that it enables non-syntactic explanations of alignment, Woolford’s approach still falls short of accounting for alignment that is pragmatically determined.
expression of the Subject referent and the type of alignment are parameters relevant
to determining the expression strategy.

**Genitive Subject construction** Besides the nominative and accusative Subject clitics, postverbal Subject NPs may also be cross-referenced by means of a genitive enclitic. Klamer (1998: 96ff) classifies clauses with genitive Subject marking as nominal clauses. According to her, nominal clauses can serve as main clauses when expressing parts of a narrative that are circumstantial, or otherwise serve as background information to the ‘core development’ of the story (also see Moody 1991: 146. The same behaviour was shown earlier for participial clauses in Lezgian). As such, their occurrence is assumed to be motivated primarily by narrative rather than by informational considerations. Nevertheless, while primarily a narrative device, that is not to say that assertions made by means of a nominal clause have no information packaging. One would only expect that articulations which are not easily compatible with the status of background knowledge do not occur.

In particular, this would go for Identificational Focus, Address-central Thetic and Address-central Categorical articulations, since all of these typically involve the introduction of new, noteworthy referents. Indeed, no instances have been found of nominal clauses that convey these articulations, while (13) and (14) illustrate that they can be used to convey Entry-central Categorical and Thetic articulations. Thus the nominal clause strategy in Kambera constitutes an excellent illustration of the claim that narrative and informational considerations may conspire in the choice for a particular expression strategy.

(13) (So he about reaches school-age, this Umbu Mada) C
[∅₁]ₚ [urus-uruh-na-nyā₁-na₃ₗₚ]ₚₐ₌ₗₚ
red-organise-emph-3sg(gen)-3sg(dat)-pfv art horse
‘He is looking after his horse (all the time).’ (Klamer 1998: 369/4)

(14) (Thus it went on, you know) B
{lupa}ₚ [tāka-du-na-nyā₁-na₃ₗₚ]ₚₐ₌ₗₚ
until arrive-emph-3sg(gen)-3sg(dat)-pfv illness 3sg deic.3sg art
kuru uma-na]ₚₐ₞ₗₚ
wife-3sg(gen)
‘until illness arrived at her, his wife.’ (Klamer 1998: 370/6)

With respect to (14), it should be pointed out that the event of the stepmother falling ill is definitely part of the story’s core development. One can, however, formulate an alternative characterization of the narrative context in which nominal clauses are used, which relies not on the distinction between core development and circumstantial events, but rather on stance or perspective. That is, in nominal clauses the narrator chooses to ‘zoom out’ on the events, taking a bird’s eye perspective.¹¹

¹¹There may be a relation here to claims made in Lehmann (1988: 193) concerning the relation between ‘desententialization’ and the compression of semantic structure. In
Nominal clauses are also attested in a third context. Because they mark the Subject by means of the enclitic genitive pronominal instead of the proclitic nominative and do not allow for the occurrence of prepredicative NPs, they provide the unique opportunity to express the lexical verb as the very first element in the clause. This property appears to be exploited in order to express assertions with Identificational Focus on the predicate, as in (15) and (16). Both examples express predications that are in no way circumstantial, but instead central to the development of the story.

(15) (she doesn’t feed Umbu Mada) E
\[ \text{ndia, } [\partial] \text{-} [\text{pahu}_d \text{ mànu-na-nya-ka nì}]_.\]
no hit always-3SG(GEN)-3SG(DAT)-PFV DEIC
‘No, she **HITS** him all the time’ (Klamer 1998: 368/1)

(16) (Umbu Ndilu feels very sorry for Umbu Mada) E
\[ [\text{namu}_d \text{-} \text{na-na-nya-i ma-na-na-ya-i}]_. \text{una na} \text{na} \text{emph.3sg gen} \text{emph.3sg dat iter emph.3sg art.sg} \]
\[ \text{ana-na}]_. \text{child-3SG GEN} \]
‘He **CARES** for him, his child.’ (Klamer 1998: 374/19)

**Clefting 1 construction** Kambera exhibits two distinct cleft constructions. The first consists of a clausal predicate, identifiable as such by the presence of Subject cross-reference marking and/or TMA-marking, followed by a simplex Subject. Although similar to it, this type of cleft does not fit the definition of a prototypical cleft (see Dik 1997b: 293ff), because the simplex referential phrase does not serve as the ‘verb’ but as the Subject. This can be seen clearly in (17), where the Subject relative clause carries the dative pronominal -nya that cross-reference the Subject, as well as the perfective marker -ka:

(17) (so they say that, and she says “oh well, in that case”) E
\[ [\text{ma-padening-ma-nya-ka} \text{una nì}]_. \text{ma} \text{rel-true-emph-3SG(DAT)-PFV EMPH.3SG GEN DEIC} \]
\[ \text{this here is what is true} \] (Klamer 1998: 372/13)

In (17), the relative clause contains a lot of information which is assumedly new to the Addressee, but is presented as though it is not, relying on the Addressee’s willingness to accommodate it accordingly (see Lambrecht 1994: 66ff). What is very atypical, is that the informational status ‘non-focal’ patterns syntactically with the predicate, and not the Subject (Prince 1978; Lambrecht 2001b; Paul 2001: see also). It makes good sense, though, in view of the special status of the postpredicative position in Kambera, which seems the slot par excellence for the expression of focal elements. Another example, with the same informational articulation, is given in view of the behaviour of Kambera nominal clauses, this compression may take a wider scope than the predication, and be also used to condense events on a discourse level.
(18). This example also shows that the Topical referent can be expressed as part of the clausal predicate:

(18) (that’s when I can stop my illness, she says) E

\[ \text{wà-na}_1 \text{ka} \quad \{\text{nü}_0\}_x \]
\text{say-3SG(GEN)-PFV DEIC}

‘Thus she says’ (Klamer 1998: 373/16)

Clefting 2 construction  The second type of cleft construction is a more standard one. Here, the focal referential element is raised to the syntactic status of predicate, while the rest of the clause is expressed as a complex Subject referent. The element serving as predicate conveys the identificational Focus of the assertion, while the Subject contains presupposed knowledge (or information presented as such). The Topical referent may be expressed as part of the complex Subject.

(19) (no context) E

\[ \text{nyuna-ka} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{ma}_1 \text{-mayilu-nya}_0 \]
3SG-PFV ART S.REL-first-3SG(DAT)

‘He was the one who came first [lit. he-was who came before him]’
(Klamer 1998: 88/105)

(20) (no context) E

\[ \{\text{mud-a} \}_x \quad \text{hanggil-na} \quad \text{tau}_y \quad \text{na} \quad \text{motur} \]
\text{easy-MOD bump_into-3SG(GEN) person ART truck}

‘The truck may just hit someone [lit. EASY is a bumping of the truck’s into someone]’ (Klamer 1998: 97/18)

In (20), the lack of cross-reference marking on the predicate muda ‘easy’ may be explained by the fact that any (occurrence of the) event of ‘the car bumping into someone’ is likely, and not a specific one. For the same reason, the embedded main predicate hanggil ‘bump into’ is only cross-referenced for its Actor argument, and not for its non-specific Undergoer.

(21) and (22) illustrate cases where the Subject of the matrix expression is expressed twice, by means of a pronoun in postpredicative position and a complex phrase. The complex phrase, while typically formally dependent, need not be, as is illustrated by (23):

(21) (she knows only too well how dearly Umbu Mada loves his foal) E

\[ \{\text{nù-ya-ka}_0 \}_x \quad \text{una} \quad \text{hi} \quad \text{na}_1 \text{-hidu} \quad \text{kapilandu}_0 \]
DEIC-3SG(ACC)-PFV DEIC.3SG CONJ 3SG(NOM)-ill simulate

‘It’s thus why she simulates being ill’ (Klamer 1998: 373/14)

(22) (Umbu Mada looks after his horsey) E

\[ \{\text{lai nù-ki-ya-i-ka}_0 \}_x \quad \text{duna} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{ngia} \quad \text{pa-haruva} \]
LOC DEIC-MOD-3SG(ACC)-ITER-PFV EMPH.3SG ART place O.REL-support
et-i-ná-duná nú]-
liver.3sg(gen) emph.3sg deic
‘It is there that he finds solace [lit. it is there the place where he supports his liver]’ (Klamer 1998: 373/16)

(23) (no, she always hits him, because she hates his guts) E
{{(nú-yá-ka)₂ una palu-palu-bia-na-nya-ka}}₇
deic.3sg(acc)-pfv deic.3sg red-hit-mod-3sg(acc)-3sg(dat)-pfv
[duná]₇
emph.3sg
‘It’s thus (why) she just hits him’ (Klamer 1998: 368/2)

‘Predification’ construction Besides the two clefting strategies discussed so far, Kambera features an additional construction that, while bearing some resemblance to clefting, is not quite similar to it. By means of introduction, compare (24) and (25):

(24) (my mum came from a foreign home)
{{dangu barang}₁₉ red [pa₁-ngandi-na}₇ weling la uma
much stuff obj.rel-take-3sg(gen) abl loc house
jawa]sbj, {na ina-nggu}₁ stranger art mother.1sg(gen)
‘much stuff is what she took from the foreign house, my mother’ (Klamer 1998: 385/6)

(24) is a cleft construction of the type discussed in section (18), where a proposition is realigned such that the focal part (dangu barang) is expressed as a simplex non-verbal predicate, and the non-focal part as a complex postpredicative Subject.

