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Glossary

Most examples in this study are glossed with a line of transcription that follows the phonetic realisation of the utterances as closely as possible, a second line which shows the morpheme breaks and the spelling of the example corresponding to its grammatical analysis, a line of interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses following the conventions described below, and an idiomatic gloss (the free translation) between single quotes (""), which in a number of cases is preceded by a translation between double quotes (""”) as given by a language consultant. The first line of the transcription may contain punctuation the marks ,,!?’” and ... to indicate a pause, sentence final intonation, exclamation intonation, question intonation, an attributed element and an unfinished utterance, respectively. These are not used in the second and third glossing lines.

Wherever possible and feasible, glosses follow the Leipzig glossing rules (Bickel et al., 2008).

Glosses make a three-way symbolic distinction between morphemes: grammatical markers are most often glossed in capitals, with the exception of coverbs and mood markers, which are glossed with generic English translation equivalents in lower capitals (e.g. maybe), and the referential features singular/plural, gender and clusivity, which are all encoded through the pronominal prefix paradigm, and are written in lower case. As is customary, lexical glosses are written in lower case as well.

The target language transcriptions are in italics except for instances of English code switching.

Symbols in glossed examples:

[] clause
[ introduces an overlapping passage in conversation
... unfinished utterance
¿...? unknown word

Abbreviations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>first person</th>
<th>NMLZ</th>
<th>nominaliser/nominalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
<td>n_{w}</td>
<td>w-class neuter gender (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>object prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>PAUC</td>
<td>paucal number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBIPH</td>
<td>ambiphoric pronoun</td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>plural (number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAPH</td>
<td>anaphoric</td>
<td>PROSSR</td>
<td>possessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPLV</td>
<td>completive aspect</td>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>proximal/proximate (demonstrative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFS</td>
<td>definite subject marker</td>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present (tense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>dual (number)</td>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past (tense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distal</td>
<td>REDUP</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXC</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>subject prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future tense</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>semblative ('like')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>feminine gender</td>
<td>SENS</td>
<td>non-visual sensory evidential (Oksapmin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>singular (number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object suffix</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>irrealis mode</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>visual evidential (Oksapmin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITRV</td>
<td>iterative aspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>masculine gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n_{m}</td>
<td>m-class neuter gender (location)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1. Introduction

Warla bungon di layburru bidi ‘I tellim, then they know’
— Pansy Nulgit (Ngalkad)

1.1. The Ungarinyin framing construction

The Worrorran language Ungarinyin spoken in the Western Central part of the Kimberley region of Western Australia has a single grammatical construction dedicated to reporting words the speaker alleges to be (or have been) spoken at any stage in time. The construction is frequent in Ungarinyin conversation and narrative and is exemplified in (1):

(1) [[ mid mid ngama ] ngamernangka ]
    [[ mid mid nga1-ma-ø ] nga1-ma-ra-nangka ]
    [[ weak weak 1sg-DO-PRS ] 1sg.S-do-PST-3sg.IO ]

‘I am weak,’ I told her’/’I told her (that) I was weak’ (100903-31NGUN, 3:42-3:45)

The double sets of brackets above indicate that complex clause construction in (1) consists of an element demarcated by the inner set of brackets, which I will call the ‘framed clause’ and the element between the outer brackets, the ‘framing clause’, containing in all instances, except when expressing reciprocal saying events (‘say to each other’), the generic action verb -ma- ‘do’. The entire construction in (1) I will refer to as the Ungarinyin ‘framing construction’, following Rumsey (1982; 1990) and McGregor (1994). The (predominant) order within Ungarinyin framing constructions is [[framed clause] framing verb] and the two elements may either be separated by an intonation break or form a tight prosodic unit. The most typical function of the framing construction is to encode reported speech, as in (1).

Apart from denoting saying events framing constructions can express reported thought as in (2).

(2) nini e [[ kunya nguma kanda ] ama ]
    ni-ni a1-yi Ø [[ kunya nga1-yi-ma kanda ] a1-ma ]
    think-REDUP 3msg-BE-PRS [[ what 1sg-FUT-do n. PROX ] 3msg-do ]

‘He is thinking. “What can I do here?” he thinks’ (090813AJMJSMPDm, 2:01-2:02)
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Example (2) consists of two separate clausal constructions: the verbal construction ni ni e ‘he thinks’, which contextually prompts the interpretation that what follows describes the contents of what-is-being-thought, and the framing construction kunya nguma kanda ama ‘What will I do here?’ he says/thinks’. The framing construction in isolation is often fully synonymous between an interpretation of reported speech as in (1), and reported thought, but the discourse context provided by ni ni e ‘he thinks’ disambiguates the framing construction in (2) with the latter interpretation.

The framing construction has a third function, which I will label ‘reported intentionality’. In this function the verb -ma- ‘do’ in the framing clause is more suitably translated not as ‘say’ or ‘think’ but as ‘want’ (also see Rumsey, 2001), as example (3) illustrates.

(3) [[ ngurrba nyunguminda | amayali jirri ]
[[ ngurr-bo nyung01- yi-minda | a1-ma-y2ali jirri ]
[[ hit-ITRV 3fsg.O:1sg.S-FUT-TAKE | 3msg-do-INDEED m.ANAPH ]

‘He really wants want to hit her’ (090813AJMJSMPDc, 3:14-3:15)

The interpretation of reported intentionality in (3) is structurally more restricted than that of framing constructions with a reported speech or thought interpretation: the meaning of reported intentionality only arises in framing constructions which combine future tense morphology and first person subjects in the framed clause (i.e. the inner set of brackets). As a consequence, like most examples of reported intentionality the framing construction in (3) is potentially ambiguous between reported speech (i.e. ‘He really says: “I will hit her”’) and also reported thought (i.e. ‘He really thinks: “I will hit her”’).

There are several other interpretations of framing constructions that can be related to each of the three basic components of the polysemous triad REPORTED SPEECH, REPORTED THought and REPORTED INTENTIONALITY, but the general form of the framing construction exemplified in (1-3) may be summarised through the single schematic representation in (4).

(4) [ [ ... ]framed clause -ma- ]framing clause

As (4) shows, the construction minimally includes a framing clause with the root -ma- ‘do’. I will assume that the specific translations ‘say’, ‘think’ and ‘want’ are only relevant within the instantiated grammatical context of a framing construction, not as a lexical element within this construction, i.e. -ma- ‘do’ does not mean ‘say’ until it has been interpreted as an integral part of a reported speech construction. Following this analysis, I will gloss the verb -ma- generically as ‘do’ in the interlinear glosses below, choosing the more specific translation in the English idiomatic gloss, which is (typically) in the fourth line of the example.

1There are instances in which -ma- by itself, i.e. outside a framing construction, is interpreted as ‘saying’/‘talking’. In most cases, however, the -ma- root is either used in a complex verb construction (see section 2.3.2) or is interpreted as an action, i.e. translated as ‘do’, e.g. in (103a) on page 67.
1.1. The Ungarinyin framing construction

The schematic representation of the Ungarinyin framing construction (4) fails to capture one further important feature of the construction, which is the main syntagmatic marker of dependency between the framed and framing clause: the interpretation of person reference in the framed clause. The value of the subject referent in the framed clause is always interpreted with respect to that of the framing clause, as represented by the label ‘coreferential relation’ in figure 1.1, a representation of the example in 3 with slightly simplified glosses.

```plaintext
[kunya] ng- ima kanda a- ma
what 1sg- will.do now 3msg- do
```

Figure 1.1.: A representation of the referential relations between framed and framing clauses

When the framed clause has a first person singular subject form (as also in examples 1 and 2) the subject of the framed clause is coreferential with that of the framing clause, whereas framed second person subjects or third person subjects are not. This pattern is a result of the fact that Ungarinyin only allows for ‘direct speech/thought’, a ‘[f]orm of speech or thought representation in which the deictic centre shifts to that of the represented speaker and the current speaker purports to re-enact the represented speaker’s presumed original utterance or thought’ (Buchstaller and Alphen, 2012: 283). There appear to be a few marginal exceptions to this general characterisation (see sections 3.2 and 4.2), but these do not contradict the assessment in Rumsey (1982; 1990) that ‘there is [...] no evidence for a formal opposition between direct discourse and any other, less direct variety’ (Rumsey, 1990: 347).

This study examines the nature, meaning and expression of the Ungarinyin framing construction. It addresses the linguistic and cognitive mechanisms that allow the polysemy of the construction to persist in the language apparently without causing difficulty in communicating the ambiguous saying, thinking and wanting interpretations. And it analyses the alternative expressions Ungarinyin speakers may choose to framing constructions and the elements that are used within or instead of framing constructions.

---

2For example: [[you, are x] you said], [[she, is x] she said]. Second person subjects in the framed clause are coreferential with the indirect or oblique object of the framing clause (i.e. [[you, are x] she said to/about him,]).
Chapter 1. Introduction

Reported speech, i.e. talking about the words of others, \(^3\) reported thought (talking about thoughts) and reported intentionality (talking about wishes/intentions) are three of the most common activities in language. Constructions reflecting these activities in the languages of the world lend insight into how languages allow a speaker to portray linguistic interaction and (projected) cognitive processes, which fundamentally motivate everything we do with language. It was Vološinov ([1929] 1973) who first drew attention to the importance of reported speech for linguistics because reported speech constructions present a model of dialogue that can be studied not at just some abstract conceptual level, but –in his famous phrase– ‘in the stabilized constructional patterns of the language itself’ (Vološinov, 1973: 116) (see section 3.2). The polysemy of the Ungarinyin framing constructions, expressing reported speech, reported thought and reported intentionality, provides the ultimate grammatical context to examine the Ungarinyin ‘linguistic model’ of speech, thought and intention. By analysing variation within the expression of the framing construction, the constructions it co-occurs and alternates with, and its behaviour in discourse, this study aims to contribute to the research program initiated by Vološinov ([1929] 1973) of examining the expression of social cognition through linguistic structures. At the same time, this provides a window onto how our ability to conceptualise the words, thoughts and intentions of others can shape grammar.

1.2. Data collection and methodology

1.2.1. The Ungarinyin language: its speakers and country

‘By far the largest of the Northern Kimberley tribes is the [Ngarinyin] [...] It is bounded on the west by the [Worrorra], on the south-west by the Unggumi, on the south by the Bunaba and Gidja, and on the east by the Djerag tribes’
— Capell, 1939, p. 382

The Ungarinyin language is a non-Pama-Nyungan language, spoken by a geographically dispersed speech community in the West and Central Kimberley region of Western Australia, roughly stretching from Mt. Barnett in the South to King River in the North (Rumsey and Redmond, 1999). The area is bounded by land on all sides, making the Ngarinyin people, the speakers and custodians of the Ungarinyin language, \(^4\) ‘freshwater’ or inland people, as opposed

\(^3\)Several authors have preferred to adopt the term ‘represented speech’ or ‘constructed dialogue’ following Tannen (1989) over ‘reported speech’ in order to highlight the role of the current speaker in the expression of reported speech. Speakers do not literally report the words of others verbatim, as the term ‘reported speech’ may imply. My use of ‘reported speech’ is not intended to carry such implications and is fully synonymous with, e.g. ‘represented speech’ in McGregor (1997), Vandelanotte (2004ff) and Verstraete (2011). For a further discussion of terminology, see section 3.2.

\(^4\)The initial u- in the language name derives from the ethnonym prefixed with the gender marker wu-, which typically combines with nouns denoting ‘language-like’ concepts (see section 2.2.3.2).
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to, for example, their close neighbours the Worrorra and Wunambal, whose traditional country borders on the coast.

Through the heart of present-day Ngarinyin country runs the Gibb river road, an approximately 700 kilometre long mostly unpaved road along which several small Ngarinyin communities can be found. Although most speakers regularly travel between the towns and the communities, most Ngarinyin people live in Derby or Wyndham at least for part of the year and in the Aboriginal community Mowanjum, about 10 kilometre outside Derby. In the 2011 census 5 people in Broome, 5 people in Derby and 25 people in Wyndham indicated Ungarinyin was their home language. My estimate is that a dozen of elderly Ngarinyin people are full speakers of the Ungarinyin language and up to around 50 middle-aged speakers have a good to moderate passive understanding of Ungarinyin.

All Ungarinyin speakers are fluent in Aboriginal English and a form of Kriol that has fewer distinct creolised features than, e.g. Roper Kriol of the Northern Territory, but shares several of its defining features, such as transitivity marking through the suffix -im, the generic preposition la/langa and past tense marking through the particle bin + infinitive. Almost all full Ungarinyin speakers have grown up in missions or on cattle stations and were confronted with British and Australian varieties of English from an early age. Most male Ungarinyin speakers have worked as stockmen in several parts of the Kimberley, where they came into contact with both Aboriginal people from other language groups and white Australians (often referred to with the Kriol term *karriya/kadiya*).

Ungarinyin is no longer learned as a first language, and although many of the speakers whose knowledge is represented in the present study make great efforts to safeguard stories and share knowledge with culturally appropriate members of the Ngarinyin community, the language is under severe threat. In conversations Ngarinyin people have often indicated that state schooling, which involved spending most of their school years far away from family, was a main reason for losing their ancestral language, and that language loss was perpetuated since insufficient fluency prevented semi-speakers from further sharing the language with their children. Younger generations have often had limited exposure to the language beyond a few often repeated phrases (such as balu ‘come’, ada buma ‘sit!’, bubungarri ‘cigarettes’ etc.). There are notable exceptions in the proficiency of Ungarinyin across all age groups, however, and several younger Ngarinyin people are showing a strong interest in the language. In combination with the large amount of archival materials available for Ungarinyin and the commitment of local community organisations to supporting ancestral culture, there is hope that the Ngarinyin community will be able to reverse the trend of language loss. The census finding that at least 5

---

6See Lommel (1950) for an account of the lives of Ngarinyin people during the early period of white settlement in the Kimberley region.
35 Ngarinyin people in several parts of the Kimberley strongly identify with the language is a positive indication that this indeed may be the case.

The language map in figure 1.2 on page 7 shows the full distribution of neighbouring languages (in roman type) and Ungarinyin dialects (in italics). The three languages printed in bold, Ungarinyin, Worrorra and Wunambal form a language family McGregor and Rumsey (2009) (after O’Grady et al., 1966) have labelled the Worrorran language family. Nowadays, the three cultural groups also live together in separate quarters of the Mowanjum Aboriginal community near Derby. The following assessment in Capell (1972b) still holds:

‘In the Northern Kimberley Division of Western Australia there are three communalects which which may be rightly be ranked as “languages” in terms of mutual intelligibility tests. These are the ‘northern’ languages [i.e. Wunambal, Wilawila, Gambere, Ginan and Forrest River language], [Ungarinyin] and [Worrorra]. Other forms of speech should rather be classed as dialects’ (Capell, 1972b: 54).

Of the three Worrorran languages, Wunambal is the least described language and there is much unclarity about its internal subgrouping although Ungarinyin speakers often refer to presumed dialects of Wunambal, such as Wilawila (the first language of song man Scotty Martin), Gambere/Gambera and Guni/Gunin/Kwini (McGregor, 1993). Vaszolyi (1973: 9) writes that long before the establishment of missions ‘bilingualism did exist in the area prior to European contact and it was widespread, no matter how much it varied according to age groups, sex, intelligence and other factors’.

‘[A] Worora speaker would normally speak, say, Wunambal with an impeccable Worora accent; or he might be quite fluent in Ngarinyin but would often violate Ngarinyin grammar’ [...] ‘[S]ign languages, gestures, mimicry and other non-verbal signalling also facilitate communication’ (Vaszolyi, 1973: 8).

In addition to the multilingual and dialectal variation that characterises the traditional Ungarinyin speech community, Ungarinyin also boasts a sociolect in the form of an elaborate avoidance register called Yalan (see Spronck, 2012b; ms). This avoidance register used to be spoken in the presence of or when referring to avoidance relatives, rambarrngarri, such as a mother-in-law/son-in-law and perhaps also by recent widows who were not allowed to speak openly.7 Yalan is the most pronounced case of how kin relations govern Ungarinyin speech culture, but more subtle examples exist, such as the taboo on full opposite-sex siblings directly speaking to or about each other (cf. Evans, 2003: 60–65). For details of Ungarinyin kinship system and its associated cultural conventions, see Rumsey (1981) and especially Rumsey and Redmond (1999).

7The text in appendix H discusses some structural and pragmatic features of Yalan.
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Figure 1.2.: Ungarinyin, its dialects and neighbouring languages
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The languages of the Kimberley region of North-Western Australia have attracted interest from (amateur) linguists since the 1880s (McGregor, 2008: 406) and Ungarinyin is relatively well described with published texts (Coate, 1966; 1970; Rumsey, 1992), a two-volume dictionary (Coate and Elkin, 1974), two descriptive grammars (Coate and Oates, 1970; Rumsey, 1982), a volume-length study of Ungarinyin song and dance (Treloyn, 2006) and many grammatical and cultural studies (e.g. Capell, 1939; Coate, 1973; Elkin, 1974; Capell, 1976; Rumsey, 1987; 1990; 1994a; 2001; Delwel, 2003; Rumsey, 2010a). Recently, a large number of Ungarinyin language story books were published with Batchelor Press.  

1.2.2. Fieldwork, language consultants and methods

Most of the data presented in this study consists of newly collected fieldwork recordings of spontaneous, unelicited speech. The data was collected over six fieldwork trips to Derby, WA, funded by the former Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies at ANU, the ARC project Social cognition and language – the design resources of grammatical diversity (Grant DP0878126, PI Nick Evans), the Hans Rausing Endangered Language Documentation Programme (Grant IGS0148) and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (Grant G2011/7629) during the following periods:

- July – August 2009
- 20 June – 28 October 2010
- 13 September – 19 November 2011 (Project: ‘Documentation and description of Ngarinyin, a language of the Kimberley region of Western Australia’.)
- July 2012 (Project: ‘Documentation and description of Ngarinyin, a language of the Kimberley region of Western Australia’.)
- 7 – 30 September 2012 (Project: ‘Interpreting Howard Coate’s Ungarinyin recordings’.)