(25) (but when Rambu E was born,)
ama₁ pa₁-àw-na₄-na₂-nya₂-ka
father obj.rel-call-3sg(gen)-3sg(dat)-pfv ctr-work loc shop Sumba
pa-ràma la toko Sumba
‘Dad was whom he called to work in the Sumbanese toko.’ (Klamer 1998: 385/5)

In (25), the situation is different. While the Actor and Undergoer of the underlying proposition are cross-referenced on the verb by the Object relative marker pa- and the genitive pronominal -na, respectively, the head of the Object relative clause ‘whom he called to work in the Sumbanese toko’ also carries a dative pronominal -nya that does not appear to refer to any participant.

Klamer (1998: 154ff) provides a diachronic analysis of this construction, arguing that it may have derived historically from a Subjectless non-verbal predication with a possessed nominal predicate. The dative pronominal, used because the slot for accusative agreement is already taken by the genitive that marks the Actor of the non-verbal predication, is coreferential with the Subject of the superordinate
predication.\textsuperscript{12} Klamer reports that Kambera speakers reject modifications to this construction that result in separation of the genitive and dative clitic, and from this she concludes that GEN-nya sequences have grammaticalized to a single person marker, of which the -nya part has assumed a continuative aspect function. Under this analysis, expressions like (25) may be regarded normal nominal clauses of the kind discussed in (10).

The problem with this solution is the presence of the perfective marker -\textit{ka}, since perfectivity is logically incompatible with continuation. Second, if GEN-nya sequences have become fully grammaticalized in the continuative reading, one would expect this construction also to be possible with transitive predications, yielding a pronominal cluster in which GEN-nya is followed by another dative pronominal coreferential with the Undergoer argument. This is not the case, which to me is a clear indication that -nya has retained its status as a pronominal in its own right, rather than that of an aspectual marker. Therefore, I will treat instances of Klamer’s continuative as cases of a complex embedding construction that I will tentatively refer to as ‘predification’.\textsuperscript{13} Predification is very similar to clefting. However, while clefting is a syntactic process through which a single proposition is split in two parts that are then equated, predication addresses the superordinate logical procedure of converting something into a predicate, without this necessarily affecting the integrity of the input. Thus, while clefting entails predification, the reverse is not necessarily true.

The use of predification in Kambera appears to be the creation of a superordinate Subject role which can be used for the informational purpose of predicating relevance or the lack thereof. This is illustrated by (26). Here, the Subject position of the non-verbal predication is occupied by the anaphoric pronoun \textit{yena}, and that the construction is thus exploited to explicitly predicate relevance between the event of ‘\textit{x} not eating anymore’ and its Actor referent. While this may seem an overly complex strategy, it may be remembered that simple preverbal realization of the Subject in order to incite a categorical interpretation is restricted to those cases where the Subject referent is POset-related, which is not the case here. Also, simple omission of the Subject to indicate its topicality may not be possible either, given that the antecedent of \textit{yena}, ‘stepmother’, has not been mentioned for a long time and hence has to be evoked in order to avoid ambiguity.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12}Note that this analysis is not available for cases like (13), where both pronominals are clearly coreferential with core participants in the transitive predication.

\textsuperscript{13}This notion appears to have been coined in Cooke Brown (1999). I will not refer to this process as predicate formation (\textit{pf}) in the sense of (Dik 1997b), which is a lexical operation with strictly semantic scope, while predification is a grammatical operation with informational scope.

\textsuperscript{14}There is an interesting interaction between predification, and syntactic processes of desententialization (Lehmann 1988: 193). While Lehmann associates desententialization with the compression of semantic structure, examples like (26) show that predication, which also results in the input becoming desententialized, can be used to expand functional structure, by freeing up a structural position in order to give it an exclusively informational function. In this regard, predication is similar to certain uses of noun incorporation discussed in Mithun (1984), where incorporation is applied so that another
(26) (Umbu Ndilu is at a loss:) C
   [yena] → [nda nganggu-ma-na₁-i-pa yena]₃,
   DEIC.3SG NEG eat-EMPH-3SG.CONT-ITER-IMPF DEIC.3SG
   ‘This one, she isn’t eating anymore, (this stepmother, his wife).’ (Klamer 1998: 375/22)

Apparently, the Topical referent serving as the matrix Subject may either be focal or not. In (25), repeated here as (27), predification is used to convey an Identificational articulation:

(27) (but when Rambu E was born,) E
   [ama] → [pa-ão-na-nya-ka pa-ràma la toko father OBJ.REL-call-3SG(GEN)-3SG(DAT)-PFV CTR-work LOC shop Sumba]₃,
   Sumba
   ‘Dad was whom he [the Jap] called to work in the Sumbanese toko.’
   (Klamer 1998: 385/5)

The strategy can also be used without exploiting the additional Subject position, in which case an Entry-central Thetic articulation results:

(28) (end of discourse segment) B
   njadi [ana hakola-na₁-nya-ka ↳ una yena-ngga];
   so DIM school-3SG(GEN)-3SG(DAT)-PFV EMPH.3SG DEIC.3SG-MOD
   {i Umbu Mada}₁ nú ]₃,
   ART(PN) Umbu Mada DEIC
   ‘So (it happens that) this one, Umbu Mada is about to reach school-age.’
   (Klamer 1998: 369/3)

Finally, the construction also seems to have a use that is indeed aspectual. I tentatively labelled it ‘externalization’ here. A case in point is (29), which constitutes a Categorical articulation. What seems to motivate the embedding of the intransitive predication as the predicate of a higher non-verbal predication here, is the desire of the narrator to ‘zoom out’, and take a helicopter view. In this usage, the predification construction seems to capitalize on its desententionalization capabilities, like the nominal clauses discussed in (12).

(29) (When Umbu Mada’s father is not there,) C
   [∅] → [laku-ma-ki-a-na₁-nya-ka u-na₁ nàhu];
   go-EMPH-MOD-MOD-3SG.CONT-PFV DEIC-3SG there
   ‘...she is just sneaking out there’ (Klamer 1998: 370/5)

**Left dislocation construction**  A final strategy employed in Kambera is one where one referent is evoked separate from the clause it belongs to. It seems that this element can assume the vacant slot in surface structure.
strategy is employed for given Topics that have not been evoked for a while, as well as for Undergoer Topics. It is not clear to what extent the existential marker *jia* influences this strategy, although it may be noted that in (31), a conditional construction appears to be used to introduce a new Topic, similar to cases discussed in Haiman (1978).

(30) (new discourse segment)

\[ njadi [nuna]_\# \ldots \left[ nda na-wua-nya-pa \quad pa-ngangu \right. \] 
thus DEIC.3SG NEG 3SG(NOM)-give-3SG(DAT)-IMPF OBJ.REL-eat
\[ i \quad Umbu Mada una]_\# \]
ART Umbu Mada DEIC.3SG
‘So she (when Umbu Ndilu goes to the garden to get something), she doesn’t food-give Umbu Mada.’ (Klamer 1998: 368/1)

(31) (no context)

\[ j` aka \quad da \quad banda \quad [\quad banda-nda-ma-nya]\]_\#
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]’ (Klamer 1998: 156/34)

**Tariana**

**Tariana informational properties**

Figure 11 gives the informatogram of Tariana, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that four coding strategies can be distinguished.

Of all languages analysed so far, Tariana dedicates least of its morphosyntactic resources to information packaging, favouring the expression of coherence and referent management. The language commands an extensive array of strategies to indicate how events in a story relate to one another, or to convey the assumed familiarity of referents figuring in that story. Addressation and actualization instructions in Tariana are much less prominent in the expression, and rely primarily on constituent order permutations (and probably, intonation).

Aikhenvald (2003: 562ff) remarks that three topological fields in the Tariana sentence have informational relevance: the postpredicative slot, which is reserved for constituents with special emphasis because their referents are contrastive and/or need to be disambiguated, the prepredicative slot which is the default position for non-Subject referents, and the sentence-initial position which is associated with Topicality. Closer inspection reveals that much of what is covered by Aikhenvald’s

---

15Klamer (1998: 86) cites one non-contextualized example of a preverbal lexical Object used as Topic, in a construction strongly resembling a passive. However, given the source (a bible translation) and the fact that no corroborraion for this construction is found in the discourse data, I have not considered Object preposing to be a viable Topicalization strategy in Kambera.
notion of topicality in my approach should be classified as referent management and/or discourse cohesion; nevertheless, it seems fair to say that the left side of the clause is the preferred locus for the expression of Topical referents that have no further special significance.