1.2. Data collection and methodology

Most of the recording sessions on which the present study is based were held in Derby, Western Australia. In 2009, together with Alan Rumsey I recorded two versions of the picture task ‘Family problems’ (San Roque et al., 2012) in Dodnun with Scotty Martin, Masey Jodba and Alec Jilbidij and with Pansy Nulgit and Jilgi Edwards. In subsequent weeks I transcribed a large part of the picture task with Pansy Nulgit and recorded some additional stories. The fieldwork carried out in 2010 mostly involved recording and transcribing sessions with Pansy Nulgit. Her enthusiasm resulted in over 20 hours of recordings, which included several unique stories and a large amount of elicited sentences. Other speakers I had the chance of working with during this trip were Alec Jilbidij, Scotty Martin, Dorothy Spider, Donald Campbell and Paddy Neowarra. The greater mutual familiarity, combined with higher availability of speakers compared to the previous year, made this trip particularly rewarding. An important aim of the fieldwork in 2011 and 2012 was to collect more conversational data and comments about language. During the fieldtrips in September 2012 and 2013 I collected metadata about recordings and transcriptions from Howard Coate’s archive and sought comments on questions that remained from the earlier fieldtrips.

All digital audio recordings were transcribed using the linguistic annotation and analysis program ELAN (http://tla.mpi.nl/tools/tlatools/elan/, Wittenburg et al., 2006). Phonetic analysis was performed using Praat (Boersma and Weenink, 2015) and for additional coding and analysis I used LibreOffice Base (in chapter 4) and MMAX2 (Müller and Strube, 2006, in chapter 5).

The list in (5) shows the Ungarinyin speakers whose knowledge is represented in this study. The two-letter code preceding each name is used to identify the speaker in the label of the respective recording/transcription and is shown in the references to example sentences.⁹

---

⁹For all speakers, except for Pansy Nulgit the speaker codes correspond to the initials of their Australian first and last names. In order to avoid ambiguity, the speaker code of Pansy Nulgit, the one most frequently encountered in this study, consists of the first two letters of her Ungarinyin name ‘Ngalkad’.

---
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NG: Pansy Nulgit (Ngalkad), language affiliation: Ungarinyin
PN: Paddy Neowarra (Nyawarra), language affiliation: Ungarinyin
JE: Jilgi Edwards, language affiliation: Wurla, Ungarinyin
DC: Donald Campbell, language affiliation: Wurla, Ungarinyin
AJ: Alec Jilbidj, language affiliation: Ungarinyin, Mirriwoong
SM: Scotty Martin, language affiliation: Miwa, Ungarinyin
JU: Janet Oobagooma, language affiliation: Worrorra
MJ: Masey Jodba, language affiliation: Ungarinyin
DD: Donald Dolun, language affiliation: Ungarinyin
DS: Dorothy Spider, language affiliation: Ungarinyin
SN: Sally Nulgit, language affiliation: Ungarinyin

Ungarinyin language examples will be cited in one of three ways. (i) If the example has been taken from a published source, it will be referenced in the customary manner with author, publication year and page number, (ii) except for when it is taken from the Ungarinyin dictionary Coate and Elkin (1974), in which case the relevant entry is added in italics after the page number, e.g. Coate and Elkin (1974: 81, entry: biyarra). In the glosses of examples cited from published or archival sources, the first line reflects the original transcription and the morphemic gloss gives my interpretation, unless stated otherwise. The most frequent reference method is the third format (iii), described in (6): the name of the recording and ELAN transcription file plus a time interval, as in (7), which shows the variables in the data references.

(6) Recording/transcription code, time interval

(7) yymmdd-(nr)XXXX, m:ss-m:ss

The recording/transcription code consists of the date of the recording (in yymmdd format for automatic sorting), a number indicating that the recording was the n\textsuperscript{th} one on that date (this number is only added if more than one recording file was created on this specific date), a two-letter code referring to the speaker (see 5 above, if multiple speakers are participating in the recording session the two letter codes for each of these speakers are shown and the name of the speaker is underlined). In the citation of dialogues the speaker code precedes the respective turns in the dialogue. The final two letters of the recording/transcription name signal whether the recording session mostly involved Elicitation (E), Unelicited, spontaneous speech (U)\textsuperscript{10} or

\textsuperscript{10}Many recording sessions consisted of a combination of elicitation and spontaneous speech but for simplicity I have treated these as binary choices: a recording session is either marked E or U depending on whether the overall purpose of the session was to collect elicited or unelicited data. The reference code refers to the recording.
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a session of the Family Problems picture task (P) and the dominant discourse type in the recording. The discourse type may consist of the categories in (8)\(^{11}\):

\[(8)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
D: & \text{ dialogue} \\
N: & \text{ narrative} \\
M: & \text{ a ‘meta-session’, a recording of a speaker commenting an earlier recording (often a transcription session)} \\
S: & \text{ isolated, individual sentences (often elicited)}
\end{align*}
\]

As an example, the reference ‘100903-31NGUN, 3:42-3:45’ following example (1) on page 1 indicates that the transcription is based on the recording 100903-31NGUN, which is the 31st file created on the 3rd September 2010 with speaker Pansy Nulgit and consists of an unelicited narrative and the cited example occurs between 3’42” and 3’44” of the recording.

The full list of recordings used in this study can be found in appendix L from page 437.

1.2.3. Ungarinyin orthography

Over the many years that Ungarinyin has been described from an academic perspective, several orthographies have been used to write the language. There is also a community orthography accepted by Ngarinyin elders at a meeting organised by the Kimberley Language Resource Centre at Wanalirri school in 1997 at the Gibb River community, but this orthography is not widely used. A comparison between three different orthographies and the one used in the present study is shown in table 1.1. Table 1.2 shows several ways in which Ungarinyin diphthongs have been represented.

Appendix K from page 413 reproduces a booklet used in an orthography workshop held in Derby in July 2013. The booklet contains a discussion of the choices distinguishing the alternative orthographies and suggests solutions to issues that e.g. the 1997 Wanalirri school orthography does not satisfactorily address. I believe that the orthography used in this study presents a reasonable compromise for these issues, but I hope that the discussion in the appendix will contribute towards the development of a new community orthography that is commonly accepted among Ngarinyin people. For a detailed treatment of Ungarinyin phonology the reader is referred to Rumsey (1982: 1-30).

The glosses used in the transcriptions are listed in the glossary on page ix. Most grammatical features (except gender and singular/plural) are glossed in upper case capitals. I will use lower case capitals for Ungarinyin grammatical elements that are glossed in English as a lexical

---

\(^{11}\) Only one discourse type has been selected for each file, so this is again a slightly rough classification.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[a] ~ [a]</td>
<td>a/aa</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>amalarr ‘his forehead’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>bururruru ‘men’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>darr ‘to stand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd</td>
<td>[ɖ]</td>
<td>rd</td>
<td>ɖ</td>
<td>ɖ</td>
<td>marduk ‘to walk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>[j]</td>
<td>dj</td>
<td>dj</td>
<td>dj</td>
<td>ija ‘dad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>[ɛ] ~ [e]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>engen ‘his arm’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>[i] ~ [i]</td>
<td>i/ee/ií</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Nygarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>[j]</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>yorr ‘to sit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>karnangkurr ‘dog’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>langkan ‘throat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rl</td>
<td>[ɭ]</td>
<td>rl</td>
<td>ɭ</td>
<td>ɭ</td>
<td>wurlan ‘to talk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ly</td>
<td>[ɭj]</td>
<td>lj</td>
<td>lj</td>
<td>lj</td>
<td>balya ‘to go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>marduk ‘to walk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>nak ‘to listen’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rn</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>namburr ‘paperbark’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny</td>
<td>[ɲ]</td>
<td>nj</td>
<td>nj</td>
<td>nj</td>
<td>nyinguŋan ‘you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>ngayak ‘to ask’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>[ɔ]</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>wongay ‘woman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rr</td>
<td>[r]</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>yarrra ‘nest’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>[ɾ]</td>
<td>r̃</td>
<td>r̃</td>
<td>r̃</td>
<td>rarrki ‘stone’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>buk ‘to appear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>[v]</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>wungkurr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1.: A comparative list of Ungarinyin orthographies
1.3. A look ahead

This study has two complementary aims. The first is to present a multifaceted account of the Ungarinyin framing construction, the grammatical environments and discourse contexts in which it occurs, and to identify grammatical structures and strategies it alternates and interacts with. In doing so, I intend not just to chart the functional range and shape of the framing construction, but to provide a comprehensive account of the grammatical structures used in Ungarinyin in the expression of perspective, a linguistic domain that has come to be known as ‘stance’ (Englebretson, 2007b; Du Bois, 2014). The ultimate objective of identifying the meanings, structures and systemic interactions in the expression of perspective in Ungarinyin is to explore ways in which these observations can be related to human socio-cognitive capacities.

### Table 1.2.: Ungarinyin diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ay</td>
<td>[əi]</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>wungaay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ey</td>
<td>[ei]</td>
<td>ey</td>
<td>ej</td>
<td>ej</td>
<td>merley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oy</td>
<td>[ɔi]</td>
<td>oy</td>
<td>oj</td>
<td>oj</td>
<td>wodooy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uy</td>
<td>[u̯i]</td>
<td>uy</td>
<td>uj</td>
<td>uj</td>
<td>kuluy-kuluy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

word in capitals (for example, the Ungarinyin epistemic modal marker =karra I will represent in the interlinear gloss as ‘=MAYBE’). Lexemes and some composite grammatical features, such as gender and singular/plural (see Glossary), will be represented in lower case. The three-way distinction between capitals, small capitals and lower case can be thought of as an iconic representation of the granularity of grammatical meaning (cf. Boye and Harder, 2012). For example, the glosses of the following three Ungarinyin words represent a cline from lexical to grammatical meaning: ukuli ‘tomorrow’, wali ‘wait’ (sometimes translated in the free translation as ‘wait a moment’, sometimes as ‘yet’) and - ba ‘ITRV’. The choice between lower case glosses and capitals is also meaningful in the case of inflecting verbs, which can be interpreted as fully lexical elements or more grammatical elements in complex verb constructions (see section 2.3.2).

A final convention that I will adhere to throughout this study is that I will refer to generic speakers as ‘she’ and generic addressees/hearers as ‘he’ so that sentences like ‘the speaker, said to the addressee, she,...’ and ‘the speaker said to the addressee, he,...’ are unambiguous without requiring indexical subscripts.
within a grammatical account of social cognition. As per Volosoñov ([1929] 1973), the study of reported speech presents a unique opportunity to study social and ‘creative’ features of the speech situation using the traditional methods of descriptive grammar. This allows us to ask more fundamental questions about the expression of aspects of cognition and sociality in grammar. By studying the types of polysemy and subtle structural variations in the realisation of the Ungarinyin framing construction construction this study aims to contribute to the analysis of the organisation and socio-cognitive foundation of the stance domain in the language.

The main influences on the approach taken here come from the (Australianist) descriptive grammar tradition and cognitive discourse analysis. The analysis has a close affinity with typological examinations of grammatical categories encoding perspective such as complex modal constructions (Evans, 2006) and interactions between person and modality/evidentiality (Curnow, 2002; Manson, 2012; Lehmann, fc). It shares an interest in relating grammatical structures to social cognition with accounts from cognitive linguistics (cf. Fauconnier and Turner, 1996; 2002; Pascual, 2007; Verhagen, 2005) and methodological assumptions with cognitive discourse analysis (Chafe, 1974; 1996; 2008; Du Bois, 1987; Kibrik, 2003; 2011), an emerging field that in recent years has developed a focus on ‘stance’ (Englebretson, 2007b). Cognitive discourse analysis builds on a varied tradition that incorporates insights from models and methods such as rhetorical structure theory (Mann and Thompson, 1988; Mann et al., 1992), corpus linguistics (e.g. Channell, 2000; Kibrik and Krasavina, 2005; Taboada and Hadic Zabala, 2008), systemic functional grammar (Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Martin and White, 2005), various other functionalist grammar models (Talmy, 1975; Givón, 1992; Daneš, 1994) and conversation analysis (Wooffitt, 2005; Sidnell, 2010).

The present study is also deeply influenced by the rich Australianist tradition of studying grammatical forms in situated language use and relating grammatical categories and constructions to discourse entities and settings. Prominent examples in Northern and Central Australian languages are accounts of moods such as admonitives and of specific epistemic markers such as ‘unbeknownst’ particles (Evans, 2010) and detailed analyses of interjections in their interpersonal and discourse functions (cf. Wilkins, 1986; Evans, 1992; 1995; 2003; Evans and Wilkins, 2000; Garde, 2008). Work on languages of the Kimberley region often reflects a specific interest in situated language and discourse as well, including hallmark studies on reported speech, discourse organisation and pragmatic ‘case marking’ (Heath, 1985; Rumsey, 1982; 1987; 1994b; 2010b; McGregor, 1994; 2004; Blythe, 2009a). In recent years, discourse has more emphatically come to the forefront in Australianist studies (Mushin and Baker, 2008; Ritz et al., 2012; Stirling, 2012), following other traditions of field linguistics such as Americanist studies exploring modality and discourse (Gudschinsky, 1959; Jones, 1979; O’Connor, 1990; Beier et al., 2002; Lovick, 2010). Several detailed studies of reported speech have been made in American Indigenous languages (e.g Larson, 1978; Reid, 1979; Hedinger, 1984; Rice, 1986; Hill,
One central assumption motivating the present study is that sociality is a fundamental aspect of human cognition and consequently of language and language use (e.g. Tomasello, 2003; Tomasello and Herrmann, 2010; Tomasello, 2014a; Ramirez-Goicoechea, 2006; Dean et al., 2012). The Ungarinyin framing construction forms an area of Ungarinyin grammar that may provide a unique perspective on how social cognition is reflected in language.

In the next chapters I explore different aspects of reported speech and framing constructions in Ungarinyin. Each chapter will offer a different view on the grammatical and semantic domain of reported speech, with the exception of chapter 2, which gives an overview of Ungarinyin grammar to assist the reader with the interpretation of the example sentences. The chapter takes a look at core grammatical relations and simple and complex clause structures in Ungarinyin and pays particular attention to referential devices.

Chapter 3 introduces the Ungarinyin framing construction more fully, discusses and defines the relevant theoretical and analytical notions used to describe it and sketches a typological context. As Rumsey (1982: 157) notes, to some extent the functions of framing constructions often ‘can be distinguished from each other on syntactic grounds’. This chapter presents and illustrates each of these functions and their associated morphosyntactic properties.

Chapter 4 introduces the notion of ‘defenestration’ and surveys the Ungarinyin stance domain, the structures and strategies used to express some type of perspective meaning in collocation with or in the absence of framing constructions. Defenestration is a playful allusion to insubordination (the main clause usage of formally subordinate clauses, Evans, 2007) and the framing relation (McGregor, 1994) as typically expressed through framing constructions. The term describes the phenomenon by which a meaning of reported speech, thought or intentionality is signalled by other linguistic means than a framing construction, which, as I will demonstrate, is relatively infrequent in Ungarinyin but certainly does occur. The chapter also gives an overview of the types of meanings and constructions in the stance domain and provides an analysis of how these are put to use in narrative and conversational discourse.

Chapter 5 continues and expands the topic of discourse and examines several aspects of discourse reference and information structure related to framing constructions and defenestrated clauses. Following Verstraete (2011) I demonstrate that the distribution of framing constructions in (narrative) discourse is not arbitrary but intimately connected with the organisational structure of the discourse. With respect to discourse reference, framing constructions involve a relatively high number of referents, since both the framing clause and the framed clause may index participants, and the status of these referents is irregular because deictic elements in the framed clause normally refer in the reported speech event while those in the framing
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clause refer in the current speech event. On the basis of textual analyses I account for the form and information value of referential expressions in framing constructions. The chapter argues that discourse reference in framing constructions straddles the domains of stance and cohesion, the set of grammatical means by which discourse is organised into supra-sentential units, and considers findings from cognitive discourse analysis about reference and information structure in relation to stance. The expression of perspective is shown to play a central role in the interpretation of framing constructions in discourse.

Chapter 6 considers one specific type of interaction between framing constructions and the epistemic clitic =karra ‘maybe’ involving the perspective of both the reported speaker and the current speaker, a type of complex perspective (Evans, 2006). This meaning goes to the heart of reported speech as, in the phrase of Vološinov ([1929] 1973), a message about a message. The chapter concludes with a consideration of the socio-cognitive mechanism involved in communicating complex perspective.

Chapter 7, finally, summarises the main conclusions of the study and develops its suggested consequences for understanding the grammatical expression of social cognition in Ungarinyin and cross-linguistically.
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2.1. Introduction

Before turning to the grammatical construction at the heart of the present study in chapter 3 this chapter aims to provide the reader with the necessary grammatical background to interpret the Ungarinyin examples and to be able to contextualise specific constructions within the broader system of Ungarinyin grammar. Readers familiar with the descriptions of Ungarinyin in Coate and Elkin (1974), and especially in the definitive grammar of Ungarinyin Rumsey (1982) may prefer to skip through to chapter 3 and refer back to relevant sections of this chapter where necessary.

2.1.1. Ungarinyin word classes and morphological types

The main Ungarinyin word classes are shown in table 2.1 along with their frequencies in the dictionary Coate and Elkin (1974).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th># ENTRIES/N</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nouns</td>
<td>3165/8474</td>
<td>37.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coverbs</td>
<td>2603/8474</td>
<td>30.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modifier</td>
<td>883/8474</td>
<td>10.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflecting verbs</td>
<td>800/8474</td>
<td>9.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1.: Distribution of frequent word classes in Coate and Elkin (1974)

Nouns in Ungarinyin are morphologically distinctive by being able to inflect for case. This

1These frequency counts, as well as other analyses of the dictionary presented below, were performed on the basis of a digitised XML-version of the dictionary prepared at the Kimberley Language Resource Centre in Halls Creek, WA, which I have been able to access courtesy of the KLRC board of directors (decision of the 5th December 2008). With 8474 entries Coate and Elkin (1974) remains one of the largest published dictionaries of any Australian Indigenous language. There are a few minor word class/morphological categories that are not included in this table, namely: unclassified grammatical words: 309/8474 (3.6 %), constructions of quantification: 257/8474 (3 %), unclassifiable items/other categories: 169/8474 (2 %), affixes: 108/8474 (1.3 %), interjections: 94/8474 (1.1 %), unclassifiable verbs (verbs but not identifiable as either coverb or inflecting verb): 74/8474 (0.9 %). Interjections and particles will be discussed in chapter 4.
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feature separates them from ‘coverbs’, a class of words that can only be instantiated in combination with an inflecting verb as exemplified in (9).²

(9)  a. marr nyumarn
     marr ny2-ma-rn
     aim.at 3sg.O:3msg.S-TAKE-PRS

     ‘He raises his fist at her/takes aim at her/threatens her’ (090813-AJMJSMPDh, 11:51-11:52)

b. [[marr]uninflecting verb [nyumarn]inflecting verb]

As the schematic representation in (9b) illustrates, a coverb is (normally) followed by an inflecting verb to form a complex verb construction, which in its entirety expresses a single verbal meaning. I gloss the inflecting verb in these coverb constructions in lower capitals, symbolically representing its intermediate status between a fully grammatical element (glossed in capitals) and a lexical word (glossed in lower case) (see section 2.3.2). As table 2.1 demonstrates, the number of inflecting verbs listed in Coate and Elkin (1974) is considerably lower than that of coverbs, but unlike coverbs inflecting verbs may also form a verbal predicate without another verbal element.

The broad category of ‘modifier’ in table 2.1 is semantically defined: nominal modifiers in Ungarinyin may sometimes be recognised morphologically if they carry prefixes that agree with the modified noun in gender and number. But this feature is not restricted to a class of adjectives (see section 2.2.3.2) and in fact most ‘semantic adjectives’ do not agree with the modified noun at all. Classification of adjectives and adverbs is complicated further by the observation that semantic adjectives, such as burdu ‘small’ and kakalamun ‘long ago’ may in fact often be used as nominal constructions as well, as in (10a) and (10b), respectively.

(10)  a. nyandu burdu nyindi budmaranyirri
     nyandu burdu nyindi bur-r-ma-r-nyirri
     f.AMBIPH small f.ANAPH 3pl-do-PST-DU

     ‘She is the little one,” the two of them said’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 12:35-12:37)

b. kakalamun di
   ka-kalamun di
   REDUP-long.time.ago n.ANAPH

    ‘A very long time ago’ (110925-05NGUN)

Adverbs are not morphologically distinctive and may resemble coverbs, adjectives or nouns.

²Other labels for similar constructions in other Australian languages include ‘preverb’ (Nash, 1982) and even ‘phrasal verb’ (Reid, 1997) (also see McGregor, 2002; Schultze-Berndt, 2000).
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Because there is no independent morphological distinction between nouns and adjectives (i.e. apart from agreement patterns) in Ungarinyin I will mostly refer to both as ‘nominal constructions’, but in context this phrase may be read as synonymous with either ‘noun’ or ‘adjective’. The next section analyses how nominal constructions are formed.

2.2. Nominal constructions and nominal morphology

This section describes the form and function of nominal morphology at the level of individual words and in multi-word constructions. Section 2.2.1 introduces the form and functions of Ungarinyin nominal morphology, section 2.2.2 introduces the freestanding deictic elements in the language, and section 2.2.3 addresses the morphosyntax of Ungarinyin nominal constructions and discusses the important subclass of nominal constructions displaying ‘nominal agreement’ (as in constructions of inalienable possession) and nominal modification.

2.2.1. Nominal morphology

The discussion of nominal morphology in this section will focus on three aspects: case (in section 2.2.1.1), gender and ‘noun class’ distinctions (section 2.2.1.2) and derivational morphology (section 2.2.1.3). The description of the morphemes involved on these phenomena will be mostly semantic: a syntactic perspective, e.g. regarding the specific placement of the morpheme in multi-word constructions will be added in section 2.2.3.

2.2.1.1. Case

The most frequent Ungarinyin cases are shown in table 2.2, which also indicates their primary functions in the second and third column, and where relevant some additional functional extensions.

The first observation to make with respect to table 2.2 concerns the cases that are not represented: Ungarinyin does not morphologically mark core arguments on nominal constructions, so there are no case forms expressing semantic functions such as ‘agent’, ‘affected’ etc., which are staple elements of more familiar nominative/accusative/ergative case systems. Agents and patients, when introduced lexically, are represented with bare nominals, cf. (11a) and (11b)

(11) a. yirrkakngarri ngurr yilan
   yirrkakngarri ngurr a1-y1 ila-n
   police hit 3msg.O:3sg.S-PUT-PRS

   ‘The policeman hits him’ (090812JENGPGc, 5:15-5:21)

3These topics are also discussed in Coate and Oates (1970: 20–27) and Rumsey (1982: 37–74). The reader is referred to these sources for a further analysis of issues not touched upon here.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE FORM</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL FUNCTION(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ku</td>
<td>DATive</td>
<td>‘for’, ‘to’</td>
<td>goal, purpose constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nangka</td>
<td>GENitive</td>
<td>‘of’</td>
<td>relator/nominaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kurde</td>
<td>COMitative</td>
<td>‘(together) with’</td>
<td>phrasal coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nyine</td>
<td>INSTRumental</td>
<td>‘with’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ra</td>
<td>LOCative</td>
<td>‘in’, ‘on’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-yu</td>
<td>LATive</td>
<td>‘to’, ‘through’</td>
<td>paragraph marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2.: The most frequent Ungarinyin cases

b. mara bungoni
mara bungaq2-w1 u-ni
mara 3pl.O:1sg.S-ACT.ON-PST animal
ngala
‘I saw an animal/animals’ (100722-04NGUS, 7:30-7:32)

For indirect objects, vocative addressees and relational, directional and locational semantic relations, however, Ungarinyin does have a relatively extensive set of case forms, as listed in table 2.2. I will illustrate each of these cases in turn.

The dative, expressed with the suffix -ku, is mostly used to encode indirect objects, such as in the benefactive construction in (12).

(12) Discussing the purpose of Ungarinyin documentation:

>yilelaku      wungininga       belen
>yila-la-ku    wungaq2-ininga-o  belen
kid-REDUP-DAT 3n1w.O:1sg.S-put-FUT behind

‘I will leave it [the language] behind for the children’ (100831-01NGUN, 3:12-3:14)

Another very frequent use of the dative is reference to a goal in constructions that express a motion towards a goal as in (13). As shown here, the goal may either be an inanimate location (13a) or an animate target (13b).

(13) a. joli nga dambuku
joli nga1-a-o dambun-ku
return 1sg-GO-PRS camp-DAT

‘I am going back to [my] camp’ (101001-01DCES, 13:14-13:15)

4For an overview of Ungarinyin case markers, also see Coate and Oates (1970: 25–27) and for an in-depth description of the case system, see Rumsey (1982: 60–74).
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b. *yirranangkaku mardumardu* e
   *yirranangka-ku mardu-mardu* a₁-y₂i-ø
   his.father-DAT walk-REDUP 3msg-be-PRS

   ‘He is walking towards his father’ (090812JENGPDc, 0:59-1:01)

A third very common meaning of the dative is ‘purpose’ or ‘reason’, as in (14).

(14) *kiwa* nyumindan mangarriku
   *ki-wa* nya₂-minda-n mangarri-ku
   push-ITRV 3fsg.O:3sg.S-TAKE-PRS food-DAT

   ‘He pushes her because of that food’ (090812JENGPDg, 00:51-00:53)

The purpose/reason function of the dative case also accounts for the interrogative construction *anja-ku* ‘why, what for?’, a combination of the interrogative pronoun *anja* ‘what’ and the dative suffix.

With the polysemy of the dative comes ambiguity, as illustrated in (15), where *wungayku* ‘woman-DAT’ may be interpreted as either beneficiary (‘for that woman’), goal (‘to that woman’) or reason (‘because of that woman’), the latter being the most likely interpretation in context.

(15) A passage from the Family problems picture task: After being convicted in court the police take the abusive husband away.

   *idmindarnyirri* (.2) *nyinda wungayku* (.05) ngurrba
   irr-minda-n-nyirri nyinda wungay-ku ngurr-ba
   3msg.O:3pl.S-TAKE-PRS-DU f.PROX woman-DAT hit-ITRV

   *nyumindaningarri*
   nya₂-minda-ni-ngarri
   3fsg.O:3sg.S-TAKE-PST-SUB

   ‘After he hit her, they take him because of that woman’ (090812JENGPDc, 1:24-1:30)

Finally, sometimes the dative can mark possession, as *dativus possessivus*, as in (16).

(16) *nyangkiku* mananarrmananarrkarra
   *nyangki-ku* mananarrmananarr=karra
   someone-DAT camera=maybe

   ‘This might be someone’s camera’ (111013-01NGUN, 20:51-20:52)

---

5 The example here is edited by the speaker, the original recording contained the English word ‘camera’ rather than the Ungarinyin translation *mananarrmananarr* ‘camera’ (< *mananarr* ‘flash’).
The possessive dative is not very common, but seems to occur specifically with kinterms (if a free possessive pronoun is used, cf. 143b on page 111) and in instances in which ownership is questioned, such as in (16).\textsuperscript{6}

The function of the genitive is most often simply to mark nominal possession, as in the examples in (17).

(17) a. \textit{almara-nangka} \textit{wurlan}
  white.people-GEN language
  ‘English [lit.: white people’s language]’ (100831-01NGUN, 2:37-2:39)

b. \textit{banmarn-nangka} \textit{anguma}
  magician-GEN spirit
  ‘the magician’s spirit’ (Coate and Oates, 1970: 38)

The suffix -\textit{nangka} also has derivational functions, which may be seen as an extension of the relational meaning that is necessarily part of a possessive relation (see section 2.2.1.3). In my corpus, explicit marking of a possessive relation through the use of a genitive suffix is most commonly found with ‘possession’ of abstract objects (as in 17); however, Rumsey (1982: 71–72) shows that genitive case marking with concrete objects such as ‘car’ and ‘pillow’ is found as well.

The suffix -\textit{nyine} or -\textit{nyinengka} encodes instrumental case. Example (18) illustrates some common uses of this marker.

(18) a. \textit{yarurr wudmanga} \textit{mardarnnyine}
  \textit{yarurr wurr-ma-nga} \textit{mardarn-nyine}
  rub \textit{3n}_{w}.O:3pl.S-TAKE-PST gumtree.glue-INSTR
  ‘They rubbed it with gumtree glue’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 17:13-17:14)

b. \textit{kajinyine} \textit{di} \textit{dijilan} \textit{nyidni}
  \textit{kaji-nyine} \textit{di} \textit{dijilan} \textit{nyirr-w}_{1}u-ni
  rope-INSTR \textit{n}_{w}.ANAPH make.a.hole \textit{3fsg.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-PST}
  ‘They made a hole in it with a rope’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 17:17-17:18)

c. \textit{anjanyine} \textit{ngurr nyinmernangka}
  \textit{anja-nyine} \textit{ngurr nyin-ma-ra-nangka}
  what-INSTR hit \textit{2sg.S-do-PST-3sg.O}

\textsuperscript{6}This use is paralleled by Aboriginal English forms such as ‘who for?’ and ‘x for dad’ (meaning ‘x’s dad’), which are common in the Ngarinyin community.
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d. **ngurr nyumernangka**  **anjanyine**
   **ngurr nyΩ2-ma-ra-nangka**  **anja-nyine**

hit 3fsg-do-PST-3sg.IO what-INSTR

‘What did she hit him with?’ (100903-31NGUN, 11:32-11:35)

As the examples in (18) demonstrate, the instrumental case attaches to a noun or an interrogative pronoun referring to an object by means of which or with the use of which some action is performed.

Comitative case is signalled by the suffix *-kurde*. It may be used with all objects, including humans (as in 19a and 19d), other animates (19b) and inanimates (19c).

(19) a. **beja nyangkalu wadikurde**
   **beja nyΩ2-a-ngka-lu wadi-kurde**

CMPV 3fsg-go-PST=PROX Wati-COM

‘Then she came with Wati’ or: ‘She and Wati came’ (Rumsey, 1982: 74)

b. **karnangkurr-kurde minjal bidi**
   **karnangkurr-kurde minjal biri-yi-ø**

dog-COM eat 3pl-be-PRS

‘They eat, together with the dog’ (100903-13NGUN, 0:04-0:06)

c. **jina jina darr amlu dalarukurde belen**
   **jina jina darr a1-ma-ø-lu dalaru-kurde belen**

m.PROX m.PROX stand 3msg-do-PRS=PROX walking.stick-COM behind

**jina**

**jina**

m.PROX

‘This one here is standing a bit back with his walking stick’ (090813-AJMJSMPDh, 12:09-12:12)

d. **yilakurde mangarri mardu mardu nya**
   **yila-kurde mangarri mardu mardu nyΩ2-a-ø**

kid-COM food walk walk 3fsg-go-PRS

‘She walks with the child and the food’ or: ‘She and the child walk with the food’ (090812JENGPDi, 8:01-8:04)

Nominal constructions with a comitative often represent a coordinated set of discourse entities (*x* and *y*), as in the alternative translations of (19a) and (19d). As example (19c) demonstrates, when attaching to nominals denoting inanimate objects, the meaning of the comitative grades into that of the instrumental, as also illustrated in (20) (cf. Dixon, 1976).
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(20)  
\[\text{handkakwurde warduk awani} \]
\[\text{handkakwurde warduk a]-w a-ni} \]
\[\text{handcuff-COM lock.up 3msg-FALL-PST} \]

‘He is locked in handcuffs’ (090812JENGPDc, 5:21-5:25)

The locative in Ungarinyin is encoded by the suffix -\textit{ra} and may encode a range of stative spatial meanings, including ‘in’, ‘at’, ‘on’ etc and motion paths, e.g. ‘onto’, as in (21).

(21)  
\[\text{anduyu milimilira wuningan wurlan di} \]
\[\text{andu-\textit{yu} milimili-\textit{ra} wu2-\textit{ingga-n} wurlan di} \]
\[\text{m.AMBIPH-LAT paper-LOC 3n\textsubscript{w}.O:3sg.S-put-PRS language n\textsubscript{w}.ANAPH} \]
\[\text{nyanangka wurlan} \]
\[\text{nyu2-nangka wurlan} \]
\[\text{3fsg:sg-POSS language} \]

‘And he puts words onto the paper, her words’ (090813-AJMJSMPDh, 14:11-14:14)

The marker -\textit{yu} indicates ‘motion up to’, ‘as far as’ and its usage also includes ‘change of state’ (Rumsey, 1982: 64). Acknowledging these two semantic aspects of the marker, Rumsey (1982) labels this case form ‘lative-translative’, noting its similarity with two cases by these names in e.g. some Finno-Ugric languages that cover these same functions. For convenience I will abbreviate this label to ‘lative case’, but my analysis of the marker fully follows that in Rumsey (1982).\footnote{Coate and Oates (1970: 26) only list -\textit{yu} as one of a set of directional suffixes in Ungarinyin and note that it has the idiomatic meaning ‘to become’.}

Example (22) illustrates the spatial meaning of the the lative case.\footnote{In this example the lative case is used ‘stacked’ onto a locative case. Case stacking is not as frequent as in some other Australian languages (cf. Dench and Evans, 1988) but it may occur, particularly in combination with the locative case. As example (131) on page 96 and (42) on page 315 demonstrate the lative case suffix may also as a ‘non-stacked’ case express the spatial meaning signalled in (22).}

(22)  
\[\text{About a bush turkey eating stones} \]
\[\text{marnderayu wudningan} \]
\[\text{marndu-ra-\textit{yu} wurr-\textit{ingga-n}} \]
\[\text{gut-LOC-LAT 3n\textsubscript{w}.O:3pl.S-put-PRS} \]

‘They put it [the stones] into their guts’ (100903-18NGUN, 3:14-3:15)

Apart from its movement and change-of-state meanings, lative case is much more frequent in a non-local function which I will refer to as ‘paragraph marker’ (see Rumsey, 1987 and chapter 5). In this usage, -\textit{yu} indicates a shift in discourse topic or a new stage in the narrative and an example of this use was shown above on the first word in (21), where it was translated as the discourse connective ‘and’.
Other locational/directional case suffixes in Ungarinyin include the addessive -ngunda, meaning ‘in the vicinity of’, which is often used with place names (as in 23a) and the allative case marker -biny, which ‘signals motion in some particular direction’ (Rumsey, 1982: 63), shown in (23b).

(23) a. kalungunda wari inyi
    kalu-ngunda wari a₁-y₁-i-nyi
    about-ADESS burn 3msg-BE-PST
    ‘He got burned about here’ (100903-31NGUN, 1:41:1:43)

b. nyadakabiny dambura burray
    nyadaka-biny dambun-ra burray
    1pl.EXC:3pl.POSS-ALL camp-LOC nothing
    ‘There were none coming to our home’ (= line 50 of the bowerbird story on page 281)

The suffix -ningke, which Coate and Oates (1970: 25) list as one of the directional suffixes, has the opposite meaning of the lative case, and I will label it ablative, as in (24).

(24) mindiningke barij e
    mindi-ningke barij a₁-y₂-i-∅
    nₘ.ANAPH-ABL get.up 3msg-BE-PRS
    ‘He gets up from here’

There are two other directional suffixes indicating movement towards (-lu/-walu/-wula) and movement away from some discourse referent (-nya) (see section 2.3.1). While these mostly occur on verbs, they may be used in nominal constructions as well, such as in (25).

(25) bulong nyangkalu barnjawula
    bulong ny₀₂-a-ngka=lu barnja=wula
    come.out 3sg-GO-PST=PROX cave=PROX
    ‘She came out of the cave’ (111006-02NGSNU, 1:55:1:59)

A common use of the directional suffixes in non-verbal constructions is with the interrogative pronoun kunya ‘where’, i.e. kunyawalu/kunyawula ‘from where’ (also see Rumsey, 1982: 132).

One final case form that both Coates (1987: 27) and Rumsey (1982: 74) distinguish is a vocative, formed by the suffix -ay, as in (26)

(26) kundi-ay
    husband-VOC
    ‘Husband!’ (Rumsey, 1982: 74)
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2.2.1.2. Gender

Each Ungarinyin noun belongs to one of four genders or noun classes:

(27) a. ‘masculine’, relating to animates, male, most items associated with/carried by men;
   b. ‘feminine’, relating to animates, female, most items associated with/carried by women;
   c. ‘neuter m-class’, relating to non-human objects, most places, most plants and most body parts;
   d. ‘neuter w-class’, non-human objects, most time concepts, most rocks and minerals, most trees and wood(en objects) and linguistic concepts.

Both Coate and Oates (1970) and Rumsey (1982) classify a plural or collective marker as a fifth gender in Ungarinyin, and indeed the marking of plural/collective number completely parallels that of gender marking in the language. A number of pluralia tantsum, such as mangarri ‘food’, always belongs to this ‘collective class’.

The simplest way of indicating gender within nominal constructions is through a gender bearing word, such as the anaphoric pronouns in (28).