**Tariana examples**

**SOV construction** Even though no predominant constituent order can be established on the basis of the available data (Aikhenvald 2003: 562), Tariana is typologically consistent with SOV basic constituent order. Assertions exhibiting this order are relatively rare, mostly because given Subject referents strongly tend not to be expressed by means of independent DPs at all. When they are, though, they pattern as Topics of Entry-central Categorical articulations almost without exception. Examples are given in (1)-(2). The elements preceding an independent preverbal Subject do not express categories relevant to information packaging, but rather seem to be engaged in the expression of discourse coherence. These are not only sequencing and tail-head linkage devices as in (1), but can also be elements that evoke the protagonists of a story, as in (2).

(1) (The Yanomami chieftain ordered his followers to desist) C
ne-na [nha], [kaya-na nhematha-na-niki na-yarupe-ne]r.
then-RPV 3PL thus-RPV 3PL:shout-RPV-CMP 3PL:language-INST.
‘Then they shouted like this in their language.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 574)

(2) (We were standing among them, and) C
[wa-na ne-na [diha nekana], di-retan di-pe-na]r.
1PL-NSBJ then-RPV ART 3PL:chief 3SGNF-order:CAUS 3SGNF-leave-RPV
‘...then (for) us their chieftain ordered them to leave it.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 633/15)

Overt evocation of Topical Subjects typically occurs when a change is made from one given Topic to another. If the Topic is kept stable, Subject evocation is exceedingly rare, although (3) seems to present evidence that it is possible:

(3) (Thunder acted as if offering a pepperpot) C
so 3SGNF-do 3SGNF-SBJ 3SGNF-see-SR fish-RPR
3SGNF 3SGNF-eat-RPR
‘When he did it, he [the brother] seeing it, it was fish. He ate.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 640/13)

The Subject may be marked with tense-evidential clitics, as in (4). However, the correlation between the occurrence of such ‘floating’ tense-evidential clitics and the informational articulation conveyed is rather unsystematic. This is clearly illustrated when (4) is compared to (5): while both have tense-evidential marking
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on the Subject, in (5) an interpretation in terms Identificational Focus is ruled out by the context.

(4) (Now only one thing is lacking, they said) E
\[[\text{diha-pidana}], [\text{hipatu-nuku di-de}]\]
\[3\text{SGNF-RPR snuff-NSBJ 3SGNF-have}\]
‘He [Thunder] has snuff (and we do not).’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 641/17)

(5) (It is not like Thunder gives away snuff to everybody) C
\[[\text{diha-pidana}], [\text{kuphe-nuku dhita}]\]
\[3\text{SGNF-RPR fish-NSBJ 3SGNF:bring 3SGNF:come-RPR}\]
‘He brought fish (, broke it and put it down).’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 642/23)

It seems that floating tense-evidential markers convey a more general kind of emphasis or highlighting which, given the proper context, may aid in the disambiguation of what is focal and what is not. They do not, however, constitute an expression strategy for information packaging in its own right. Accordingly, their occurrence will not be considered separately in the analysis.

In sum, the Subject position conveys Topics, the identity of which may be focussed. Turning now to the ‘Object’ position, the referent evoked there typically is construed as part of a focal Comment as in most of the examples discussed so far. It should be noted that case marking of non-Subjects in that position does not seem to affect the informational articulation that is conveyed. For instance, the overt marking of \textit{hipatu-nuku} in (4) seems to mark the activation state of the referent ‘snuff’ rather than its status as a (expectant) Topic. In fact, ‘snuff’ does not make it to Topic status at any stage in the discourse, despite it being a central concept in the development of the story.\footnote{The most plausible explanation is that ‘snuff’, as well as most of the other case marked non-Subjects, are inanimate while the protagonists are animate.}

Also, (6) illustrates that the preverbal position can be exploited to convey Identificational Focus on non-Subject referent without the use of overt case marking:

(6) (They took us, and made it fearsome for us) E
\[\emptyset \], \[[\text{nya yawithepu-pe}]\], \[[\text{nya kwaka-nha}]\]
\[3\text{PL bow-PL 3PL what-PRS.VIS.INTER 3PL}\]
\[[\text{na-muru-nita-pe}]\], \[[\text{heku-pada-pe}]\], \[[\text{na-de-na}]\]
\[3\text{PL-pierce-ACNR:CLF-PL wood-CLF-PL 3PL-have-RPV}\]
‘They had their bows, their what else?, their spears, pieces of wood.’
(Aikhenvald 2003: 633/14)

That is not to say that overt case marking (or, for that matter, floating tense-evidential marking) is incompatible with a special informational interpretation. As is illustrated by (7), preverbal non-Subjects can very well be identically focussed:

(7) (She went up there with her husband’s brother. He was also there) E
Aikhenvald (2003: 479ff) observes that NPs may be expressed discontinuously to convey certain pragmatic distinctions. Again, the categories concerned mainly seem to be related to referent management. An example of a discontinuous non-Subject NP is given (9); according to Aikhenvald, an approximate translation could be ‘and we arrived at – guess what – the mouth of that river’.

(9) (we went upstream, and) C

\[ \text{[\{\text{diha wa-patu-na} \}_1 \text{ART 1PL-arrive-RPV ART-CLF mouth}]} \]

‘...arrived at the mouth of that river.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 630/4)

The case in (10) is interesting, because it seems to suggest that the relevant preverbal position for focal elements is not necessarily the immediately preverbal slot, but may also be further to the left. The evidence is inconclusive, but it may be that non-specific, unmarked non-Subjects are more closely linked to the verb, which enables the interpretation typically associated with the preverbal position to ‘shift’ further to the left:

(10) (You are Yapirikuri, she said) E

\[ \text{[\{\text{nu-ha-ni}_R \}_1 \text{1SG-parent-M elsewhere-RPV tobacco 3SGNF-have 3SGNF-stay-ANT}]} \]

‘My father was keeping tobacco ELSEWHERE.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 639/5)

Because an argument could be made that yema and dide form a single unit in (10), I will group the expression strategy used there under the same label as the other examples seen so far. In sum, (S)OV clauses in Tariana convey Entry-central Categorical and Identificational articulations.

Furthermore, it seems that SOV order can also be used to convey Address-central Categorical articulations, as is shown in (11):

(11) (the fire was everywhere, it took all) D

\[ \text{[\{\text{hiwe kasiwa} \}_1 \text{lizard small_crocodile smoke-DIM:PL-RPV 3PL:take}]} \]

‘A lizard and a small crocodile took little bits of the fire.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 646/44)
In this light, presentational constructions like (12c), which convey an Address-central Thetic articulation, are also relevant. That is, Aikhenvald (2003: 250) points out that first arguments of prefixless copulas are real Subjects, and not Objects underlyingly, as can be seen from the overt case marking they may take.

(12) (End of segment. New scene)
   a. [∅]: $\{\text{dusa } \text{du-a}\}_{3}$
      $3\text{SGF:go}_\text{up} 3\text{SGF:go}$
   b. [∅]: $\{(\text{du-siri-ne})_{2} \text{du-a-pidana}\}_{3}$
      $3\text{SGF:husband’s_brother-INST} 3\text{SGF:go-RPR}$
   c. $\{\text{du-siri-tiki alia-pidana}\}_{3}$
      $3\text{SG-husband’s_brother-DIM EXIST-RPR}$
   d. [∅]: $\{(\text{di-na-pidana})_{2} \text{dhuta dusa du-a}\}_{3}$
      $3\text{SGF:NSBJ-RPR} 3\text{SG:bring} 3\text{SG:go}_\text{up} 3\text{SG:go}$

‘She went up there. She went with her husband’s brother. There was a younger husband’s brother. Him she brought up there.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 639/8)

Finally, the construction can be used to convey Entry-central Thetic articulations as in (13)-(15). Note that -ni, which Aikhenvald (2003: 283ff) analyses as a ‘Topic advancement marker’ in most cases behaves like a general nominalizing suffix. In (13b), an example is given of Identificational Focus on the complement of such a nominalization.