---

9 The terms ‘gender’ and ‘noun class’ are both used in the Australianist literature to describe comparable phenomena, namely paradigmatic choices in agreement patterns and/or pronominal elements in nominal (phrasal) constructions that are distinct from other nominal feature categories such as person and number. But the definitions of what distinguishes noun class from gender differ considerably for individual authors. For example, Dixon (1968: 105) states: ‘Gender can be regarded as a particular instance of ‘noun class,’ when there are just two or three classes and considerable semantic correlation with sex.’ Based on a similar definition Capell and Coate (1984: 61) state that noun class distinctions outnumbe gender distinctions, and apply the notion ‘noun class’ to Kimberley languages. Harvey (1997: 17) observes that in Australian languages biological gender does not correlate closely with gender/noun class and adopts the latter term, while Clendon (1999: 310) takes the a priori semantic opacity of gender as a starting point, disqualifying the notion of presumably semantically coherent noun classes for the case of Australian Aboriginal languages (or at least in the description of a rather typical exponent of the (Kimberley) Australian system in Worrorra).

Outside Australia, in a description of what is perhaps often thought of as the most prototypical noun classification system, that in Bantu languages, Allan (1977: 290) argues that the flexibility of noun classes is exactly what distinguishes them from ‘European type’ gender systems (i.e. noun N with nominal classifier A has meaning X and combined with classifier B meaning Y). Under this definition, a language in which a noun can only belong to one specific class category is a gender system. Evans (2003) in his description of Bininj Gun-Wok, on the other hand, reserves the term ‘noun class’ for the inherent class membership of a noun, as indicated by the morphological properties (class markers) on the noun itself and characterises gender as an agreement class, expressed through adjectival and pronominal affixation Evans (2003: 181-183).

I will follow both Coate and Oates (1970) and Rumsey (1982) in referring to gender/noun class distinctions in Ungarinyin as ‘gender’: Ungarinyin has more than two genders (i.e. ‘noun class’ in terms of Dixon/Capell and Coate) that only partially correlate with biological sex and are only partially semantically transparent (i.e. ‘noun class’ in terms of Harvey and ‘gender’ in terms of Clendon) an the specific gender of an Ungarinyin noun cannot be judged on the basis of morphological properties, but is revealed through agreement patterns (i.e. ‘gender’ in terms of Evans). This position is in accordance with the definition of gender in Corbett (1991), i.e. as an agreement class depending on a variety of semantic, phonological and morphological factors.

10These distinctions are similar to genders/noun classes in Worrorra: ‘males’ (I), ‘females’ (II), ‘place’ (III) and ‘time’ (IV) (Clendon, 1999: 315). In Wunambal (and its varieties) the Worrorra/Ungarinyin distinctions seem to have collapsed into three classes: ‘living things’, ‘general neuter’ and ‘place’ (Capell, 1941: 295-297).
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(28) a. ari jirri
   man m.ANAPH
   ‘Man’

b. wungay nyindi
   woman f.ANAPH
   ‘Woman’

c. dambun mindi
   camp n.m.ANAPH
   ‘Camp’

d. ukuli di
   morning n.m.ANAPH
   ‘Morning/Tomorrow’

The same applies to the collective/plural category Coate and Oates (1970) and Rumsey (1982) both include as a fifth gender, as in (29).

(29) a. ari birri
   man pl.ANAPH
   ‘Men’

b. wungay birri
   woman.ANAPH pl.ANAPH
   ‘Women’

c. me birri
   vegetable.food pl.ANAPH
   ‘Food’

The distributional morphological properties of the ‘b-class’ are the same as those of the classes represented in (28) and Rumsey (1982: 39) states that in its ‘mass’/‘collective’ meaning, when referring to non-human entities, such as me ‘vegetable food’ in (29c) it can be recognised as a gender since in this meaning birri-marked noun phrases are not countable and unlike other plurals cannot trigger dual or paucal agreement on the verb (Rumsey, 1982: 39).11

In terms of the defining property of noun classes used by Allan (1977) – ‘inherent values’ in gender versus classificational flexibility in noun classes– Ungarinyin shows some variability between lexemes. For example, some animate sex neutral words may be associated with more than one gender, as illustrated in (30).

11Without addressing these arguments, McGregor (2004) and Testart (1977: 52) have classified Ungarinyin as having four gender distinctions. Note, however, the analysis of a very similar category in the Cushitic language Konso in Tsegaye et al. (2015), which seems to support the original classification of collective/plural as a gender.
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(30)  a. *yila jirri*
    child m.ANAPH
    ‘a little boy’
  b. *yila nyindi*
    child f.ANAPH
    ‘a little girl’

The examples in (31) and (32) are slightly more figurative examples of ‘multiply classified’ nouns.

(31)  a. *narnburr di*
    paperbark n_w.ANAPH
    ‘paperbark/a paperbark tree’
  b. *narnburr nyindi*
    paperbark? f.ANAPH
    ‘a woman’

(32)  a. *rambarr di*
    screen/barrier n_w.ANAPH
    ‘a barrier/screen’
  b. *rambarr nyindi*
    barrier? f.ANAPH
    ‘an avoidance relative’ (commonly a mother-in-law)

Within Ungarinyin speech culture there are clear metonymic links between the respective examples in (31) and (32): the connection between ‘paperbark’ and ‘woman’ is an associative relation since paperbark objects, such as paperbark baskets (coolamons), are commonly carried by women (cf. Evans and Wilkins, 2001). The relation between *rambarr* ‘barrier’ and *rambarr* ‘avoidance relative’ lies in the taboo relationship that is a central component of the Ungarinyin kinship system (see section 1.2.1): within the Ngarinyin cultural tradition a person is strictly forbidden to communicate, look or even be in the same space as his or her avoidance relative. When in the presence of an avoidance relative, such as a mother-in-law, a man was to avert his eyes and if possible place himself behind a physical barrier, such as a windscreen. So no matter how distinct the respective meanings in (31) and (32) initially may appear from a non-Ngarinyin cultural perspective, these examples show that even in the exceptional case when a lexeme may belong to more than one gender category, gender distinctions are in fact always semantically motivated.

Discussions of the semantics of gender in Australian languages are varied and numerous, but a particularly interesting approach to gender marking is suggested by Heath (1975; 1985),

---

12See the references in footnote 9.
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who proposes that the function of genders/noun classes is independent of their specific meaning:

‘Linguists encountering noun class systems for the first time inevitably want to know the ‘meaning’ of noun class categories. If the noun classes are not obviously unitary semantically, mythological associations and other non-obvious factors are invoked. However, noun class systems do not exist to express semantic cryptotypes; rather, they serve as syntactic devices permitting accurate cross-referencing and anaphora [...] This is not to deny that semantic principles may be operative in noun class assignment, rather only to emphasize that the existence of the system is not motivated by semantic factors and it does not require semantic integrity of the individual noun class categories’ (Heath, 1985: 104-105).

In the alternative interpretation, Heath (1975: 95-96) states that ‘[t]he Nunggubuyu noun classes have a perfectly respectable disambiguating function which would not be appreciably increased by realigning the classes on cognitive principles to suit the linguist’. According to this analysis the most important function of gender/noun classes is to guide reference in discourse. Rumsey (1982: 37) follow this suggestion and claims that ‘[i]n general, gender in [Ungarinyin] has less to do with semantics than with discourse reference maintenance, which is its primary function.’ Gender plays an important role in ‘discourse reference maintenance’ (Rumsey, 1982: 37), a view McGregor (2004: 149, 275) supports.

Kibrik (2011) presents a slightly modified version of this analysis, calling gender/noun class categories not referential devices themselves but ‘referential aids’, grammatical elements whose function is to resolve potential ambiguity in discourse reference (‘referential conflict’, where more than one referent is activated in the discourse) (Kibrik, 2011: 295). As a first illustration of the referential properties of Ungarinyin gender, compare (33), in which the gender is reflected in bound pronouns and an unbound demonstrative pronoun. In (33) there are three discourse referents; a third person object, not specified for gender, a w-class object and a place indicated by munamuna ‘right here’, marked with ‘place’ m-class.

(33) munomuna wumindanerri muna-muna wa2-minda-ni-yirri
nₘ.prox-redup 3ₘₐ.O:3sg.S-take-PST-CONT

‘He is taking it [the bushes] at that place over there’ (= line 21 on page 312)

As can be seen in the text in appendix F from which this example has been taken, the subject can be easily recovered since it is also the subject of the preceding clause, but the object (the

A benefit of this view is that it re-establishes the functional coherence of the five genders Coate and Oates (1970) and Rumsey (1982) distinguish: masculine, feminine, n-neuter, w-neuter and collective/plural: number can be a referential aid as well.
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bushes) to which the bound pronoun refers to last occurs no less than five intonation units before the example cited in (33) above (viz. in line 16 on 311). However, this is the only referent with w-neuter gender in the immediately preceding discourse, which allows the hearer to successfully identify the object referent in (33). Chapter 5 discusses such referential aids in more detail.

2.2.1.3. Nouns and derivational morphology

Ungarinyin has some strategies for deriving nouns from other words, that are either nouns themselves or, e.g. adjectival modifiers or words with an adverbial meaning. In this section I will illustrate some of these strategies.

One productive strategy for deriving nouns is through the suffix -nangka, which I will gloss as ‘genitive’, consider example (34):

(34) yali-nangka
    kangaroo-GEN
    ‘A kangaroo hunter’ (110924-04DSES, 4:47-4:48)

The semantic connection between the possessive genitive meaning and the derivational meaning as in (34) is a relational one, that can be captured with an English equivalent such as ‘of’ or ‘belonging to’: a kangaroo hunter is a ‘person of the kangaroo’. Another example of this type is ngabunnangka (lit.: ‘of the water, belonging to the water’), which is derived from the word ngabun ‘water’ and can potentially refer to any water animal, most frequently crocodiles. In contemporary Ungarinyin, the noun ngabun also means ‘beer/grog’, and (35) shows that also in this meaning a ‘genitive’ derived noun ngabunnangka can be productively formed.

(35) ngabunnangka e
    ngabun-nangka a1-y2i-ø
    beer-GEN 3msg-be-PRS
    ‘He is an alcoholic’ (090812JENGPDK, 1:17-1:18)

Coate and Oates (1970: 24) cite examples such as wurla-nangka ‘messenger’ (lit.: ‘of the language’), embularu-nangka ‘footstep/track’ (lit.: ‘of his foot’).

Examples (36) illustrates a possible example of non-noun/noun derivation through -nangka. In (36), the prefixing nominal -lmara, which may both mean ‘white’ or ‘white person’, is suffixed with -nangka to form the meaning ‘(language) of the white man’.

(36) almaranangkanga wurla budmalu
    a-lmara-nangka-nga wurla burr-ma-ø=lu
    3msg-white-GEN-ONLY talk 3pl-do-PRS=PROX
    ‘They can only speak English (to us)’ (100831-01NGUN, 1:34-1:37)
Apart from the genitive, two other case forms that are common in derivational functions are the comitative suffix -kurde, for which Coate and Oates (1970: 24) cite the examples in (37), with a nominal and a coverb as base, and the locative -ra.

(37)  
   a.  *wurlun-kurde*  
       woman-COM  
       ‘married man’  
   b.  *warnadij-kurde*  
       create-COM  
       ‘artist’

(38)  
   a.  *arrangura*  
       arrangu-ra  
       on.top-LOC  
       ‘The one above’  
   b.  *ondolanda*  
       ondolan-da  
       clouds-LOC  
       ‘The one in the clouds’ (100721-02NGUS, 2:05-2:10)

Both terms in (38) are neologisms for the introduced Christian God (in Ungarinyin cosmology ancestral beings reside in and on the Earth).

Ungarinyin also has a number of distinct nominalisation strategies, such as with the suffix -ngarri, which doubles as a subordinating suffix (see Coate and Oates, 1970: 23-24; Rumsey, 1982: 133-134). Common examples include lexicalised neologisms such as *yirrkalngarri* ‘police’ (< *yirrkal* ‘rope’) and *bubungarri* ‘cigarettes’ (< *bubu* ‘blow’) and productive examples as in (39).

(39)  
   a.  *kawarr-ngarri*  
       mad-NMLZ  
       ‘a madman’ (100726-04AJUN, 5:53)  
   b.  *yoyo-ngarri jirri*  
       hairy-NMLZ m.ANAPH  
       ‘a hairy man’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: 299)

A nominalising suffix with the meaning ‘person who does x’, -barda (Coate and Oates, 1970: 24) is prominent in the story in Appendix C through the word *rimijbarda* ‘thief’, derived from the coverb *rimij* ‘steal’ (see, e.g. line 42 on page 280). Several other ‘actor’ derivational suffixes similar to -barda may be used, such as -maro, for which Coate and Elkin (1974) list the example
wirlmaro as ‘a pleader, one who pesters, to pursue with words’ deriving from the coverb *wirl* ‘to plead’. The suffix *-moya* is used to form words relating to *mama* ‘sacred, secret’ practices. And a fuller list of nominal derivational suffixes is found in Coate and Oates (1970: 23-25) and Rumsey (1982: 123-126).

Although, as indicated, adjectives are often formally indistinguishable from nouns Ungarinyin does have a productive strategy for deriving ‘adjectives’ through the use of the suffix *-kajin* ‘-like’ (cf. Rumsey, 1982: 125). Example (40) shows an instance of this suffix in a predicative construction during a discussion about traditional types of vegetable found on Ngarinyin country, which the speaker compares to an introduced one.

(40) **While discussing Ungarinyin names for bush foods:**

```
jinda yobi jina cabbagekajin alngun wirriya jinda
jinda yobi jina cabbage-kajin a₁-lngun w-irriya jinda
m.PROX other m.PROX cabbage-like 3msg-name nᵣᵣ-what’s.it.called m.PROX
```

‘This other one that’s like a cabbage, what’s that one called again?’ (111015-02 PNNKDDJEUD, 23:58-24:00)

2.2.2. Deictic and pronominal constructions

This brief section will list the main deictic pronouns in Ungarinyin, but the analysis of their interpretation beyond the clause, particularly their discourse referential functions, will follow in later chapters (particularly chapter 5). Rumsey (1982: 31–36) provides more details about each of these paradigms and also lists the interrogative pronouns, which I have left out here.

The Ungarinyin independent personal pronouns for ‘local’ discourse participants, i.e. first and second persons, are shown in (41).

(41)  1sg  ngin  
    2sg  nyngan  
    1pl.INC ngarrun  
    1.INC-DU ngarrun-nyirri  
    1.INC-PAUC ngarrun-nyina  
    1pl.EXC nyarrun  
    1.EXC-DU nyarrun-nyirri  
    1.EXC-PAUC nyarrun-nyina  
    2pl  nurrun  
    2.DU  nurrun-nyirri  
    2.PAUC nurrun-nyina
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The third person pronoun forms express two additional semantic dimensions: gender and discourse status/spatial remoteness. The first set of these, anaphoric pronouns, were introduced in the previous section: in (42) its paradigm is given alongside a set of pronouns Rumsey (1982) calls ‘ambiphoric’, ‘used to introduce a new topic’ (Rumsey, 1982: 33, also see section 5.2.1.1). The demonstrative pronoun series, which includes a proximal–distal–remote distinction, is shown in (43).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(42) & \text{ANAPH} & \text{AMBIPH} \\
m & jirri & andu \\
f & nyindi & nyandu \\
n_m & mindi & mandu \\
n_w & di & wandu \\
pl & birri & bandu \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(43) & \text{PROX} & \text{DIST} & \text{REM} \\
m & jinda & jino & jindingya \\
f & nyinda & nyino & nyindinya \\
n_m & munda & muno & mindinya \\
n_w & kanda & kano & kandinya \\
pl & bunda & buno & bundinya \\
\end{array}
\]

The distances referred to by the opposition PROXIMATE – DISTAL – REMOTE are relational and do not denote any fixed spatial distance. For example in lines (43) and (44) of the dialogue in appendix F on page 315, the pronoun kanda ‘here’ is used to refer in a narrative space that is far removed from where the narrator and current addressee are located.

All pronouns can be affixed with the same cases as regular nouns and appear in the same functions, and subsequently bare pronouns may act both as subject and object. The pronouns in (42) and (43) commonly follow the noun, although there are exceptions (e.g. cf. line 166 on page 332, which shows an example of an anaphoric pronoun preceding the noun). Pronouns of multiple types may also be combined to form complex referential devices, a further analysis of which will be provided in chapter 5.

The category of interrogative pronouns includes nyangki ‘who’, anja ‘what’, kunya ‘what’, kunyal ‘where’, anjamangarn ‘when’ and the gender inflecting irriya ‘what, where’ (Rumsey, 1982: 35). The uninflecting interrogative pronouns may be suffixed with the indefinite clitic =karra ‘INDEF/maybe’ to form ignoratives (someone, somewhere, something, some time). The clitic =karra is often contracted to -rra, resulting in the ignoratives nyangkirra ‘someone’, anjarra ‘something’, kunyarra ‘somewhere’, etc., but I have recorded several instances in which the speaker doubles the enclitic -(ka)rra ‘INDEF’, as in (44).

\[14\text{This example is discussed in chapter 5 as example (202b) on page 175.}\]
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(44) *From a narrative about a group of rangers who find a crocodile with an object stuck in its nose*

*anjarrakarra* darrak burrwani ornjira

*anjarrar=karra* darrak burr-wa- ni ornji-ra

something=INDEF be.stuck 3pl-FALL-PST nose-LOC

‘Something became stuck in his nose’ (111013-01NGUN, 16:55-16:57)

The form *anjakarra* ‘something’ appears in (189) on page 147 and *nyangkikarra* ‘someone’ in the Bowerbird story in appendix C (lines 9 on page 274 and line 21 on page 276). Ignorative subjects always combine with third plural verb inflection.

The list of possessive pronouns in (45) concludes this brief overview of Ungarinyin pronouns.

(45) 1sg *n ginangka* 1.EXC-DU *nyadakarri*

2sg *nyunganangka* 1.EXC-PAUC *nyadakana*

3msg *anangka* 2pl *nudaka*

3fsg *nyanangka* 2-DU *nudakarri*

3m-sg *wanangka* 2-PAUC *nudakana*

3f-sg *manangka* 3pl *budaka*

1pl.INC *ngadaka* 3-DU *budakarri*

1.INC-DU *nyadakarri* 3-PAUC *budakana*

1.INC-PAUC *ngadakana* 1pl.EXC *nyadaka*

Possessive pronouns in Ungarinyin inflect for both possessor (person, number and gender) and possessed (only number, i.e. singular, dual, paucal and plural). Rumsey (1982: 52) lists all possible combinations. Possessive pronouns may be suffixed with a case form, as in (46), *anangka* ‘his (singular possessor)’.

(46) *balya andumindan* anangkaku minjarl minjarl

*balya andar-minda-n* anangka-ku minjarl minjarl

*go* 3pl.O:3sg.S-takePRS 3msg.sg.POSS-DAT eat eat

‘He takes off for his own [food (pl)], eat eat’(100903-02NGUN, 0:59-1:01)

As (47) illustrates, possessive constructions may take several forms in Ungarinyin, particularly with inalienably possessed referents.
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(47) buluba nyangkanu marnbakunda (.09) buluba nyangka
    buluk-ba nyanga2-a-nkga-ru marnbakun-ra buluk-ba nyangka
look.for-ITRV 3fsg,-S-go-PST-2sg.IO head-LOC look.for-ITRV 3fsg,go-PST
    ngiyalunkunda (.06) munduwarri (.15) buluba (.08) nyangka (.23)
    ngiya1-lunkun-ra munduwarri buluk-ba nyangka2-a-ngka
1sg-head-LOC lice look.for-ITRV 3fsg-go-PST
    nginingka (.12) marnbakun (.16) munduwarri ku
    nginingka marnbakun munduwarri-ku
1sg:3sg.POSS head lice-DAT

‘She looked at your head. She looked for lice on my head. She looked for lice on my head’ (100722-03NGUS, 3:09-3:30)

In the first intonation unit in buluba nyangkanu marnbakunda literally: ‘she looks for you on the head’ possession is not marked at all. In the second intonation unit buluba nyangka ngiyalunkunda ‘she looks on my head’ the possessive relation is expressed with the possessive prefix ngiy(a)-. And in the third clause buluba nyangka nginingka marnbakun munduwarri ku ‘she looks on my head for lice’ a possessive pronoun is used.

2.2.3. Nominal constructions

2.2.3.1. Nominal constructions: a general overview

Ungarinyin is a ‘non-configurational’ language in the sense that ‘phrasal units above word level are not obviously well-defined’ (Heath, 1986: 375). Rumsey (1982: 135–142) presents a comprehensive overview of flexible nominal constructions that I will briefly summarise here.15 Evans (2003: 227–233) identifies several problems for determining constituency and argument-hood in ‘nominal groups’ in Bininj Gun-Wok, which may serve as a useful introduction for the discussion of Ungarinyin here. First of all Evans (2003: 227) observes that ‘the opposition between predicate and actant is frequently unclear, since a typical verb already contains a great deal of information about the actant(s). Rather, identificational information typically proceeds by a series of successive predications’. In Ungarinyin it is also often unclear if the verb or the nominal elements introduce the semantic participants in an event and whether nominal constructions have syntactic ‘argument status’. Second, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that each nominal construction in fact form a structurally definable unit, i.e. a constituent. And third, referential properties and features of event participants are encoded

15While Rumsey (1982) uses the term noun phrase (NP) and does not rule out the possibility of a transformational generative grammar approach to Ungarinyin, much of his description would now classify as constructionist and the bracket notation (Rumsey, 1982: 136ff) even foreshadows the bracket formalism used in much of the contemporary construction grammar literature.
both on nominal and verbal elements and it is unclear how to determine their functional relations, a problem Evans (2003: 231) calls the ‘unification problem’.\textsuperscript{16} I will exemplify these problems in reverse order.\textsuperscript{17} The unification problem may be illustrated by the two examples in (48).

(48)  a. aru mara bungoni balu balu
     aru mara bungo2-w1u-ni ba2-a=lu ba2-a=lu
     snake see 3pl.O:1sg.S-ACT.ON-PST IMP-go=PROX IMP-go=PROX

     ‘I’ve found some snakes, come, come!’ (100903-31NGUN, 1:07-1:08)

 b. banjali bundon yila
     banjali bundo2-w1u-n yila
     leave.behind 3pl.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-PRS child

     ‘They are leaving the children behind’ (090912JENGPDi, 6:36-6:37)

As is often the case in Ungarinyin, the nominal elements in (48) do not specify any number/gender features or reveal any information about their semantic/syntactic role, but the plural bound object pronoun, which is coreferential with aru ‘snake’ in (48a) and yila ‘child’ in (48b), marks its referent as a plural object, i.e. ‘snakes’ and ‘children’. These instances of ‘number unification’ (Evans, 2003: 234) occur every time an Ungarinyin noun is not accompanied by an anaphoric, ambiphoric or demonstrative pronoun or nominal modifier.

The problem of defining nominal constructions as a unit comes up most clearly in discontinuous nominal constructions, i.e. non-adjacent nominal elements within a single clause and intonation unit sharing the same referent and apparently expressing the same semantic and syntactic role. In (49) the underlined elements in each of the three examples may be interpreted as one single constituent (also see the first turn in (67) on page 46 below).

(49)  a. nyandu nyuma bellingerr
     nyandu nyu2-ma-ø bellingerr
     3f.AMBIPH 3fsg-do-PRS corella

     ‘This little white corella does/sings’ (111013-01NGUN, 15:40-15:41)

 b. mangarri nalya birrinyi burdu
     mangarri nalya birr-y2i-nyi burdu
     food pile.up 3pl-BE-PST small

     ‘The took a little bit of food’ (111013-01NGUN, 3:46-3:47)

\textsuperscript{16}Evans (2003: 232) identifies a fourth problem in Bininj Gun-Wok, labelled the ‘division problem’, which deals with the semantic interpretation of nominal elements within and outside of verbal constructions but this problem is irrelevant for Ungarinyin since unlike Bininj Gun-Wok it does not display noun incorporation (but see section 2.3.2).

\textsuperscript{17}Here and elsewhere in this chapter, relevant sub-clausal elements of multi-word constructions are underlined in the examples.
c. kalamun nyangkanya kanda di
kalaman� nyo=nya kanda di
long.ago 3fsb-go-PST=DIST ṉm-prox ṉw-anaph

‘She went away from here a long time ago’ (= line 98 on page 323)

The words nyandu...belngerr ‘this corella’ in (49a), mangarri...burdu ‘a little bit of food’ in (49b) and kalamun...di ‘long ago’ may all be interpreted as discontinuous nominal constructions on semantic grounds but standard constituency tests such as movement, negation, plural/singual feature change etc. fall short.\textsuperscript{18}

The first problem Evans (2003) signals, the difficulty of determining the status of nominal constructions as referential devices, is illustrated by examples such as (50), in which both the agent referent and the patient referent are indexed by a bound pronoun but only the object is also referred to with a freestanding nominal construction.

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\text{karraki burdu di} & \quad \text{nginingka} \quad \text{(08) bejakarra} \quad \text{wudmani} \\
\text{karraki burdu di} & \quad \text{nginingka} \quad \text{beja=karra} \quad \text{wurr-ma-ni} \\
\text{basket small ṉw-anaph ḻs:sg.POSS already=maybe 3ṉw.o:3pl-take-PST}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

‘They may have taken my small purse’ (100903-25NGUN, 4:08-4:11)

Similar constructions are frequent in Ungarinyin, but I will consider this point in more detail after the introduction of verbal constructions in section 2.3.

While these issues are problems in defining nominal constructions as distinctive units in Ungarinyin nominal constructions do show certain regularities. The most typical unmarked word order in nominal constructions is illustrated in (51). Nominal constructions are often organised according to a head–modifier principle and pronominal elements commonly follow nominal elements.

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\text{marnjarn burdu di} \\
\text{stone small ṉw-anaph}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

‘A/the small stone’ (111013-01NGUN, 1:21)

Rumsey (1982: 136) lists the (non-clausal) nominal constructions in Ungarinyin represented below as (52a-52e). The labels N (noun or pronoun), ProN (pronoun), Adj (adjective), Dem (demonstrative) and Quant (quantifier) indicate the unmarked positions for each of these ele-

\textsuperscript{18}These tests are inadequate for different reasons: the movement test does not work since the result that these elements can be moved together as one construction does not answer the question if they are one construction and negation in Ungarinyin is a feature of the verbal construction so cannot be used to test properties of nominal constructions. Changing the number of one element in the discontinuous constructions in (49a) does mean that the other element has to be adjusted in number as well (demonstrating both words refer to the same referent), but the two other examples are pluralia tantum.
ments in nominal constructions but they may take any position within a particular construction frame. Initial position normally indicates prominence/focus.

(52) a. N
b. N N ...
c. N ProN
d. N Adj
e. N_{possessor} N_{possessed}
f. Dem Quant N Adj (ProN)

The constructions in (52a), (52c) and (52d) were illustrated in (51). Example (53a) illustrates the construction in (52b).

(53) a. rarrki a:: manjarn rock and stone
   ‘Rocks and/or stones’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 0:11-0:12)
b. amen waduwa ngala jirri alginangka ya kanda
   a_{1-men} w-aduwa ngala jirri alyi-nangka ya kanda
   3msg-eye n_{w-all} animal m.ANAPH inside-GEN and n_{w}.DEM
   ‘He sees with his inner eye as well as his ordinary eyes’ (Coate, 1966: 122, lines 358-359)
c. kanangkurr aru dolod warndij monyinu
   karnangkurr aru dolod warndij ma_{2}-y_{2i}-nyi-nu
   dog snake hole create 3n_{m}.S-BE-PST-2sg.IO
   ‘It could become a dog, snake or hole for you (Coate, 1966: 117, line 252)

Examples (53a) and (53b) both contain two coordinated nouns connected by the connective a/ya ‘and’. The juxtaposed words karnangkurr aru dolod ‘dog, snake, hole’ in (53c) exemplify disjunction, referring to the different shapes a magician is able to take on according to the story in Coate (1966: 117) (also see the discussion of clausal coordination in section 2.4.2.1).

---

19 This boxed notation represents a similar structural representation as the square bracket notation elsewhere and is adopted from construction grammar (Goldberg, 1995; 2006; Croft, 2001). Note that unlike non-constructionist, hierarchical representations of grammatical structure the construction schemas in (52) simply represent different levels of generalisation are not mutually exclusive. For example, the sequence of nominal constructions in (53c) could be seen as a combination of construction schema (52b) and a repetition of (52a).
Possessive constructions as in (52e) may be expressed with pronouns as in (54) or with genitive case, as illustrated in (17) on page 22 above.

(54)  
a. *juwibarn anangka dambura*  
\hspace{1cm} *juwibarn a₁-nangka dambura*  
bowerbird 3msg-GEN house-LOC  

‘The bowerbird’s home’ (100903-21NGUN, 6:58-7:00)

b. In a story about Aboriginal women giving birth to white children:

\hspace{1cm} *anangka yila (.03) kundi jina kulin nyumarangarri*  
\hspace{1cm} *a₁-nangka yila kundi jina kulin nyu₂-ma-ra-ngarri*  
3msg-GEN kid husband m.PROX give.birth 3fsg-DO-PST-SUB  

\hspace{1cm} *kulibangarringa kulibangarringa*  
\hspace{1cm} *kuliba-ngarri-ng a kuliba-ngarri-ng*  
black-NMLZ-ONLY black-NMLZ-ONLY  

‘When she would give birth to her husband’s child it was just black’ (110925NGUN, 1:45-1:52)

Constructions in which more than three of the element types represented in (52f) are realised are exceedingly rare.

Case marking plays a relatively limited role in the encoding of grammatical relations within nominal constructions: often when the semantic role of an element is sufficiently clear case forms are left out, as in the possessive construction (52e) underlined in (55a), for which during the transcription session Pansy Nulgit suggested the alternative form in (55b) or the nominal construction signalling a location in (56).

(55)  
a. *yilela birri mara wudni juwibarn dalmana*  
\hspace{1cm} *yila-la birri mara wu-r-r-w₁ u-ni juwibarn dalmana*  
kid-REDUP pl.ANAPH see 3nᵢₜ.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-PST bowerbird nest  

‘The kids found it in the bowerbird’s nest’ (100903-24NGUN, 2:22-2:25)

b. *yilela birri mara wudni juwibarn anangka*  
\hspace{1cm} *yila-la birri mara wu-r-r-w₁ u-ni juwibarn a₂-nangka*  
kid-REDUP pl.ANAPH see 3nᵢₜ.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-PST bowerbird 3m-POSS  

\hspace{1cm} *dalmana*  
\hspace{1cm} *dalmana-ra*  
nest-LOC  

‘The kids found it in the bowerbird’s nest’ (alternative version of 55a)

---

\(^{20}\) This example corresponds to line (28) of the Bowerbird story in Appendix C on page 277.
Although frequent in discourse, the locative can be dispensed with in many contexts, e.g., the ‘place’ noun class mindi signalling a locational meaning. In (56), muno anbada ‘in Mt. Barnett’ does not carry a locative case (although there wouldn’t be any grammatical reasons preventing it to be expressed here) but the demonstrative muno belonging to the ‘location noun class’ signals the location meaning.

(56) kanda anangka yarra amarangarri muno anbada
kanda a₁-nangka yarra a₁-ma-ra-ngarri muno anbada
nᵦw.PROX 3msg-GEN nest 3msg-do-PST-SUB nᵦm.DIST Mt. Barnett

‘When he made his nest in Mt. Barnett’ (111013-01NGUN, 18:33-18:37)

The high degree of variability in the expression of case in spontaneous speech is another reason why morphological criteria often fail to provide evidence for constituency in Ungarinyin. For example, in (57a) both of the elements in the underlined construction carry locative case, while in (57b) only the final element does.

(57) a. nalya inyangarri barrel di anangkara damburera
nalya a₁-ya₂-nya-ngarri barrel di a₁-nangka-ra dambu-ra
pile.up 3msg-be-PST-SUB bottle nᵦw.ANAPH 3msg-GEN-LOC camp-LOC

‘He piled the bottle glass up in his house’ (100903-24NGUN, 6:50-6:53)

b. anangka damburera
a₁-nangka dambun-ra-ra
3msg-GEN camp-LOC-LOC

‘in his home’ (100903-21NGUN, 6:01-6:02)

2.2.3.2. Nominal agreement and nominal modification

Ungarinyin has two types of nouns that carry prefixes for gender, number and person: a small class of nominal modifiers/adjectives and a class of ‘inalienably possessed’ nouns (mainly bodyparts and some kinship terms). The paradigm of these prefixes is given in (58).21

(58) 1sg
2sg
3sg masculine: a₁-
3sg feminine: nya₂-
3sg neuter (m): ma₁-
3sg neuter (w): wu-

21 I fully follow the analysis in Rumsey (1982: 44) here. For an explanation of the subscripts, see (Rumsey, 1982: 16–30) or appendix A.
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Examples (59a) illustrates adjectival nominal concord, (59b) an adjectival form used as a referring term.

(59) a. aniyangarri... wuniyangarri wurlan
   a1-niya-ngarri... wu-niya-ngarri wurlan
   3msg-good-NMLZ nwc-good-NMLZ language
   ‘good... good language ’ (090823JENGPD, 1:45-1:47)

b. nyorongarrinyirri
   nya2-rongarri-nyirri
   3fsg-white-DU
   ‘Two whites [white women]’ (100726-02AJUN, 2:33-2:34)

In (59a) the speaker uses self-repair to correct the gender inflection on the adjective -ningyangarri ‘good’ from masculine to w-class, the gender of the word wurlan ‘language’, with which it agrees. Example (59b) belongs to the class of prefixing nominals and could be thought of as deriving from an adjectival construction such as wungay nyorongarrinyirri ‘white woman’, but given that the gender of the referent is already indicated by the prefix nya2- on nyorongarrinyirri ‘white’ the noun wungay ‘woman’ would be redundant. In instances such as (59b) it is difficult to draw a principled distinction between adjectives and nouns.

Two examples of non-adjectival nominal prefixation are shown in (60).

(60) a. nyuru ngaurr amernangka
   nya2-ngaarr ngaurr a1-ma-ra-nangka
   3fsg-ear hit 3msg.S-DO-PST-3sg.O
   ‘He hit her [on the] ear’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 15:27-15:28)

b. wumbalarr yawurr nyumara (.14) nyalangkun
   wumbalarr yawurr nya2-ma-ra
   3fsg-DO-PST charcoal cover
   ‘She covered her head with charcoal’ (111006-01NGUN, 0:09-0:13)

Both underlined bodyparts in (60) inflect for a female, singular possessor.\(^{22}\)

\(^{22}\)Note, however, that irrespective of the possessor prefix the gender of both -uru ‘ear’ and -langkun ‘head’ is m-neuter, although in (60) this is not shown morphologically.
Neither the morphological class of adjectives nor that of prefixing nouns are semantically coherent. In (61a) the predicatively used ‘semantic adjective’ does not take any prefixes, simply because it morphologically does not belong to the class of prefixing nominals. Example (61b) shows a rare instance in which a noun phrase contains two adjectives *rarrki* *biyudungarri* *wu-niyangarri* ‘good small stones’. The adjective *-niyangarri* ‘good’ inflects for the gender/number of its head noun, but the lexeme *biyudungarri* ‘small’ (61b) does not. As for inalienable terms, the lexeme *alangkun* ‘3msg.head’ is prefixing but the synonymous *mubakun* ‘head’ as in (61c) is non-prefixing, as is *langkan* ‘throat’ illustrated in (61d). For the most part, the property prefixing vs. non-prefixing is lexically determined.\(^\text{23}\)

\(^{23}\)Rumsey (1982: 42-46) develops a number of morphonological criteria accounting for prefixation following Capell (1972b), but acknowledges that this may not fully explain the properties of every prefixing or non-prefixing nominal (see Coate and Oates, 1970: 33-35 and Rumsey, 1982: 41-46, 53-55). Capell (1972b) suggests that prefixing terms have vowel initial roots, whereas non-prefixing terms do not, but since the nominal prefix ends in a vowel such an analysis quickly leads to circularity (cf. McGregor, 2011: 121, n. 10 on similar objections for Nyulnyul). Rumsey (1982: 45) argues that Capell’s analysis mostly holds for glide onsets followed by homorganic vowels (i.e. /w/ followed by /u/ and /y/ followed by /i/), which normally allow for prefixation. But this may not explain the distinction between e.g. prefixing -\((a?)\)langkun ‘head’ vs. non-prefixing langkan ‘throat’.