(13) (yes, I have tobacco, Thunder said to her) B
   a. $\{\text{di-mita-ni-kayama-re } \text{di-swa-pidana}\}_{3}$
      $3\text{SGF-smoke-ACNR-CLF-POSS} 3\text{SGF-stay-RPR}$
   b. $\{(\text{diha kuphe kayu})_{2} \text{di-mita-ni-kayama-re } \text{di-swa-pidana}\}_{3}$
      $\text{ART fish as } 3\text{SGF-smoke-ACNR-CLF-POSS} 3\text{SGF-stay-RPR}$

‘A smoking grid was [lit. stayed] there. A smoking grid for fish was there.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 640/11)

(14) (In the beginning, we had everything) B
   $\{\text{hi yema sede-sina walikasu}\}_{3}$
   $\text{DEM.GNR tobacco NEG.EXIST-RPI in_the_beginning}$
   ‘(But) this tobacco did not exist in the beginning.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 638/3)

(15) (End of discourse segment) B
   $\{\text{pa-da daikina-pidana uni-se-pidana keraphe-da nhepa}\}_{3}$
   $\text{one-CLF afternoon-RPR water-LOC-RPR flame-CLF appear-PAUS}$
   ‘In the afternoon, flames appeared on the water.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 646/44)
**Postverbal Subject construction** Postverbal Subject referents occur frequently. One of the main uses of this order seems to be the conveyance of Address-central Categorical articulations. This is illustrated in (16) and (17), where ‘Yapirikuru’ and ‘Yapirikuru’s wife’ are both evoked for the first time.

(16) (But tobacco did not exist in the beginning) D
\[
\begin{array}{c}
yema \quad sede-ka \quad di-ka]_\gamma \\
\text{tobacco \ NEG.EXIST-SR \ 3SGNF-see \ DEM,GNR \ what’s_his_name}
\end{array}
\]
‘This one what’s-his-name [Yapirikuru] saw that there was no tobacco.’
(Aikhenvald 2003: 638/3)

(17) (Having no tobacco, Yapirikuru smoked leaves) D
\[
\begin{array}{c}
pana-phe \ di-sita-ka \quad du-ka]_\gamma \\
\text{leaf-CLF \ 3SGNF-smoke-SR \ 3SG-see \ 3SGNF-spouse-F}
\end{array}
\]
‘His wife saw him smoke leaves.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 638/4)

In (18), the postverbal Subject strategy is used to convey an Entry-central Categorical articulation.

(18) (we arrived at a plain where a lofty mountain was standing) C
\[
\begin{array}{c}
diha-na \ ithani-se \ waka-ka-na]_\gamma \\
\text{ART-CLF \ near-LOC \ 1PL:arrive-DECL-RPV \ 1PL}
\end{array}
\]
‘We arrived close to this mountain.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 632/10)

**Fronting construction** Postverbal Subjects also occur in circumstances where they are very clearly not focal. For instance in (19), the Topic ‘the Yanomami’ is continued, but the Subject is expressed postverbally. In (20), ‘Thunder’ has been mentioned before and is now reinstated as the Topic of the assertion.

(19) (The Yanomami shouted like this in their language) E
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{ma\-nhina-na-na\}_\gamma \quad \{nha\}_\gamma \\
\text{be_difficult-EXC-RPV \ 3PL}
\end{array}
\]
‘Difficult they were (to understand).’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 574)

(20) (End of segment. Explanatory remark by narrator) E
\[
\begin{array}{c}
yenu-ni-se-pidana \quad \{diha \textenu\}_\gamma \\
\text{sky-AFFMT-LOC-RPR \ ART \ Thunder}
\end{array}
\]
‘Up in the sky Thunder is.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 639/7)

(21) (I will tell you a story) E
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{i\textif\}_\gamma \quad \{nawiki\}_\gamma \quad nu-ka-nipe-de \quad nu-kalite-de\]_\gamma \\
\text{yanomami people \ 1SG \ 1SG-see-ACNR-FUT.EVD \ 1SG-tell-FUT.EVD}
\end{array}
\]
‘About the Yanomami I will tell what I saw myself.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 630/1)

It seems that in all four cases, the left-most element is focussed, and the Subject is expressed postverbally in order to realize the focal element as the first element of
the clause. The same could be true for (22). Here, the previous assertion contained the exact same information; the only added value of (22) is to Focus the unexpected and highly informative fact that, of all possible candidates, the old widow married a deer.

(22) (There was widow who had children with a deer) E
\[\{\text{neeri-ne-pidana}\}_p \text{ du-henita}\].
\text{deer-instr-rpr} \quad \text{3SGF-remarry PST.parent-FEM.NOM.PST-FEM}

‘With a deer she remarried, the old widow.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 652/4)

**Topic advancement construction** It has been mentioned in (13) that Aikhenvald’s ‘topic advancement’ in most cases can be analysed as a type of nominalization, the occurrence of which is not informationally conditioned. There are a few scattered instances of this construction however, that really seem to serve the purpose of promoting something to an informational status it could not easily be assigned otherwise. Consider (23):

(23) (The house that they inhabited was large, a big house) E
\[\text{nha}\]. \[\{\text{iine-dapana}\}_p \text{ na-ni-dapana}\].
\text{3PL spirit-clf} \quad \text{3PL.call-TOP.ADV-CLF}

‘They called it spirit house.’ (Aikhenvald 2003: 630/1)

The classifier agreement between ‘verb’ and Object in this example seems to suggest that they form a nominal constituent, but this is not easily reconciled with the interpretation. Alternatively, it could be argued that this realignment strategy simply serves to get the focal element in canonical preverbal position.

**Begak**

**Begak informational properties**

Figure 12 gives the informatogram of Begak, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that six coding strategies can be distinguished.

**Begak examples**

**Canonical construction** Begak has a semantically determined VAU constituent order with a preverbal Subject position. The language has a three-way tense/aspect system, distinguishing past, non-past and neutral tense (cf. also Moody 1991). It has a voice system similar to that of Tagalog and other Philippine languages, in which the argument promoted to Subject is marked on the verb by means of a corresponding voice inflection. Unlike Tagalog, only core arguments can be promoted this way (Goudswaard 2005: 120). Goudswaard (2005: 116) argues
Figure 12  Begak informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
that only fronted arguments are Subjects while arguments in their semantically
determined position are not, irrespective of voice marking.

Subjects are privileged syntactic arguments in Begak: they are the only consti-
tuents that can be relativized, and the only ones to figure in raising and control
constructions. Their reference must be definite, and only Subjects can be omitted
when contextually retrievable. The semantically determined, Subjectless constituent
order without overt voice marking I will label the canonical expression strategy. It is
one of two ‘unmarked’ expression strategies in Begak (Goudswaard 2005: 386), and
also the most versatile one informationally, covering three of the five articulations
that were defined for this study. In (1) and (2), examples are given of the canonical
expression strategy conveying a Entry-central Categorical articulation:

(1) (Tempitut and Mousedeer were playing)

\[
{[titik-tambur \text{kat}]}_{S} - \text{[Tikung-korow]}_{C} - {[biluk \text{kat}]}_{S} - {[Polanuk]}_{T}
\]
play_drums CDM Tempitut dance CDM Mousedeer
‘Tempitut played the drums, and Mousedeer danced’ (Goudswaard
2005: 408/25)

The most typical usage of the canonical strategy seems to be the expression of a
Entry-central Categorical articulation where a new referent is introduced as the
Undergoer argument. Examples are given in (2) and (3).

(2) (along the way,)

\[
{[t\text{ogbuk} [miro]}_{C} - {Polanuk]}_{S}
\]
meet 3PL Mousedeer
‘...they came across Mousedeer.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 406/8)

(3) (They went along the river, and)

\[
{[t\text{ogbuk} [miro]}_{C} - \text{R\text{\textregistered}ngog]}_{S}
\]
meet 3PL R\textregisteredngog
‘...they came across R\textregisteredngog.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 419/89)

The second articulation this strategy can convey is the Address-central Categorical
one that construes a new Topic. An example is given in (4).

(4) (so while P. was working the field,)

\[
{[ratu' [bu'a' t\text{ogwakwak}]}_{T} - \text{sakko ttas langit]}_{S}
\]
fall fruit t\text{ogwakwak} from top sky
‘...a t\text{ogwakwak} fruit fell from the sky.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 422/3)

Finally, the assertion in (5) illustrates how the canonical strategy can be exploited
to convey and Address-central Thetic articulation as well. It may be noted that,
while bua' t\text{ogwakwak} in (4) was a non-controlling S\text{U} argument, ulun in (5) is a
controlling S\text{A} argument.

(5) (The t\text{ogwakwak} fruit broke, and)
[buruy ulun]♀.
stand person
‘... (there) stood a person.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 422/5)

**S–V–U, controlling Subject**  The other unmarked expression strategy is that with a [+Control] Subject, signalled by AV-marking on the predicate. This expression strategy is typically used to convey Categorical assertions, as in (6). In (6b), it is shown that the Subject referent may be dropped when contextually retrievable:

(6)  (There was a deity called Pəngəlimo.)
\[Pəngəlimo]\, [bo-kaung umo]♀,
P. AV-burn ricefield
AV-LV-work ricefield
b. ‘P. burnt the ricefield, worked the ricefield.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 422/2)

In (7), the Topicality of the Subject referent is highlighted by means of the marker *ton*:

(7)  (What is it, Mousedeer asked)
suga’ [Pəlanuk ton], [ga-runi sakko di’ dtu’]♀.
but Mousedeer TOP AV-speak from LOC far
‘But Mousedeer spoke from far away.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 418/80)

In (8), we have an S\_A argument in Subject function (as can be told from the fact that it is omitted) combined with neutral tense. I have classified neutral tense as part of the Subject-active expression strategy.

(8)  (Thereupon, Mousedeer took a cloth)
\[∅]\, [am-tuan]♀.
SEQ NEUT-wrap_in_cloth
a. sa’ [∅]\, [am-tuan]♀.
SEQ NEUT-wrap
b. \[∅]\, [təmuvan]♀,
NEUT:wrap
c. \[∅]\, [mə-kkos kasu’]♀,
NEUT-LV-tie foot
d. \[∅]\, [mə-kkos ppi’]♀,
NEUT-LV-tie arm
‘... and wrapped [dead baby Civet]. (He) wrapped (it), tied (its) feet, tied (its) arms,’ (Goudswaard 2005: 411/41-2)

An example with a core development marker is given in (9):

(9)  (They had barely started playing, when Baby Civet began to cry)
\[leppap kat [Pəlanuk], m-uat anak rənəŋgon sakko\]
immediately CDM Mousedeer NEUT-pick_up child Civet

\[∅]\, [mə-kkos ppi’]♀,
NEUT-LV-tie arm
‘... and wrapped [dead baby Civet]. (He) wrapped (it), tied (its) feet, tied (its) arms,’ (Goudswaard 2005: 411/41-2)
Immediately, Mousedeer picked up baby Civet from that cradle and put him to sleep on the floor.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 408/22)

Another use of this strategy is to express Identificational Focus on the Undergoer argument, as illustrated in (10b) – (10c):

(10) (end of segment) E
   a. jadi, [apon jadi [miro], m@ng-bunu’ nong P@lanuk],
      so NEG become[Malay] 3PL AV-kill OBL Mousedeer
   b. [ø] [m@ng-bunu’ nong (Tikung-k@row)],
      AV-kill OBL Tempitut-bird
   c. [ø] [m@ng-bunu’ (P@sawow)],
      AV-kill Prawn

‘So, it did not happen that they killed Mousedeer, killed Tempitut bird, killed Prawn,’ (Goudswaard 2005: 420/93)

The example is (11) illustrates what is commonly classified as a contrastive Topic construction, which involves the same event and the same referents twice, but with the referents in reversed semantic functions. As can be seen, such contrastive Topics morphosyntactically behave exactly similar to their non-contrastive counterparts. In (11b), the information that is conveyed is the Undergoer status of the referent that served as the Actor in (11a). It is therefore the Identificational Focus of the assertion.

(11) (Tempitut and Mousedeer blame each other) E
   a. [satu] [m@ng-tagbis suru anan satu],
      one AV-blame direct place one
   b. [satu ino] [da m@ng-tagbis (sru anan satu ino)],
      one DEM PROG AV-blame direct place one DEM

‘One blamed the other, and the other blamed the first.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 410/37)

V–A–U with voice inflection In Begak the presence of overt Actor Voice marking licenses promotion of the Actor argument to Subject. This is not necessary, however, and occasionally AV marking is attested in combination with the semantically motivated constituent order as well. Goudswaard (2005: 386) analyses this as a ‘marked’ construction, used to indicate thematic continuity. It is not entirely clear what she takes this to mean; moreover, based on the narrative data available in the grammar, it appears that the construction marks discontinuity rather than continuity. In particular, the use of this construction seems to be to detopicalize the
Actor argument, and to present an event a single chunk of information, typically to mark the transition from one segment to another, as in (12):

(12) (end of segment) B
    [da buay, k-uli’ iro gamo Rānggon]>
    PROG long AV.NV-go_home COLL couple Civet
    ‘At long last, Mr. and Mrs. Civet came home.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 411/44)

Even though ‘Mr. and Mrs. Civet’ have served as the Topic earlier in the story, there as been a long intermittent piece of discourse about two other protagonists. An example with core development marking is given in (13):

(13) (end of segment) B
    jadi, [na go-lisang kat Tikung-korow bio Pālanuk]>
    so PRT AV-play CDMP Tempitut bird and Mousedeer
    ‘So, they were playing, Tempitut bird and Mousedeer.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 408/24)

In (14), the asserted event is one of a long series that describes the ancestry of Begak weather deities. Again, these are posited as isolated events, and the AV marking is used:

(14) (Thunderstorm is already in heaven with his mother) B
    dadi [bōg-nak Lappit anu Bariot Tembasung]>
    so AV-child Thunderstorm whatever Flash Tembasung
    ‘So Thunderstorm, er..., Flash gave birth to Tembasung.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 430/55)

In (15), a sudden event is posited, and again the SA argument is realized postverbally:

(15) (but they had barely started to play) B
    [tota’ anak Rānggon]>
    NEUT:cry child Civet
    ‘When baby Civet began to cry.’(Goudswaard 2005: 408/21)

Another use of this construction is to place Identificational Focus on an Actor argument. Notably, this seems to involve the suppression of the Undergoer argument.

(16) (The bridegroom has to sing first) E
    [bog-aus]>
    AV-bring chief DEM
t    ‘The HEADMAN invites (him).’ (Goudswaard 2005: 445/7)

S–V–(A), non-controlling Subject  Non-controlling Subjects can either be Undergoer arguments of transitive predications, in which case the Actor argument must be
expressed in its semantically determined postverbal position in Genitive case, or $S_U$ arguments of intransitive predications. An example of the latter (in which the Subject is dropped) is given in (17).

(17) \[(suddenly, a \text{ tawakwak fruit fell from the sky})\]
\[
[\emptyset], \{\text{sawot nong buta' no nong kilid rumo ne}\}.
\]
\[
\text{arrive OBL earth DEM OBL side 3SG DEM}
\]
\[
\text{‘(it) came down on the earth beside him.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 422/4)}
\]

**U–V–A with voice inflection** I noted in section (16) that Undergoer Topics do not seem to occur. Nevertheless, Undergoer arguments may appear preverbally, but are interpreted as Identificational Focus when they do, as in (18)-(19).

(18) \[(\text{Tempitut bird asked Mousedeer: you like to play games?})\]
\[
[\{\text{nu lisang}_G a-tow}\}]. \{\text{mo}\}?,
\]
\[
\text{what play NVOL-know 2SG.GEN}
\]
\[
\text{‘What play do you know?’ (Goudswaard 2005: 407/12)}
\]

(19) \[(\text{Why has Mousedeer left before we came home? After all,})\]
\[
[\{\text{ino rumo}_G ni-arab} \{\text{kito}\} \text{ bog-ami’ nong mar@kang ino}\}.
\]
\[
\text{DEM 3SG PST-find 1PL AV-babysit OBL baby DEM}
\]
\[
\text{‘...Him we found to look after yonder baby.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 414/56)}
\]

**Periphrastic Topic marking** A final construction is one that we have seen before in other languages as well, notably in Ma’di. It is illustrated in (20).

(20) \[(\text{The Civets wanted to go creeling})\]
\[
\text{jadi [i\text{ro gamo Rqnggon ton, akay anak}]},
\]
\[
\text{so COLL couple Civet TOP EXIST child}
\]
\[
\text{‘So as for the Civets, there was a child,’ (Goudswaard 2005: 406/7)}
\]

(21) \[(\text{The Civets went on their way})\]
\[
\text{[mi\text{ro ton}], [\text{malu’ panow moniud}]},
\]
\[
\text{3PL TOP DES go AV:creel}
\]
\[
\text{‘As for them, they wanted to go creeling.’ (Goudswaard 2005: 405/6)}
\]

Here, an intransitive stative predication that introduces a new participant (which is not a Topic at this stage in the discourse) is ‘enriched’ by predicating relevance between it and the established Topic ‘the Civets’. Because ‘the Civets’ are not a core participant in the (inherently intransitive) existential clause, this type of relevance predication cannot be classified under one of the existing strategies.
Tidore

Tidore informational properties

Figure 13 gives the informatogram of Tidore, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that five coding strategies can be distinguished.