(61) a. *wurlan ngama jongarri*
   *wurlan ngaa-ma-o jongarri*
   language 1sg-do-PRS heavy
   ‘I speak heavy Ungarinyin’ (100721-01NGUN, 6:24-6:27)

b. When searching through the guts of a bush turkey (*barnarr*), some people discover it has swallowed small rocks
   *mara bundonya nyangiyarra* (.06) *karda*
   look 3pl.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON=DIST 3sg-guts-LOC cut
   *bundonngarri* (.03) *rarrki biyudungarri wuniyangarri*
   3pl.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-PRS-SUB rock small-NMLZ 3n-w-good-NMLZ
   ‘They find them in its [her] guts, when they cut them open, nice, small stones’
   (100903-17NGUN, 5:42-5:44)

c. *marnbakunnga buk wanka*
   *marnbakun-nga buk wa2-a-ngka*
   head-ONLY come.out 3n-w-GO-PST
   ‘Only its head stuck out’ (100903-31NGUN, 1:45-1:46)
d. *langkan muju amanangka*

*langkan muju a₁-ma-nangka*

throat grab 3msg.S-DO-3sg.O

‘He grabs her (by the) throat’ (090813AJMJSMPD, 0:02-0:03)

2.3. Verb constructions

Ungarinyin is a head-marking, highly agglutinative language, and the optionality and ambiguity that is characteristic for much of the morphology in nominal constructions, is matched by rigidity and explicitness in the verbal domain (cf. Kibrik, 2012). Example (62) shows the morphological slots in the Ungarinyin verbal template of inflecting verbs (also see Rumsey, 1982: 75).24

```
(62) FUT- IMP- O- S- | DefS- -root- -Refl -T/M -Num -CONT -DIR -IO
    -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6
```

One of the benefits of a templatic morphology is that it allows for great transparency in the interaction between morphemes and categories. For example, some grammatical categories require specific realisations in more than one of the slots in (62) for their encoding, while others can only be expressed when a complementary slot is zero (Rumsey, 1982: 79). In section 2.3.1 I will briefly illustrate the slots in (62) (for a more detailed discussion, see Rumsey, 1982: 74–115).

Although an inflecting verb with a morphological structure as in (62) can independently act as a main verb in Ungarinyin, it is more common to have complex verb constructions, or coverb constructions that may be schematically represented as in (63).

```
(63) [[coverb verb] [inflecting verb]]
```

The selection of the inflecting verbs with which coverbs may combine is limited to one of 14-odd roots, as shown in table 2.3.

Coverb constructions of the form as in (63) occur in many Northern Australian languages and I will discuss the the specifics of the Ungarinyin complex verb in section 2.3.2. Section 2.3.3 concludes the discussion of the verb with a list of the different types of verbal constructions available in Ungarinyin.

---

24Explanations of the abbreviations used in (62) can be found in section (2.3.1) and in the Glossary on page ix.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRANSITIVE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ma-</td>
<td>‘do’, ‘say’ involves action as opposed to state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y2i-</td>
<td>‘be’ involves state or upward motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a-</td>
<td>‘come’, ‘go’ involves motion within a horizontal plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-w1a-</td>
<td>‘fall’ involves downward motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y1inde-</td>
<td>fall involves clumsy or uncontrolled downward motion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-w1u-</td>
<td>‘act on’ involves action by agent A on patient P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ma(ra)-</td>
<td>‘take’, ‘bring’ involves action by A causing motion in P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-minda-</td>
<td>‘take’, ‘bring’ involves action by A causing motion in P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ininga-</td>
<td>‘put’ involves action by A causing change of location or state in P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y1ibu-</td>
<td>‘throw’ involves action by A causing P to move within the horizontal plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ngurlu-</td>
<td>‘give to’ involves action by A causing object X to move to P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y1ila-</td>
<td>‘hold’ involves action by A on P which does not cause movement on P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(r)a-</td>
<td>‘go to’, ‘come to’ involves movement of A to P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-minjala-</td>
<td>‘wait for’ involves action by A in the presence of P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3.: Inflecting verbs in coverb constructions as described in Rumsey (1982: 81; 118)
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2.3.1. Verbal morphology

2.3.1.1. The verbal template

Of all affixes of the verbal template in (62), the bound pronouns occur most frequently: all transitive inflecting verbs are marked with a prefix complex referring to the grammatical object and subject (in that order) and ditransitive verbs may be suffixed with an indirect object marker. The only marker that may replace the subject prefix is the imperative prefix \( b_{a_2} \), as exemplified in (143a) on page 111 below. In all other instances, an Ungarinyin verb minimally inflects for subject, through one of the prefixes in (64).

\[
\begin{align*}
(64) & & 1\text{sg} & & n_{g_{a_1}}- \\
& & 2\text{sg} & & n_{y_{i_{n}}}- \\
& & 3\text{msg} & & a_1- \\
& & 3\text{fsg} & & n_{y_{a_2}} \\
& & 3\text{n}_{u}\text{sg} & & w_{1\text{u}}- \\
& & 3\text{n}_{m}\text{sg} & & m_{a_2} \\
& & 1\text{pl.INC} & & n_{g_{a_{r}}r} - \\
& & 1\text{pl.EXC} & & n_{y_{a_{r}}r} - \\
& & 2\text{pl} & & k_{u_{r}}r- \\
& & 3\text{pl} & & b_{u_{r}}r
\end{align*}
\]

In intransitive verbs, cross-reference relations are maximally transparent:\(^{25}\) the prefixes in (64) uniquely identify all person values available in the language. The paradigm of transitive verbs, on the other hand, contains a large number of syncretic forms, which in all instances are ambiguous with respect to their subject referents. The bound prefixes signalling singular objects are indicated in (65) and the ones marking plural objects are shown in (66); syncretised forms are shaded \( \text{in grey}^{26} \).

\(^{25}\)Note that dual and paucal distinctions are signalled by number suffixes in position +3 in the verbal template in (62).

\(^{26}\)Apart from the formatting, these paradigms are the same as in Rumsey (1982: 85).
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As (65) and (66) show, the transitive pronominal prefixes display a high degree of syncretism, with gender distinctions collapsing for third person subjects with singular objects and most person, gender and number oppositions within the paradigm disappearing for local (i.e. first and second person) subject pronouns, when either the subject, object or both are plural. With these ambiguous pronominal prefixes only the object can be reliably identified. The exchange in (67) from the dialogue transcribed in appendix F, illustrates some of the referential ambiguity this may create.

(65)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg.S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>nyun-</td>
<td>anja2-</td>
<td>nyoq2-</td>
<td>wu-</td>
<td>mo2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg.O</td>
<td>nyan-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a12-</td>
<td>nyoq2-</td>
<td>wu-</td>
<td>mo2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3msg.S</td>
<td>nyan-</td>
<td>nyan-</td>
<td>a12-</td>
<td>nyoq2-</td>
<td>wu-</td>
<td>mo2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fsg.S</td>
<td>nyan-</td>
<td>nyan-</td>
<td>a12-</td>
<td>nyoq2-</td>
<td>wu-</td>
<td>mo2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3n_gsg.S</td>
<td>nyan-</td>
<td>nyan-</td>
<td>a12-</td>
<td>nyoq2-</td>
<td>wu-</td>
<td>mo2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3n_mgsg.S</td>
<td>nyan-</td>
<td>nyan-</td>
<td>a12-</td>
<td>nyoq2-</td>
<td>wu-</td>
<td>mo2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl.INC.S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ary2-</td>
<td>nyarr-</td>
<td>war2-</td>
<td>mar2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl.EXC.S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>anyirr-</td>
<td>nanyirr-</td>
<td>wanyirr-</td>
<td>manyirr-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl.S</td>
<td>ngando2-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ina2-</td>
<td>nuno2-</td>
<td>wuno2-</td>
<td>muno2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl.S</td>
<td>ngando2-</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>iry2-</td>
<td>nyirr-</td>
<td>wurr-</td>
<td>murr-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(66)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1pl.INC.O</th>
<th>1pl.EXC.O</th>
<th>2pl.O</th>
<th>3pl.O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg.S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>kunda2</td>
<td>bungo2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg.S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>bina2-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3msg.S</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>kunda2</td>
<td>ando2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fsg.S</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>kunda2</td>
<td>ando2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3n_gsg.S</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>kunda2</td>
<td>ando2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3n_mgsg.S</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>kunda2</td>
<td>ando2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl.INC.S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>barr-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl.EXC.S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>kunda2</td>
<td>banyirr-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl.S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>buna2-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl.S</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>nyan2-</td>
<td>kunda2</td>
<td>bundo2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As (65) and (66) show, the transitive pronominal prefixes display a high degree of syncretism, with gender distinctions collapsing for third person subjects with singular objects and most person, gender and number oppositions within the paradigm disappearing for local (i.e. first and second person) subject pronouns, when either the subject, object or both are plural. With these ambiguous pronominal prefixes only the object can be reliably identified. The exchange in (67) from the dialogue transcribed in appendix F, illustrates some of the referential ambiguity this may create.

(67)  

B: *di jina ke onerriyal*  

*di jina ke a1-w1-u-n-yirri-y2ali*  

nw.ANAPH 3msg.PROX call 3msg.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PRS-CONT-INDEED

warrmuna (.07)  

warrmuna  

possum
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A: nyinda-ku lirrirri?
    nyinda-ku lirrirri
    3f.PROX-DAT blue.tongue.lizard

B: lirrirri (.02) di walwi nyindi?
    lirrirri di walwi nyindi
    blue.tongue.lizard 3n-w-ANAPH blue.tongue.lizard fsg.AMBIPH

yeah!
yeah

‘Then it called the opossum’
‘[You mean] the blue tongue lizard?’
‘That one is the blue tongue lizard? Yeah!’ (= lines (75)–(77) on page 320)

In (67), the ambiguous verb form ke onerryali ‘he/she/it calls him’ refers to the blue tongue lizard (lirrirri or walwi, both words are feminine irrespective of the biological sex of the animal). The object pronoun uniquely refers to a masculine referent, the clause final masculine noun warrmuna ‘possum’. But the grammatical gender of the subject referent is not explicit and the clause final position may both be occupied by the grammatical subject and the object (see section 2.4.1). Therefore, the addressee could interpret ke onerryali as both ‘she is calling’ and ‘he is calling’, which means that the masculine referent warrmuna ‘possum’ could also be the subject of the clause. The clarification question in speaker A’s turn is prompted by this referential opacity.

The interpretation of the pronoun in suffix position 6 in the verbal template in (62) is also somewhat problematic. I have been glossing the preverbal object slot as object (O) and the postverbal indirect object slot as indirect object (IO). This analysis reflects the most typical and frequent uses. However, there are two (morphologically indistinguishable) types of pronominal suffix that do not represent indirect objects. The first of these types will be discussed in chapter 3; the indirect object suffix may refer to the addressee of a speech report (‘say to x’) or express an oblique argument relation (‘say about x’), i.e. the verb amanangka may be translated as ‘he talks to him/her’ but also ‘he talks about him/her’. An interesting example of this ambiguous object function is shown in (68), which allows both readings.

(68) Discussing the special avoidance register Yalan, used to both talk to and talk about an avoidance relative, here a mother-in-law

27Rumsey (1982) glosses the post verbal secondary object as ‘dative-benefactive’.
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‘And there she does not say ‘angkalu’ (he came) to/about him’ (= line 31 on page 359)

While the addressee and object talked about could still be construed as secondary or at least as oblique objects, the pronominal suffix may sometimes also refer to direct objects (patients) on verbs with a morphologically intransitive pronominal prefix. Compare the ‘regular’ transitive expression of an event involving two semantic participants in (83) and (69b) to the ‘intransitive’ example (18c), repeated below as (69c).28

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. } \text{ngurr a } \text{bija ngurr nyilan} \\
\text{hit 3msg-go-PRS CMPLV hit 3fsg.O-3sg.S-HOLD-PRS}
\end{array}
\]

‘He completely bashes her up’ (090812JENGPDi, 2:35-2:36)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{b. } \text{ngurrba nyumandan} \\
\text{hit-ITRV 3fsg.O-3sg.S-TAKE-PRS}
\end{array}
\]

‘He bashes her’ (=line 19 on page 302)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{c. } \text{anja-nyine ngurr nyinmrnangka} \\
\text{what-INSTR hit 2sg.S-do-PST-3sg.O}
\end{array}
\]


As these examples show, the ‘indirect object’ suffix has a wider range of functions than the subject and object prefixes.29

I will very briefly mention the remaining slots of the Ungarinyin verbal template depicted in (62), since most of them are either self-explanatory or will be treated in more detail in later chapters. The irrealis category in position -2 marks negation and modality and will be discussed in section 4.3.5. The irrealis morpheme takes the same slot as future tense and both markers are often phonologically absorbed into the pronoun complex. The -1 slot in the verbal template, which Coate and Oates (1970: 52ff.) describe as the ‘long form’, Rumsey (1982) glosses as ‘definite subject’. This prefix signals the discourse status of the subject referent as

28 Also in (18d) on page 23 and (60) on page 41.

29 Occasionally the object prefix does refer to a more ‘oblique-like’ argument as well, however, cf. (144) on page 111.
being identifiable on the basis of either the preceding discourse or other contextual factors (see section 5.3).

The suffixes of the Ungarinyin verbal template require little explanation: the suffix in position +1 combines a reflexive and a reciprocal meaning.\textsuperscript{30} Position +2 signals present/past tense or optative mood and has to be zero for future tense (for details see Rumsey, 1982: 79–80). The number suffix in position +3 denotes dual or paucal number, often of the subject, but it may apply to the object or even the indirect object as well. Dual/paucal number is expressed compositionally: the bound pronoun referring to the dual/paucal subject or (indirect) object has a regular plural form.\textsuperscript{31} The continuative suffix in position +4 is one of three ways of expressing aspect in Ungarinyin, as I will discuss further in section 2.3.1.2 and, finally, the directional suffix in position +5 indicates motion towards or away from some discourse referent.

Often the directional suffix follows the generic motion verb -\textit{a} ‘go’/‘come’, to form a more specifically directed motion, i.e. -\textit{a}...=(\textit{wa})\textit{lu}/-\textit{a}...=\textit{wula} ‘come’ and -\textit{a}...=\textit{nya} ‘go’/‘leave’. A few examples of motion verbs with the =\textit{lu} suffix include (140) on page 108 and (25) on page 25. An example with a stative verb was (19c) on page 23. The distal suffix =\textit{nya} was exemplified in (61b) on page 42 and can be used on verbs denoting speech, like in (200a) on page 174 (this form may be used to express ‘talking’ events without a specific addressee). The two examples in (70) include reference to the speaker, but in these instances it is the grammatical subject of the utterances forming the deictic anchor of the motion.

(70) a. \textit{marduk nyinaranya} molnganara
\textit{marduk nyin-a-}\textit{a-ra}=\textit{nya} molngana\textit{-ra}
\textit{walk 2sg.S-GO-PRS-1sg.IO=DIST river-LOC}

‘You walk away to me in the river’ (120722-06NGUS, 2:19-2:21)

b. \textit{kajingka balya nyindaranya}
\textit{kajinka} balya nyinda\textit{a}_{2}-a-\textit{a-a-ra}=\textit{nya}
\textit{CANNOT go 2sg-IRR-GO-PRS-1sg.IO=DIST}

‘You can’t leave for me’ (= line (89) on page 322)

In both (70a) and (70b) the addressee of the utterance moves away from some reference point, but towards the speaker: the fact that the distal form is chosen shows that the speaker is not the reference point.

\textsuperscript{30}This form is illustrated, e.g., in example (191), where the reflexive form \textit{bidningengkerri} is translated as ‘they (two) said to each other’. Incidentally, the lack of distinction between reflexive and reciprocal meanings is also evident in local Aboriginal English; Pansy Nulgit translated this example as ‘twopela tellimself’.

\textsuperscript{31}Some examples of dual subjects are (158) on page 124, (247a) on page 220, (248c) on page 221, (254a) on page 226 and (150b) on 116. Paucal subjects are, e.g.: (138) on page 104, (25) on 304 and (138) on 104. An example of a paucal object (indexed through an intransitive object suffix) is illustrated in (228) on page 207. And (227) on page 206 shows a dual indirect object.
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More details of each of the slots of the Ungarinyin verbal template as represented in (62) are given in the in-depth discussion in Rumsey (1982: 74–115) (also see section 4.3.5). One final verbal category that I will briefly outline in the section 2.3.1.2 is aspect.

2.3.1.2. Aspect

Aspect distinctions deal with the way in which the temporal organisation of a depicted event is represented in the discourse. Sasse (2002: 201-202) lists as uncontroversial features of aspectuality that aspect deals with the way in which the boundaries of a certain event are viewed, that there are grammatical, lexical and pragmatic sides to aspectual representation and that each of these closely interact.\(^{32}\) Aspect encoding in the Ungarinyin complex verb is not confined to a single morpheme, but is signalled across three different morphosyntactic positions, plus a fourth prosodic strategy that I will exemplify below as well. The continuative suffix in position +4 of the verbal template in (62) is the most productive and straightforward aspect distinction, denoting a continuing or prolonged event, as exemplified in (71).

(71) \(\text{jinda wali ada amerri} \)
\(\text{jinda wali ada a}_1\text{-ma-o-yirri} \)
\mbox{m.PROX moment sit 3msg-do-PRS-CONT}

‘He is sitting down for a while’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 10:00-10:02)

A second, very common strategy to express aspect is through the use of the iterative suffix \(-w_1a-\) (which I will often transcribe as \(-ba\) below, see Rumsey, 1982: 17–18). This is one of only two inflectional morphemes that can attach to the coverb. The iterative suffix signals a repeated or habitual event (cf. Timberlake, 2007: 289), as illustrated in (72).

(72) a. \(\text{wa kuninba nginkingi} \)
\(\text{wa kunin-ba ngin-w}_2\text{o}_2\text{-y}_2\text{i-ni} \)
\mbox{NEG cover.up-ITRV 1sg-IRR-BE-PST}

‘I never used to cover up [my belongings]’ (100903-25NGUN, 2:25-2:26)

b. \(\text{ngurriwa andumindarn yilakurde} \)
\(\text{ngurri-wa anda}_2\text{-minda-rn yila-kurde} \)
\mbox{carry-ITRV 3msg.O:3pl.S-TAKE-PRS child-COM}

‘They pick it up, together with the child’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 1:59-2:02)

\(^{32}\)Sasse (2002) further presents a critical overview of approaches to aspect over the second half of the 20th century.
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c. ngalanyba bi amanangka
   ngalany-ba ba₂-y₂i a₁-ma-ø-nangka
   sing-ITRV IMP-BE 3msg.S-do-PRS-3sg.IO

   "Sing a bit," he said to her' (101001-04DCPN, 1:18-1:20)

The example in (72a) may be interpreted as both iterative and habitual; it illustrates a hypothetical act of covering up food, to protect it from thieves, which the speaker asserts (repeatedly) did not happen. Example (72b) is taken from the Family problems picture task and describes a picture in which the two protagonists are collecting food, ‘repeatedly taking it into their arms’, which accounts for the iterative interpretation. As a general characterisation, the iterative marker relates an event to a ‘macro-event’ that often stretches beyond the time frame denoted by the respective verb phrase construction and that involves a series of similar events. An interesting example of how this general meaning relates to individual instantiations is (72c), which focuses on one single ‘iteration’ of the depicted event: the reported speaker issues a command to the reported addressee to sing and in this instance the aspect value may be translated as ‘sing again’ or ‘sing a bit’.

Rumsey (1982: 121–122) describes a second aspect marker that may occur on the coverb, the only other inflectional marker to be able to do so. This suffix, -w₁ini, expresses ‘punctual’ aspect, an event that is explicitly presented as not being part of a larger stretch of time. It is the mirror image of the iterative suffix and as such mostly redundant, which may account for the fact that Rumsey (1982: 121) finds it to occur infrequently. I have no examples of this marker in my corpus.

The opposition between iterative and non-iterative verbs is clearly illustrated in (73).

(73) **Describing young girls becoming women and getting ready to marry:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>case</th>
<th>aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bakba</td>
<td>nyinyi</td>
<td>ready nyinyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ready-ITRV 3fsg-BE-PST</td>
<td>3fsg-BE-PST happy 3fsg-FALL-PST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nga₁-iy-a-nya  nga₂-ma-ra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1sg-FUT-GO-DIST 3fsg-do-PST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Whenever a girl was ready she was happy and she wanted to go’ [lit.: ‘she was ready repeatedly, she was happy, “I will go” she did] (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 13:10-13:12)

The verb phrase *bakba nyinyi* ‘she was ready (repeatedly)’ refers to girls in general and may be more freely translated as ‘whenever a girl reached a marriageable age’; as such it is part of an iterative or habitual macro-event. The phrase *jaji nyuwani* ‘she was happy’, on the other hand, selects a specific girl among this generic group, so the combination of the two phrases
may be translated along the lines of ‘whenever a girl was ready this girl was happy’. The punctual aspect Rumsey (1982: 121) mentions is clearly semantically incompatible with the continuative suffix, but the combination of the iterative and the continuative suffixes is allowed, cf. (74).

(74) *Regarding traditional fire practices, burning vegetation in order to prevent larger bushfires:*

warriwa biyerri malkarra:: beja  
warri-wa birr-a-o-yirri malkarra beja  
burn-ITRV 3pl-GO-PRS-CONT bush.fire finish

‘Again and again they light up a fire. And there is a bushfire all the way through’ (100903-17NGUN, 2:21-2:23)

The gloss ‘again and again’ in (74) is meant to reflect an ongoing repeated action signalled by the combination of the iterative and the continuative; the speaker describes the event of lighting fires with a torch until a whole area of bushland is set alight. Example (74) also contains a more iconic way of signalling duration with the lengthened final syllable in *malkarra::* ‘bushfire’ representing the continued lighting of fires and with the particle *beja* ‘finish’ marking the end of the action. Figure 2.1 shows the pitch and intensity contours as well as the spectrogram of (74); the prosodically distinctive *malkarra::* ‘bushfire’ appears between the thin dotted lines.

There is a fourth way in which (74) signals a meaning relating to the temporal organisation of the depicted event, apart from the iterative suffix on the coverb, the continuative suffix on the inflecting verb and the sound-symbolic representation of length: the choice of the inflecting verb itself. The inflecting verb *-yi- ‘to be’* is generally used to encode ‘state-like’ events, so by combining this inflecting verb with the coverb *warriwa* ‘burn repeatedly’ in (74), it adds to the ‘non-terminative’ meaning signalled by the continuative suffix. Unlike the grammatical aspect markers *-yirri* (continuative) and *-w1a* (iterative), however, the coverb is an example of lexical aspect (cf. Schultze-Berndt, 2012), being more restricted in meaning and application and more closely determined by the semantics of the coverb.

This observation introduces a topic that has wider relevance for the distinction between grammatical and lexical markers: the function of an inflecting verb in a particular coverb construction often borders on a grammatical meaning. In the verb classification approach advocated in McGregor (2002) an inflecting verb semantically ‘classifies’ an event in regular

---

33 Another example of a sequence of a phrase with an iterative suffix followed by a non-iterative phrase can be seen in (100) on page 66, which expresses a similar sequence of an event embedded in a macro-event ‘whenever she falls down...’ (general) ‘...the dog chases her’ (specific).

34 Another example that combines these three strategies is the verb construction *buluba eyirri* ‘they are looking around (repeatedly)’ in (97d).
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ways, parallel to the way in which nouns may be ‘classified’ into classes of objects. Drawing a sharp distinction between lexical and grammatical motivations for the choice of inflecting verbs is often problematic, as I will outline in the next section.

2.3.2. Complex verb constructions

Most verbal constructions in Ungarinyin are complex verb constructions consisting of a minimally inflecting verbal element, the coverb, and an inflected form of one of about 14 verb stems, which together express an event meaning. Apart from hosting all referential, mood and temporal inflection, the inflecting verb often also contributes specific meanings regarding transitivity, the temporal organisation of the event and direction of movement. As the minimal pair in (75) demonstrates, a single coverb may often combine with different inflecting verbs to express alternative meanings.

\[(75) \quad \text{a. } dan \ angon \]
\[\begin{array}{c}
dan \ anga_2-w_1 u-n \\
chop \ 3\text{msg.O:1sg.S-ACT.ON-PRS}
\end{array}
\]
‘I chop him’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: entry dan)
b. dan ngama
   dan ngaj-ma-ø
   chop 1sg-do-PRS

   ‘I chop’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: entry dan)

When combined with the transitive inflecting verb -w1 u- ‘act on’ in (75a) the coverb dan
‘chop’ expresses a transitive event, ‘x chops y’, whereas the combination with the intransitive
verb -ma- ‘do’ results in an intransitive event, ‘x chops’. Note that I am glossing the inflecting
verbs in coverb constructions with small capitals in order to distinguish them from when they
occur outside complex verb construction, and to signal that their function falls between that
of a fully grammatical element and a lexeme.

Example (76) illustrates a similar transitivity alternation involving the inflecting verb -w1 u-
‘act on’ (in 76b) and another intransitive inflecting verb, -a- ‘go’ (in 76a).

(76) a. bey nga
   bey ngaj-a-ø
   spin 1sg-go-PRS

   ‘I spin’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: entry bej)

b. bey woni
   bey wu-w1 u-ni
   spin 3nux.O:3sg.S-act.on-PRS

   ‘He spun it’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: entry bej)

The root -y2i- ‘be’ in minimal pairs of complex verb constructions generally seems to signal
duration, non-terminativity of the event, a function close to an aspectual meaning, as (77)
indicates.35

(77) a. dowaj dowaj ijelini
   dowaj dowaj irr-y1 ila-ni
   ambush REDUP 3msg.O:3pl.S-HOLD-PRS

   ‘They ambushed him’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: entry dowadj)

b. dowaj dowaj nyarrinyinangka
   dowaj dowaj nyarr-y2i-nya-nangka
   ambush REDUP 1pl.EXC.S-be-PST-3sg.O

   ‘We ambushed him’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: entry dowadj)

35Note that this meaning does not seem to apply to complex verb constructions that lack an opposition
between inflecting verbs, i.e. coverbs that only take -y2i- ‘be’ as their inflecting verb. For example, the coverb
barij ‘stand up’ as in (24) on page 25, (97d) on page 64 and (211b) on page 184, exclusively occurs with the
inflecting verb y2i ‘be’ and does not necessarily appear to prompt a durative interpretation.
Example (77a) describes a completed action represented as an unsegmented, unitary event, a meaning reminiscent of perfective aspect. In (77b), on the other hand, the ambushing event is described as a state, without focussing on the terminativity of the event, a property that may be associated with continuative or imperfective aspect. These aspectual meanings do not have a similar grammatical status to the continuative or iterative suffixes introduced in section 2.3.1.2. As Schultze-Berndt (2000: 164) writes in connection with coverb constructions in Jaminjung inflecting verb constructions in complex verbs are ‘not an instance of grammaticalization, since none of the elements of the complex verbs become productive grammatical formatives’. Constructing aspectual constructions by using the inflecting verb \(-y_2i\)- ‘be’ is not a fully productive and regular strategy, but aspectual meanings do seem to motivate some of the alternations of inflecting verb constructions in complex verbs.

The root \(-w_1a\)- most explicitly appears to signal a ‘directed movement’, or ‘trajectory’, and more particularly a downward motion (Rumsey, 1982: 118), cf. (78).

(78) a. bajalaj angoni
   bajalaj anga2-w1 u-ni
   ricochet 3msg.O:1sg.S-act.on-PST
   ‘I ricocheted it’ (meaning: made the spear ricochet) (Coate and Elkin, 1974: entry badjaladj)

   b. yinda bajalej awani
      yinda bajalaj a1-w1 a-ni
      spear ricochet 3msg-fall-PST
      ‘The spear ricocheted’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: entry badjaladj)

The alternation in (78) again involves an opposition between a transitive complex verb construction (in 78a) and an intransitive one (in 78b), but the inflecting verb \(-w_1a\)- ‘fall’ in (78b) adds an extra semantic dimension, it describes the (downward) movement of the spear, a trajectory.

The three semantic features that emerged from the minimal pairs above, transitivity, temporal representation of an event and direction of movement correspond to the ones Schultze-Berndt (2000) and McGregor (2002) find in similar constructions in Jaminjung and a cross-section of Kimberley languages, respectively: transitivity, Aktionsart and ‘trajectory’.

Table 2.4 lists all inflecting verbs appearing in the entries of the coverbs under the letters a to dj in the dictionary Coate and Elkin (1974), which I have used here as a representative sample. These entries include 1387 complex verb constructions, i.e. combinations of coverbs and inflecting verbs. In 668 of the entries of coverbs the dictionary lists only a single inflecting verb, a class I will refer to as inflexible complex verb constructions. The remaining entries...

---

36For a fuller analysis on the basis of the entire dictionary, see Saunders (1997).
of coverbs included one or more possible inflecting verbs and these I will call ‘flexible’. Some entries in Coate and Elkin (1974) show coverbs that are extremely flexible, i.e. they list a large number of inflecting verbs, cf. the entry *jukul* ‘contented’, which may combine with all verb classifying constructions in (79):

\[(79)\]  
```
-ma- ‘do’
-ninga- ‘put’
-y1 ila- ‘hold’
-y2 i- ‘be’
-minjala- ‘wait for’
-w1 u- ‘act on’
-anju- ‘make, cause’
```

The first column in table 2.4 lists the inflecting verbs that are listed in Coate and Elkin (1974), the second column lists the number of entries in which these were the only inflecting verb cited in the entry, the third column lists the total number of times the particular inflecting verb was listed and the fourth the percentage of ‘inflexible’ occurrences in complex verb constructions. The inflecting verbs appear in descending order of frequency and the ones that occur ‘inflexibly’ more than 50% of the time are printed in bold.

The generic action verbs *-ma- ‘do’* (intransitive) and *-w1 u- ‘act on’* (transitive) are the most frequent in the sample along with the ‘continuative’ verb *-y2 i- ‘be’*. These are followed by the movement verbs *-a- ‘go’, -ma(ra)- ‘take, bring’ and -w1 a- ‘fall’. Only very few inflecting verbs
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rarely appear to occur in inflexible constructions, as table 2.4 shows. For example, only in one out of 13 coverb entries in which the inflecting verb -anju- ‘make, cause’ appears is it the only inflecting verb listed.

The range of the semantics of inflecting verbs that may appear in coverb constructions and the differences in their frequency suggest that despite the three semantic principles, transitivity, Aktionsart and trajectory often guiding the choice of inflecting verb in minimal pairs of complex verb constructions, coverb constructions remain a highly diverse class, as Dixon (1980) points out:\textsuperscript{37}

‘Sometimes the simple verb states a generic meaning [...] with the coverb providing further specification of this. Sometimes the coverb appears to provide all the meaning, with the simple verb being, effectively, a dummy to carry verbal suffixes [...] . Other times, the complex verb has an idiosyncratic meaning, which cannot be related to the meaning of either component in other combinations [...]’ (Dixon, 1980: 186)

2.3.3. Clausal syntax of the Ungarinyin verb phrase

Coverb constructions in Ungarinyin adhere to a strict coverb-inflecting verb order.\textsuperscript{38} Adverbs may either precede, as in (80a) or follow the verb phrase construction, as in (80b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{a.} lanjannga  wanda irongkeri
\textit{lanjan-nga  wanda a\textsubscript{1}-irru\textsubscript{2}-a-ngka-irri}
alone-ONLY  camp  3msg-DEFS-GO-PST-CONT

‘He was camping alone’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974, entry: \textit{lanjan})

\item \textbf{b.} me  wok  ba  kanangkan
me  wok  ba\textsubscript{2}-a  kanangkan
food cook IMP-GO now

‘Cook some food now’ (Rumsey, 1982: 146)
\end{enumerate}

There are a few elements that may intervene between a coverb and an inflecting verb, particularly the clitic =karra ‘maybe’ (see e.g. example 238 on page 214), -nga ‘only’ (see example 97e on page 64) and temporal/aspectual adverbs such as \textit{je} ‘again’, as in (81).

\textsuperscript{37}Also see Bowern (2010) with respect to complex verb constructions in Nyulnyulan languages.
\textsuperscript{38}This is not necessarily the case for similar complex verb constructions in other Australian languages, e.g. in the Pama-Nyungan languages Gurindji (Meakins, 2010) and Warlpiri (Nash, 1982: 181) the inflecting verb may appear either before or after the coverb.
More commonly, however, the adverb precedes the complex verb construction, as in (82).

(82) jinda jewenga ngurr nyilan
    m.PROX again-only hit 3fsg.O:3sg.S-PUT-PRS

‘He hits her again’ (090812JENGPDc, 1:48-1:50)

Other common elements within or at the periphery of the verbal constructions, such as the negative marker wa ‘not/no’ and the completive aspect marker bija/beja ‘already, completed’ almost always precede the coverb, as in (83).

(83) ngurr a bija ngurr nyilan
    ngurr a₁-a-ø bija ngurr ny₂-a₁ila-n
    hit 3msg-GO-PRS CMLV hit 3fsg.O:3sg.S-HOLD-PRS

‘He bashes, he already hits her’ (090812JENGPDi, 2:35-2:36)

The two types of verbal constructions are represented schematically in (84).

(84) a. Adv<sub>temp</sub> Prt iv
    b. Adv<sub>temp</sub> Prt cov iv

As shown in example (57a), in a small number of cases multiple coverbs may occur with a single inflecting verb resembling a serial verb construction, but I will not posit this as a separate verb phrase construction.

2.4. Sentential constructions

The Ungarinyin framing construction is a syntactically exceptional construction type in that it represents one of the clearest examples of a complex clause in the language. As McGregor (1994) points out, the question of what kind of a complex clause the framing construction represents is another matter entirely, but, as in many head-marking Australian languages, simple clauses dominate in Ungarinyin discourse and even in formally subordinate clauses it is often problematic to pinpoint the exact nature of the syntactic dependency involved. In this section I will outline the formal properties of simple and complex clauses in Ungarinyin.
Section 2.4.1 discusses simple clause constructions and complex clauses are the topic of section 2.4.2.

2.4.1. Simple clauses

In this short section I will introduce Ungarinyin simple clause constructions, which consist of a combination of the nominal constructions and verbal constructions introduced in sections 2.2.3 and 2.3.3. With respect to the relative position of these elements Rumsey (1982: 145) lists three general principles in decreasing order of applicability/strength, summarised in (85).

(85) a. In the transitive configuration, the object NP precedes the verb.
   b. In the intransitive configuration the subject NP precedes the verb.
   c. In the transitive configuration, the subject NP follows the verb.

As shown in section 2.3.1 Ungarinyin provides a simple morphological criterion for distinguishing (transitive/intransitive) subjects, objects and secondary objects through its bound pronouns: if a freestanding nominal construction is coreferential with any of the pronominal affixes it can be assigned a specific syntactic role accordingly. Gender, number and – in the case of free pronouns – person values guide this interpretation of coreferentiality, cf. the three examples in (86) with the prefixing form -(a)malarr ‘head’.

(86) a. amalarr mungiya
   a1-malarr munga2-iy-(r)a
   3msg-forehead 3nml.O:1sg.S-FUT-GO.TO
   ‘Hello (to a man)’ [lit.: ‘His head I go to it’]

b. nyamalarr mungiya
   ny1-malarr munga2-iy-(r)a
   3fsg-forehead 3nml.O:1sg.S-FUT-GO.TO
   ‘Hello (to a woman)’ [lit.: ‘Her head I go to it’]

c. kurramalarr mungiya
   kurr1-malarr munga2-iy-(r)a
   2pl-forehead 3nml.O:1sg.S-FUT-GO.TO
   ‘Hello (to a group of people)’ [lit.: ‘(Each of) Your heads I go to it’]

39In this chapter I will use the term clause in a non-technical sense as, as a linguistic unit consisting of a verbal construction with accompanying nominal constructions with some definable semantic role with respect to the verbal construction, or one of the non-verbal clause constructions discussed at the end of this section. A more elaborate, structural definition of clausehood will follow in chapter 6, where I focus on the syntactic status of framing constructions. For interesting discussions of the intricacies of defining ‘minimal clausal units’ and critical evaluations of their interpretation in the linguistic literature, see Linell (1982: 63–71), Taboada and Hadic Zabala (2008: 64) and Degand and Simon (2009).
While the prefixing lexeme -(a)malarr ‘head’ in (86) indexes different ‘possessors’, ‘his forehead’, ‘her forehead’, ‘(each of) your foreheads’, the base bodypart lexeme carries m-neuter gender, as reflected in the object prefix on the verb. These examples also illustrate the pattern in (85a) of an object preceding the verb, as also shown in (87).