Tidore examples

Canonical construction The canonical expression strategy of Tidore conforms to the semantically determined AVU constituent order. As can be seen in (1), the strategy can be used to express an Entry-central Categorical articulation:

(1) (She did not speak) C
[mina], [duga sango una sarat].
3SGF  only  answer 3SGM sign
‘She only answered him with signs.’ (Van Staden 2000: 363/42)

(2) (father said ‘go home’) C
aha turus, [ona], [wako].
ah then  3PL  return
‘Ah, then they went home’ (Van Staden 2000: 404/435)

Also, the strategy can be used to convey Identificational Focus as in (3) and (4):

(3) (Thus they lived, they had a child, Ternate) E
  a. dadi [ngofa Tarnate], [ngofa toma kayangan].
     so  child  Ternate  child  LOC  heaven
  b. ∅ [ngofa (ka-re) ua].
     child  PRED-here  NEG

‘So Ternate was a child from heaven. Not a child from here.’ (Van Staden 2000: 403/425)

(4) (Tortoise fooled Monkey, because) B
∅ [yadi ua] se ∅ [rica].
jambu NEG  but  chilly_pepper
‘... (it’s) not jambu but PEPPER.’ (Van Staden 2000: 419/70)

Finally, it seems that the canonical strategy is compatible with Entry-central Thetic articulation, as illustrated in (5). Thetic assertions appear extremely infrequently in Tidore, (5) being the only unambiguous case in a 250-page text corpus.

(5) (what’s this now?) B
Figure 13  Tidore informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
Assertions that occur at the beginning of new discourse segments strongly tend to exploit this expression strategy as well. Even though most of these cannot possibly be interpreted as Thetic assertions, it is remarkable that this strategy is consistently preferred over the one discussed in section (5) below.

**Actor prefixing construction**

Predications with an actor prefix are necessarily interpreted as Entry-central Categorical assertions. That is, the thetic interpretation that is available for predications that lack the prefix appears to be out of the question for their prefixed counterparts. Illustrations are given in (6) and (7):

(6) (The way this story begins is with a traveller from Arabia)  
\[ \text{una}_{3SGM} \rightarrow [\text{wo-ado \ ka-re}]_{3SGM.A-arrive \ PRED-here} \]  
‘He arrived here [on the island].’  
(Van Staden 2000: 358/2)

(7) (Whatever there was to be organized, Jafar Sadik organized)  
\[ \text{waktu} \rightarrow \text{walo-moi}, \text{una}_{3SGM}, [\text{wo-tagi \ usu \ bangla}]_{3SGM.A-go \ enter \ forest} \]  
‘One day, he went into the forest.’  
(Van Staden 2000: 359/9)

**Framing construction**

Tidore has a semantically determined AVU constituent order. In addition, it has a special position preceding the Actor, where a core participant can be evoked instead. Such ‘framed’ constituents (Van Staden 2000: 271ff) are necessarily marked by one of the activation state markers `enage / ngge` or `enare / nde`. If this is the case, the interpretation of the assertion is necessarily that of an Entry-central Categorical articulation, as is shown in (8)-(10) for framed Objects, Beneficiaries and Actors, respectively:

(8) (You’ve played quite enough tricks on me!)  
\[ \text{ngona \ nde}_{2SG} \rightarrow [\text{ngoto \ fikir \ labilaha \ ngoto \ koru \ ngona \ nde}]_{3NHUM:here \ 1SG.A \ think \ better \ 1SG.A \ kill \ 2SG \ 3NHUM:here \ sone \ ka-re}]_{3NHUM:here} \]  
‘As for you, I think I better kill you (so that) you die here.’  
(Van Staden 2000: 420/86)

(9) (The Kakandepag informs us that haji candidates have to pay their fees at the local branch of the BRI)  
\[ \text{dadi \ te \ ona \ calon \ jama \ haji \ toma \ daera \ ena=re}]_{3NHUM=here} \]  
so LOC 3PL candidate plurality haji LOC area 3NHUM=here
[Kakandepag so-nyota suba se salam].

k. CAUS-NR.send praise and greeting

‘So to all haji candidates the Kakandepag sends praise and greetings’
(Van Staden 2000: 514/17)

(10) (Monkey finds out about Tortoise’s scam)
ala getege gira [Jafa Laba ngge], wo-hawaa.
lord thus long Monkey 3:there 3SGM.A-angry

‘Well then, Monkey became angry.’ (Van Staden 2000: 417/55)

The example in (11) shows the same for a nominal predicate:

(11) (There will be a flag ceremony to celebrate scouting day)
se dadi [inspektur upacara=ge Bupati . . . ] [ o-selaku
and CNJ inspector ceremony=there Bupati 3SGM.A-also
kapabigus kwarcap Halteng],
head of scouting Halteng

‘...and the inspector of this ceremony, the Bupati (of this region) is also
the head of scouting in Halteng.’ (Van Staden 2000: 512)

It seems that framed Topics can be either given or new, which gives rise to another
use of this construction, namely to convey Address-central Categorical articulations
as illustrated in (12) and (13):

(12) (Tortoise planted bananas close to the seashore)
getege rai ma-suru rai [Jafa Ori koi
thus already 3NHUM.POSS-long already Jafa Tortoise banana
ena=re] [ngolo yo-dahe],
3NHUM=here sea 3NHUM.A-find

‘Thus, a long time later, Tortoise’s bananas the sea found [them].’
(Van Staden 2000: 411/3)

(13) (I will now read the main points of the news)
[ upacara . . . ena=re] [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.’ (Van Staden 2000: 511/8)

Bare nominals Bare nominals are consistently used to introduce new Topical
referents in Address-central Thetic articulations. This is typical at the start of
discourse, as in (14), where both referents evoked serve as Topics later on in the
narrative:

(14) (start of narrative)
The same construction is also encountered when a new Topical referent is introduced in the midst of the narrative, as in (15) and (16):

(15) (Jafar Sadik sat down to think) A
\[
kage yali=ge \ [kumikuni]_\parallel
\]
moment again=there butterfly
‘The next moment (there was) a butterfly’ (Van Staden 2000: 401/403)

(16) (A man going to an island. New segment) A
\[
a. \ turus [una]_\parallel \ [[tagi ia]]_\parallel,
\]
so 3SGM go that\_way
\[
b. \ [no-nau \ romoi \ ena=ge]_\parallel
\]
NR\_male one 3NHUM\_there
‘So he went on his way (and there was) this man’ (Van Staden 2000: 429/11)

Note that in (16), the new Topic ‘this man’ is marked upon its first introduction by the activation state marker enage, combined by a non-specificity marker rimoi.

A more complex case is given in (17), which also occurs at the start of discourse. Here, the new referent is again introduced by means of a bare nominal, but is preceded by a nange-clause. According to Van Staden (2000: 299ff), such ‘relative clauses’ are used to “retrieve known information”. Here, the clause does not convey any information by itself (after all, it is self-evident that the story begins here, there is little communicative purpose in getting that information across), but rather sets the stage for the introduction of the central protagonist.

(17) (start of discourse) A
\[
carita tuju putri, \ ena=re=ge \ ena \ ma-asal \ awal
\]
story seven woman 3NHUM\_here=there 3NHUM 3NHUM\_POSS\_roots begin
\[
nange=ge \ [musafir \ rimoi \ dari \ tana \ Arab]_\parallel
\]
just\_there\_traveller one from land Arabia
‘The story of the seven beauties, the way its beginnings are is (with) a traveller from Arabia.’ (Van Staden 2000: 358/1)

Double evocation Double evocation of referents tends to be rare in most contexts, but occurs a number of times when an Actor referent is introduced as new Topic. In (18)-(20), we see examples where a new referent is introduced as a Topic in an Address-central Thetic assertion:

(18) (end of segment) A
\[
suru ua=ge, \ gufu roi \ [gufu sang \ rimoi]_\parallel \ yo-soro
\]
long NEG\_there fly fly\_around fly bluebottle one 3NHUM\_A\_fly
‘Before long, a fly was flying around, a bluebottle fly was flying this way.’
(Van Staden 2000: 397/362)

(19) (Jafar Sadik was at a loss how to separate the sugar and sand) A
suru ua=ge bifi, [bifi toma dunya nde]ₚ ma-polu ino
long NEG=there ant ant LOC world 3NHUM:here RFL-collect this way
ka-ge moi-moi.
PREP-here RED-one
‘Before long ants, ants from all over the world gathered there.’
(Van Staden 2000: 390/291)

(20) (Jafar Sadik was at a loss how to remove the oil from the water) A
ma kage yali=ge nyao nguci-nguci se ... nyao serompet se,
but moment again=there fish RED-spit and fish trumpet and
[ena=ge]ₚ ma-polu ino.
3NHUM=there RFL-gather this way.
‘After a moment, spittle fish as well as trumpet fish, they gathered.’
(Van Staden 2000: 392/313)

The same construction can also be used to express a Entry-central Categorical
articulation in which the Topical referent has not been mentioned for a while, and
has to be retrieved. Examples are given in (21) and (22):

(21) (Jafar Sadik broke off a branch) C
wo-tongo=ge [ona ngai-tomdii toma talaga ma-dova
3SGM.A-break=there 3PL CLF-seven LOC lake 3NHUM.Poss-inside
nange]ₚ, [ona kage]ₚ
REL 3PL be_shocked
‘Breaking it, them seven in the lake, they got scared.’ (Van Staden
2000: 361/22)

(22) (Monkey threw down some of the bananas and others he ate,) C
padahal [koi (yang kam tora toma saloi ena=ge)ₚ ] [ena]ₚ,
however banana REL fill downwards LOC bag 3NHUM=there 3NHUM
[yoso tora sorai]ₚ,
leak downwards all
‘...but the bananas he threw down into the bag they all fell through.’
(Van Staden 2000: 417/49)
Hixkaryana

Hixkaryana informational properties

Figure 14 gives the informatogram of Hixkaryana, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that four coding strategies can be distinguished.

Hixkaryana examples

Canonical construction  Hixkaryana is well-known for its Verb – Subject canonical constituent order. In the canonical order, the Subject either follows the main predicate (preceded by its complements) directly, or is separated from it by a prosodic break. This coding strategy can be used to convey an Entry-central Categorical articulation, as is shown in (1):

(1) (Hmph, he made) C
3-upset-DPC(NCOLL) sloth
‘He was upset, sloth.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 28/13)

(2) (New segment; Moon reappears on the scene) C
[u-to \ n-e-hf-ak-nun ha-tu|, [nuno]|.
there.MED 3-COP-DPC(NCOLL) INTS-EVD Moon
‘There he was [again], Moon.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 23/26)

In the canonical strategy, the postverbal Subject expression is frequently suppressed, especially when the Topical referent is highly active as in (4)–(7):

(4) (They ate what had gone bad, the vulture people) C
∅ [oske n-at-akuhto-fofenum|.
thus 3-DETR-make-DPP(COLL)
‘Thus they were made [such is their nature].’ (Derbyshire 1965: 32/99)

(5) (Immediately, they were on top of it. Yum, yum, yum,) C
∅ [fo-rui heno y-onah-yaf-knumu, utto ha-tu|.
plantain nom.pst 3>3-eat-DPC(COLL) there.MED INTS-EVD
‘...they ate the plantains, right there.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 14/38)

(6) (he went to seduce his sister) C
**Figure 14** Hixkaryana informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
(7) (The sun was right up there there at the zenith) C
\[ \text{set-NEG.ADVR} \quad 3\text{-COP-DPC(NCOLL)} \quad \text{long}_\text{ago} \]
‘Long ago it did not set.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 16/7)

In (8) and (9), the postverbal Subject construes a new address in the discourse knowledge organization. These examples illustrate the use of the canonical strategy to convey an Address-central Categorical articulation. With regard to (9) and (9), note that the location of either new Topical referent is highly informative in the context of the discourse in which they are introduced; because of the relation of relevance that is construed between them and the new Topic referents, these assertions were classified as categorical instead of thetic.

(8) (start of discourse) D
\[ [ \text{tut-notf'ha-ru}, y-ahe-ye]_{y_r} , \quad [\text{noror}]_{\tau} \]
3.RFL-sister-PSSD 3>3-seduce-DPP(NCOLL) 3.ND.AN

a. \[ [\text{tut-notf'ha-ru}, y-ahe-ye]_{y_r}, \quad [\text{noror}]_{\tau} \]
3.RFL-sister-PSSD 3>3-seduce-DPP(NCOLL) 3.ND.AN

b. \[ [\text{t-o-ye}, \quad ha-tu, \quad kohsaya]_{y_r}, \quad [(\text{numo})_{3}]_{\tau} \]
3-go-DPP(NCOLL) INTS-EVD at night Moon
‘He seduced his sister, he. He went, by nightfall, Moon.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 23/1-2)

(9) (start of discourse) D
[\text{jamata ymo mkawo}, \quad \text{n-ehf-akɔnu}]_{y_r}, \quad [\text{saraho}]_{\tau}, \quad \text{amnyehra} \quad \text{island AUG on top of} \quad 3\text{-COP-DPC(NCOLL)} \quad \text{manioc long ago}
‘At the top of the big island it was, manioc, long ago.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 13/1)

(10) (What’s up, old man? Wejeweje asked) D
[\text{hakara ya-wo tut n-ehf/k-akɔnu}, \quad \text{ha}]_{y_r}, \quad [\text{awarunnu ymo}]_{\tau} \quad \text{vanity box CLF-in EVD} \quad 3\text{-COP-DPC(NCOLL)} \quad \text{INTS darkness AUG}
‘The great darkness was in the vanity box.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 17/41)

Finally, (11) and (12) illustrate that this strategy can also be used to convey an Address-central Thetic articulation.

(11) (end of segment) A
[\text{n-omok-ye}, \quad ha-tu, \quad hory-komo]_{\tau} ,
3-come-DPP(NCOLL) INTS-EVD big-COLL
‘(There) came the chief.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 16/19)

(12) (Let them come, the shaman said) A
Preverbal Subject construction  The Subject expression may precede the main predicate. In such cases, Subject referents end up in what Derbyshire seems to consider the position for new information; in the canonical strategy, the lexical Object is realized here. This coding strategy is used to convey an Address-central Thetic articulation, as illustrated in (13):

\[(13) \quad (\text{It was light}) \quad A\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{kamumum} \quad n-ehf-ak\text{\textendash}k\text{\textendash}nurn. \\
\text{sun} \quad 3\text{-COP-DPC(NCOLL)} \\
\text{‘The sun was (there).’} \quad (\text{Derbyshire 1965: 16/5})
\end{array}
\]

In (14), we see that the same strategy can be used to express the Address-central Categorical articulation as well:

\[(14) \quad (\text{start of discourse}) \quad D\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{kurumu} \quad [n-anotom-efk\text{\textendash}nurn] \quad \text{vulture} \quad 3>3\text{-employ-DPC(COLL)} \\
\text{‘The vultures enslaved him.’} \quad (\text{Derbyshire 1965: 28/1})
\end{array}
\]

Finally, the preverbal Subject strategy can be used to convey the Identificational articulation. A clear example can be seen in (15). Here, the entire assertion is presupposed on account of the preceding information; what constitutes new information are the identity of the Topical referent (which had been introduced before, and hence does not constitute a new Topic), and the polarity of the event ascribed to that referent.

\[(15) \quad (\text{The parrot people were not listening}) \quad E\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[yururumun]} \quad [n-entf\text{\textendash}a-ye \quad ha] \quad \text{cricket} \quad 3\text{-listen-DPP(NCOLL) \ INTS} \\
\text{‘The cricket-people were listening.’} \quad (\text{Derbyshire 1965: 25/58})
\end{array}
\]

The example in (16) illustrates one aspect of a pervasive property of Hixkaryana grammar that Derbyshire (1977) describes as ‘discourse redundancy’. Especially in story-telling, Hixkaryana speakers add very little information with every new assertion they produce. In the case of (16), everything is presupposed except for the nominal past marker heno, which expresses the Speaker’s sympathy for the Topical referent, ‘sloth’.

\[(16) \quad (\text{He was upset, sloth}) \quad E\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[ojre \ heno]} \quad [n-oseryehok-ek\text{\textendash}nurn] \quad \text{sloth \ NOM.PST} \ 3\text{-upset-DPC(NCOLL)} \\
\text{‘POOR OLD sloth was upset’} \quad (\text{Derbyshire 1965: 28/13})
\end{array}
\]
Preverbal position + \textit{tu}  Third, Hixkaryana seems to exploit a strategy where constituent placed in the immediately preverbal position is marked by means of the evidential marker \textit{tu}. By far the most frequent use of this strategy is to convey an Identificational articulation, as illustrated in (17)–(20).

In (17), we see an illustration of the variability that Hixkaryana displays with regard to the respective position of the Subject and spatiotemporal adjuncts. While the adjunct follows the Subject when it serves as a frame, as in (12), it precedes it when it is part of the Comment. That is, the information communicated in (17) is the applicability of the fact that ‘they used to be like people long ago’ to ‘the buzzards’, while in (9), the qualification ‘long ago’ restricts the applicability to ‘manioc’ of the fact that ‘it grew on top of the island’. While that used to be the case long ago, it is not (necessarily) in the present time.

(17) (That’s how they got the plantains down) E
\{(\textit{noro mak tu})_2, [\textit{n-awoto-ye ha-ryhe tu}, 3.ND.AN ADVRs EVD 3>3-cut-DPP(NCOLL) INTS-CONTR EVD \}
\{tukusu\}_2\-
\text{humming bird}  
\text{‘HE cut it, humming bird.’} (Derbyshire 1965: 14/46)

(18) (They ate it like that [i.e. uncooked]) E
\{(\textit{t-koke-mW rfl.poss}-go_bad-nr RMntr \}_2, [\textit{kurumu rfl.Poss-go\_bad-NR CNTR EVD 3>3-eat-DPC(COLL) EVD vulture yana ha}\}_z,  
\text{vulture} \text{yana people} 
\text{‘They ate what had gone bad, the vulture people.’} (Derbyshire 1965: 32/98)

(19) (alone he [Sloth] was) E
\{(\textit{koho mak tu})_2 n-ehf-af\text{\textbackslash{}k}0\text{\textbackslash{}nu} ha-ryhe\}_z, [\textit{kurumu yana komo many ADVRs EVD 3-COP-DPC(COLL) INTS-EMPH vulture people COLL ha-ryhe tu}]_z,  
\text{vulture} \text{yana people} \text{‘But MANY they were, the vultures.’} (Derbyshire 1965: 29/34)

(20) (The light was there long ago. My father was who said it thus) E
\{(\textit{ammnyehra tut})_2 n-ehf-ak\text{\textbackslash{}k}0\text{\textbackslash{}nu}]_z, [\textit{t-awas-nye}]_z,  
\text{long ago EVD 3-COP-DPC(NCOLL) RFL.Poss-light-AGNR} \text{‘The light (already) existed LONG AGO.’} (Derbyshire 1965: 16/3)

Another articulation that can be conveyed by means of this strategy is the Address-central Thetic one, in which a new address is construed:

(21) (start of myth) A
Finally, the construction is used to present an event in its entirety, as is done in (22) below. With regard to this example, it may be noted that umfekru, ‘baby anaconda’ is what has been called an ‘expectant Topic’ elsewhere, which often has special informational importance.

(22) (start of story)  
\[\text{oko-ymo umfekru tuu y-ahos-at'kɔnum, amnyehra.} \]  
\text{snake-AUG baby EVD 3>3-catch-DPC(COLL) long_ago}  
‘They caught a baby anaconda, long ago’ (Derbyshire 1965: 79/1)

**Predicate only**  A final expression strategy with informational relevance in Hixkaryana seems to be the use of a predicate without any further arguments. Two examples are given below. Note that they differ from canonical constructions with a suppressed Subject expression; this is particularly clear for the detransitivised example in (24), that does not command a Subject slot at all.

(23) (Wefewefe opened the vanity box)  
\[\text{puwa, ruu...} [\text{n-awana-ye hatuu}].\]  
\text{IDEO IDEO 3-be_dark-DPP(NCOLL) EVD}  
‘Puwa (he did, and) ruu, it went dark.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 18/53)

(24) (let it dawn, they said)  
\[\text{n-ot-kufma-no mpa.}\]  
\text{3-DETR-wait-IMM.PST(NCOLL) PRT}  
‘It [a new dawn] was being waited for.’ (Derbyshire 1965: 19/73)

**Movima**

**Movima informational properties**

Figure 15 gives the informatogram of Movima, the pairwise similarity of the informational articulations and the resulting feature ordering. The figure shows that four coding strategies can be distinguished.

**Movima examples**

**Predicate-initial construction**  The predicate-initial constituent order in Movima constitutes the canonical expression strategy. The linear order of postpredicatively expressed core arguments is dictated in Movima by the position of their referents on a Nominal Hierarchy (NH), while voicing is employed to express semantic function assignment. The higher referent obligatorily encliticises to the predicate,
Figure 15  Movima informational configuration: informatogram, similarity graph, feature ordering
while the lower referent is an absolutive argument and constitutes the PSA of the clause. Affirmative intransitive predications always take absolutive arguments, while negative intransitive predications always take bound arguments.

In narratives, it frequently happens that the referents of both core arguments of a transitive predication rank equally on the NH. If this situation obtains, speakers in theory are free to express either argument as the bound or absolutive argument. Movima speakers in such cases appear to make a consistent choice, using the bound argument position to express the accessible Topical referent, and the absolutive argument position to introduce new referents.

This is illustrated in (1) and (2), both of which convey Entry-central Categorical articulations. ‘The dogs’ in (1) have been established as the Topic in the preceding context, while ‘a jaguar’ is newly introduced here as part of a focal Comment ascribed to the Topical referent. In (2), ‘the jaguar’ is the continued Topic of the assertion, and is therefore realized as the bound argument. INVerse voice is applied to reflect the proper semantic function assignment.

(1) (and we walked through the forest) C
\[\text{tu} \text{e} \text{ [manaje=[is pako], os rulrul],} \]
and find:DR=ART.PL dog ART.NT.PST jaguar
‘...and the dogs came across a jaguar.’ (Haude 2006: 562/3)

(2) (the jaguar didn’t climb back up again because it stood on the ground) C
\[\text{tu} \text{e} \text{ [mumele-kaj-a=[as], is pako],} \]
and encircle-INV-LV=NT.ABNS ART.PL dog
‘and it got surrounded by the dogs’ (Haude 2006: 563/10)

In transitive predications, it seems that the bound argument without exception outranks the absolutive argument in its interpretability as the Topic of the assertion. In intransitive predications, on the other hand, the (sole) absolutive argument can convey the Topic without problems, as illustrated in (3):

(3) (the jaguar was angry where he was sitting on the forest floor) C
\[\text{[sutuk-a]. [os rulrul].} \]
angry-EVD ART.NT.PST jaguar
‘the jaguar was angry.’ (Haude 2006: 562/7)

However, the absolutive argument in intransitive predications can also be used to convey the construal of a new address, as in the Address-central Thetic articulation in (4). This is somewhat similar to observations by Du Bois (1987), who notes that ergative alignment can be explained as informational neutralization. Accidentally, (5) shows that the canonical construction can also be used to convey Identificational Focus, as in (5).

(4) (turning point in a story)\textsuperscript{17} A

\textsuperscript{17}The absolutive argument in (4) is externally cliticized to the predicate, according to Haude’s analysis. For the sake of simplicity, it is rendered here as a separate constituent.
Finally, the construction can be used to convey an all-new assertion, as in the case of the non-verbal predication in (6):

(6) (start of discourse) B

[kaw-poj is pa:ko di’ pa:ko=iti].

much-BR.animal ART.PL dog REL dog=1PL

‘Many were the dogs that (were) our dogs’ (Haude 2006: 265-1)

Fronting construction The other main expression strategy that Movima employs is the use of the preverbal position. This position can host one element (typically a referential element) at most, which receives a special pragmatic interpretation. The most typical use of this construction is to unambiguously mark the preposed element as the Topic, as in the Entry-central Categorical articulation in (7):

(7) (the jaguar fought, it made ‘heee’ as it caught the dogs) C

bo [is pa:ko]_n_ [few-na=is is baìew-a=as].

REAS ART.PL dog pull-DR=PL.ABSN ART.NT.PST tail-LV=NT.ABSN

‘...because the dogs pulled its tail’ (Haude 2006: 265/32)

Note that this option is only available for absolutive arguments; the complementary strategy used to prepose bound arguments is illustrated in section (8). Another informational motivation for the use of the prepredicative position is identificational Focus of referents belonging to a partially ordered set, as in (8):

(8) (it put the dogs under its armpit) E

a. tfe [os ba<kwa->kwa=os pa:ko]_p_ [nej ffì~ffì].

and ART.NT.PST head<INAL~>=ART.NT.PST dog here MID-go_out

b. tfe [os (t’inki)~z=os pa:ko]_p_ [n-os

and ART.NT.PST back_part=ART.NT.PST dog OBL-ART.NT.PST

bu<ra->da=os ruìrul].

front<INAL~>=ART.NT.PST jaguar

‘And the head of the dog came out here. And the back part of the dog was in front of the jaguar.’ (Haude 2006: 565/20-2)

Antipassive + fronting By using the antipassive construction, however, bound arguments can be ‘promoted’ to absolutive status and then be preposed. Examples of this are given in (9) and (10): the preposed argument in such construction appears to convey either an Identificational or an Address-central Categorical
articulation. Possessors can also make use of this strategy. A nice minimal pair between a higher argument in canonical, and one in preposed position is given in (9):

(9) (no context) D/E
   a. \[bay-a-cho=[us], as \text{waso}\]n.
      knock-DR-inside(BR)=M.ABSN ART.NT glass
      ‘He has broken the glass’
   b. \[[\text{usk}\kwej}][\text{bay-a-cho} n-as \text{waso}]n.
      PRO.3 DETR knock-DR-inside(BR) OBL-ART.NT glass
      ‘He has broken the glass’ (Haude 2006: 287/120)

**double evocation** It appears that higher-ranking arguments can also be expressed in the prepredicative position without the use of the antipassive marker, but by means of a copy strategy as in (10). It is uncertain what type of informational articulation is conveyed by constructions of this type. It has been analysed tentatively as Identificational; it may well be the case, however, that this is not a separate strategy, but has to be merged with the antipassive case discussed in the previous section.

(10) (no context) E
    \[\{\text{usk}\}\_\text{bay-a-cho=[us]}_\text{as \text{waso}}\]n.
    PRO.M.ABSN knock-DR-inside(BR)=M.ABSN ART.NT glass
    ‘He has broken the glass’ (Haude 2006: 287/121)