(87) a. wungay nyina liny nyelan
    woman f.PROX look 3sg.O:3sg-hold-PRS

    ‘He is looking at this wife’ (090812JENGPDiz, 1:53-1:55)

b. winjangun marnarra budmara kojda
    fire stoke 3pl-do-PST gorge-LOC

    ‘They stoke a campfire in the gorge’ (100903-28NGUN, 0:55-0:58)

c. marnjarn kuno ada wuma bulonga
    rock sit come.out

    ‘After he came out (of the cave), the native cat went to sit on that rock over there’
    (= line 12 on page 29640)

The construction wungay nyina ‘this woman’ in (87a) precedes the transitive liny nyelan ‘he/she/it sees her’, in which the third person feminine bound object pronoun is coreferential with the nominal construction wungay nyina ‘this woman’. In (87b) the object winjangun ‘fire’ also precedes the verbal construction. Note that in (87c) the object prefix in the verb phrase ada wuma ‘he/she/it sits onto it’ is coreferential with marnjarn kuno ‘(on) that stone’, which qualifies the latter as an object argument, also preceding the verb construction.

The pattern in (85b), i.e. with the intransitive subject preceding the verb construction was illustrated in this chapter by examples (19c) on page 23, (61c) on page 42 and (78b) on page 55. As Rumsey (1982: 145) writes, however, this pattern has many exceptions in spontaneously spoken language, as shown with kariyali ‘goanna’ in (88), in which the lexical subject could be interpreted as an afterthought specification.

40Example (87c) forms part of a story that will be discussed in chapter 5.
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(88) wuranda bern nyinyi (02) kariyali
wuran-ra bern nyoy2-ngi kariyali
tree-LOC climb 3sg-be-PST goanna

‘She climbed up the tree, the goanna’ (100903-09NGUN, 0:21-0:25)

The pattern in (85c), i.e. with transitive subjects following the verbal construction, would seem the natural complement to the pattern in (85a), where the object precedes the verb, but this pattern is the least common of the three in (85) (Rumsey, 1982: 145) (and, indeed, cross-linguistically). The order does occur but is relatively rare, as demonstrated by the fact that none of the examples with a transitive object in this chapter displayed the pattern, while counterexamples abound, such as nyinda ‘she’ in (89).

(89) nyinda barrawa amundarn yirrkalngarri
nyinda barra-wa a1-munda-rrn yirrkalngarri-ra
3f.DEM talk-ITRV 3msg.o:3sg.s-take-PRS police-LOC

‘She reports him to the police’ (090812JENGPDi, 6:47-6:50)

One clear pattern that does emerge from these examples, however, concerns the number of nominal subject/object arguments: sentential constructions with both a nominal subject and a nominal object are exceedingly rare in Ungarinyin (cf. Du Bois, 1987). This leads to an analytical question about argumenthood: in head-marking languages such as Ungarinyin for every referent that is both referenced through verbal inflection and a nominal construction there are two possible analyses: either the functions of the bound and free pronouns are complementary and are unified at clause level, as Nordlinger (1998) argues for Wambaya and Evans (2003) for Bininj Gun-Wok (also cf. Evans et al., 2007: 565), i.e. both serve a syntactic function, or the absence vs. presence of a (pro)noun has a discourse function (cf. the discussion in Kibrik, 2012: 215, also see Travis and Torres Cacoullos, 2012). In chapter 5 I suggest that the latter pattern can be observed in Ungarinyin.

Nominal constructions that are not cross-referenced on the verb may either precede or follow the verbal construction. In the example in (90) the locative construction ny inganangka marnbakunda ‘on your head’ occurs post-verbally.

(90) About a child searching for lice on the head of the addressee.

buluba nyangka ny inganangka marnbakunda
buluk-ba nyay3-a-ngka nying-anangka marnbakun-ra
look-ITRV 3fsg-go-PST 2sg.poss-gen head-LOC

‘She was looking around on your head’ (100722-04NGUS, 1:40-1:43)
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As (18) on page 22 showed for constructions marked with instrumental case, oblique forms occur at clause boundaries in either pre- or post-verbal position.

Apart from oblique constructions, which are not cross-referenced by definition, Ungarinyin has a type of object that would seem to encode a semantic argument but is not cross-referenced on the verb since the verbal construction involves an intransitive root. Such is the case in the spontaneously produced minimal pairs in (91), in which neither *wumbalarr* ‘charcoal’ or *nyalangkun* ‘(her) head’ can be cross-referenced by the intransitive verbal construction *yawurr nyumara* ‘she covered’.41 As (91) illustrates, these constructions may occur both pre- and post-verbally.

(91) After the death of their husband, widows shave their head bald and cover it with charcoal.
   
   a. *wumbalarr yawurr nyumara*  *nyalangkun*
      *wumbalarr yawurr nya2-ma-ra*  *nya1-langkun*
      charcoal  cover  3fsg-DO-PST  3fsg-head
      ‘She covered her head with charcoal’/‘She put charcoal on her head’ (111005NGS-NUN, 0:09-0:13)
   
   b. *nyalangkun yawurr nyumara*  *wumbalarr*
      *nya1-langkun yawurr nya2-ma-ra*  *wumbalarr*
      3fsg-head  cover  3fsg-DO-PST  charcoal
      ‘She covered her head with charcoal’/‘She put charcoal on her head’ (111005NGS-NUN, 2:19-2:23)

The examples in (91) allow for different interpretations and nothing in the verbal or nominal morphology of these constructions prepares an English reader of these sentences for a specific analysis. Under the interpretation ‘she covered her head with charcoal’, the object *nyalangkun* ‘her head’ follows the verb in (91a) and precedes it in (91b).42 The opposite holds for an interpretation in which *wumbalarr* ‘charcoal’ is analysed as the object. Ungarinyin does have morphological cases for encoding the semantic roles of instrument and location (see section 2.2.1.1), but these are not used to disambiguate between the semantic roles in (91).

I will refrain from listing all possible combinations of nominal and verbal constructions43 but (92) gives a possible interpretation of (91a) parallel to the notations for nominal constructions in (52) and verbal constructions (84).

(92) \[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{wumbalarr}_{\text{instr}} & \text{yawurr}_{\text{cop}} & \text{nyumara}_{\text{iv}} & \text{complex verb} & \text{nyalangkun}_{\text{obj}} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

41 Also cf. example (181b) on page 143.
42 Under this interpretation *wumbalarr* ‘(with) charcoal’ is what Rumsey (1982: 146) an ‘oblique II adjunct’.
43 Note that the constructionist notation used here presupposes that smaller constructions can form part of all compatible larger constructions, see footnote 19 on page 38.
Modifying elements in Ungarinyin occur either within or adjacent to nominal or verbal constructions and the language does not contain markers that have scope over an entire clause, so these elements do not play a role in determining the syntactic structure of the Ungarinyin clause.\footnote{An exception is the epistemic modal clitic =karra ‘maybe’ discussed in chapter 6, which takes scope over an entire clause. For an overview of other modal markers and ‘non-scopal’ elements occurring at clause boundaries, interjections, see section 4.3.}

In addition to the verbal clause constructions Ungarinyin also has two dedicated verbless simple clause constructions: one is formed with ‘adjectival’ nominal predicates in which case the nominal predicate always follows the subject nominal:

\begin{example}
\[ N \text{ Adj} \]
\end{example}

For example (94):

\begin{example}
jinda aniyangarri
\begin{align*}
jinda & a_{1}niya-ngarri \\
m.PROX & 3msg-good-NMLZ
\end{align*}
\end{example}

‘This [picture] is good’ (090812JENGPD, 0:31-0:32)

A second type likewise consists of a subject nominal and a nominal predicate but in this case the nominal predicate is suffixed with an emphatic marker, most typically $=y_{2}ali$, as in (95).

\begin{example}
jinda jinda malngarrikarrayali jinda
\begin{align*}
jinda & jinda mal-ngarri=karra=y_{2}ali \\
m.DEM & m.DEM white-NMLZ=\text{maybe}=\text{indeed} m.DEM
\end{align*}
\end{example}

‘This one here may be a white person’ (090813AJMJSMPD, 0:56-0:58)

In this case the subject nominal and nominal predicate (with the clitic $=y_{2}ali$) are more clearly distinguished from each other and the order of the two is more flexible.

\begin{example}
\[ N \text{ N(emphasis)} \]
\end{example}

\subsection*{2.4.2. Complex sentences}

Section 2.4.2.1 exemplifies coordinated clause constructions. Subordinate clauses, introduced in section 2.4.2.2, are polysemous between temporal and causal interclausal relations, closely resembling the Australian subordinate clause type Hale (1976) termed the ‘adjoined relative clause’ (also see Austin, 2012).
2.4.2.1. Coordination

Ungarinyin uses what Blake (1987: 91) refers to as ‘asyndetic juxtaposition’ as a coordination strategy and ‘[t]he juxtaposed elements may be linked by an intonation pattern suggestive of coordination’ (Blake, 1987: 91). In a typology of coordination, Mithun (1988: 357) even hypothesises that ‘the intonational linking of concepts seems to be universal in spoken discourse’.

Coate and Oates (1970) do not list any specific coordination strategy for Ungarinyin,45 but give examples of what they call ‘sequential sentences’, defined as ‘sentences [that] consist of a base filled by an indicative clause followed by a base or bases containing indicative clauses with different verb roots to those of the first base clause. They express a sequence of events or the consequences of one event following another’ (Coate and Oates, 1970: 85). The examples in (97) illustrate several types of coordination involving a sequence of events.

(97) a. jinda ari balya amanya ngudba nyumindan
   jinda ari balya a₁-ma-ø=nya ngud-ba nyao₂-minda-n
m.PROX man go 3msg.DO-PRS=DIST hit-ITRV 3fsg.O:3sg-TAKE-PRS

‘This man goes away and hits her’ (100903-09NGUN, 0:18-0:20)

b. buluba ngiya mara bungo
   buluk-ba nga₁-iy-a mara bunga₂-w₁u-ø
look.around-ITRV 1sg-FUT-go look 3pl.O:1sg-ACT.ON-FUT

I’ll go look, I’ll find them (100722-11NGUS, 00:20-00:22)

c. barra barra bijilen di nungurrij ama
   barra barra birr-y₁ila-iy-n di nungurrij a₁-ma-ø
talk talk 3pl-PUT-REFL-PRS n₁w-.ANAPH get.up.quickly 3msg.DO-PRS

‘They are talking to each other and then he takes off’ (090812JENGPĐk, 1:08-1:10)

d. buk barij e buluba eyirri rimij
   buk barij a₁-y₂i-ø buluk-ba a₁-y₂i-ø-girri rimij
come.out get.up 3msg-BE-PRS look.around-ITRV 3msg-BE-PRS-CONT steal

   andumarn ngala winjangunwula
   ando₂-ma-rn ngala winjangun=wula
3msg.S:3pl.O-DO-PRS animal fire=PROX

‘He comes out, gets up, is looking around, the animal steals it [lit.: them] from the fire’ (100903-06NGUN, 00:28-00:32)
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e. kulingi buj e kulingi buj e burrPGA
kulingi buj a₁-y₂i-ø kulingi buj a₁-y₂i-ø burr-nga
rain.season finish 3msg-BE-PRS rain.season finish 3msg-BE-PRS lock.up-ONLY

bīya
būrr-a-ø
3pl-GO-PRS

‘Year after year they just lock him up’ [lit.: ‘It is a year, it is a year, they just lock (him) up’] (090812JENGPDi, )

In (97a) the subject referent leaves (the act described in the first clause) in order to carry out the act described in the second clause (for a fuller discussion of this type of construction, see section 4.2). In example (97b) the first clause describes an intention on behalf of the speaker and the second clause the intended result. Example (97c) simply describes two subsequent events and (97d-97e) demonstrate that multiple clause may be coordinated by juxtaposition. Example (97e) slightly stands out in that it represents the subsequent events as a continued event, ‘year after year they keep him locked up’.

Although coordinated clauses often describe subsequent events, coordinated contemporaneous events may be found as well, as in (98)

(98) bunda yorr bidi ngabun koj bidi bunda yorr būrr-y₂i-ø ngabun koj būrr-y₂i-ø
3pl.PROX group.sit 3pl-BE-PRS beer drink 3pl-BE-PRS

‘They are sitting down and drinking beer’ (090812JENGPD, 2:22-2:25)

Ungarinyin does have a morphological strategy for expressing a meaning that is close to that of regular coordination in the form of the lative case used in a non-local function. The form anduyu ‘and he’ the second clause in (99) illustrates this use (also see Rumsey, 1987).

(99) Describing a court situation in which a woman testifies about domestic abuse and a clerk writes down the testimony
kanda lemarndoka ngurr amara (0.15) anduyu
kanda lemarndkarr-ra ngurr a₁-ma-ra andu-yu
n_w.PROX temple-LOC hit 3msg-DO-PST 3msg.AMBIPH-LAT

milimiliwa wuningan wurlan di
milimili-ra wurl-nga-na wurlan di
paper-LOC 3n_w.O:3msg.S-put-PRS language n_w.ANAPH

‘He hit (me) here on the temple.’ And he’s putting language to paper’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 14:06-14:14)
Chapter 2. Grammatical devices

The first clause in (99) reflects the testimony of the woman,46 followed by a pause. The subsequent clause marks a new event, a new development in the story. In this function the lative case signals something like ‘and then e happened’, a usage I will refer to as ‘paragraph marker’. The type of ‘and then’ meaning that a lative case can instill may contrast two clauses, standing in some sort of temporal relation, as in (100), where the subordinate clause ngarrwa nyuwanngarri ‘when she falls’ followed by karnangkurrju ‘dog + lative case’ seems to express a type of disjunction ‘if, then’.

(100) ngarrwa nyuwanngarri karnangkurrju bardowa
    ngarr-wa ngar-w1 a-n-ngarri karnangkurr-ju barda-wa
fall.down-ITRV 3fsq-FALL-PRS-SUB dog-LAT attack-ITRV
nyon alyin wuran ngurrara
nyon-w1 u-n alyin wuran ngurr-ra
3fsq.O:3sg.S-Act.ON-PRS below branch ground-LOC

‘Every time she falls, the dog attacks her below the tree on the ground’ (100903-09NGUN, 00:34-00:38)

As the term ‘paragraph marker’ suggests, however, although at a bi-clausal level this lative case meaning can resemble that of clausal coordination, the lative paragraph marker often has to be understood within a wider discourse context. In this sense, the paragraph marker does not connect a clause to the immediately preceding clause, it marks a relation with respect to the entire preceding discourse. I will further discuss and exemplify this discourse use of the paragraph case in relation to other discourse marking strategies in chapter 5.

2.4.2.2. Subordination

Subordinate clauses in Ungarinyin are formed with the versatile suffix -ngarri. As the examples in (101) demonstrate, the subordinate clause may either follow or precede the main clause. Both in (101a) and (101b) the subordinate clause expresses a temporal meaning, signalling an event that occurred prior to the one described in the main clause.

46Incidentally, this is an instance of speech attribution in which the Ungarinyin framing construction, normally occurring in reported speech (see chapter 3) is not used. I will examine such instances of what I will call ‘defenestration’, ‘de-framed’ reported speech constructions, in chapter 4.
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(101) a.  idmindani  jinda  mananarr  jinda  liny  
irr-minda-ni  jinda  mananarr  jinda  liny  
3msg.O:3pl.S-take-PST  m.PROX  camera  m.PROX  see  
ongo  budmara  nalywa  birrinyingarri  
angaw-iy-w1u  burr-ma-ra  nalywa  birri-y2i-nyi-ngarri  

‘They took that picture and wanted to look at it, after they set up the camera’

b.  joli  idmindanilungarri  wunduku  
joli  irr-minda-ni=lu-ngarri  wunduku  
come.back  3msg.O:3pl.S-take-PST=PROX-SUB  evening  
nyardumanguni  
nyarda2-mangu-ni  
1pl.EXC.O:S-show-PST  

‘After they came back in the evening, they showed (it) to us’ (111013-01NGUN, 0:36-0:39)

Example (102) illustrates a temporal subordinate clause in which the subordinate clause event is contemporaneous with that of the main clause.

(102) While discussing the death of a child:

angiyarr  aniyangarri  warda  ondonna-ngarri  ija  
a2-ngiyarr  a2-niya-ngarri  warda  anda2-w1u-n-ngarri  ija  
3msg.gut  3msg.good-NMLZ  like  3pl.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PRS-SUB  father  
garruku  andumindan  arrangu  anangkaku  yila  
garruku  andumindan  arrangu  a2-nangka-ku  yila  
1pl.INC.POSS  3pl.O:3sg.S-take-PRS  on.top  3msg-GEN-DAT  child  

‘When God likes them he takes the children for himself’ [lit.: If he likes them, he good gut he, father, takes the children up for himself] (100721-02NGUS, 0:39-1:24)

As (103) demonstrates, contemporaneous subordinate clauses may equally appear either after (103a-103b) or before (103c) the main clause.

(103) a.  Commenting on a picture from the Family Problems picture task in which a group of men sits down drinking.  
wa  wardawa  nyirrko  budmangarri  jinda  picture  
wa  warda-wa  nyirr-w2a2-w1u  bud-ma-s-ngarri  jinda  picture  
NEG  like-ITRV  1pl.EXC-IRR-ACT.ON  3pl-do-PRS-SUB  m.PROX  picture  

‘We don’t like it when they do as in this picture’ (000812JENGPDi, 1:24-1:27)
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b. ngurrba nyumindan ngabunangka engarri wa
   ngurrba nyaa-minda-n ngabun-nangka a1-ŋu2-ŋ-ŋgarri wa
   wardawa nyirrko
   warda-wa nyirr-w2ŋ2-w1u
   like-ITRV 1pl.EXC-IRR-ACT.ON
   ‘He hits her when he is drunk, we don’t like that’ (090812JENGPDk, 1:25-1:30)

c. barra bijilenngarri wuniyangarri warda wunjon?
   barra bīr-ŋi1-ŋa-n-ngarri wu-niya-ngarri warda winjąŋ2-w1u-n?
   tell 3pl-PUT-PRS-SUB 3nŋ-good-NMLZ like 3nŋ.O:2sg.S-ACT.ON-PRS
   ‘Do you like it when they’re telling a good story?’ (090812JENGPDi, 5:17-5:19)

In line with the general characterisation of subordinate clause constructions in Australian Aboriginal languages in Hale (1976), apart from a temporal meaning the subordinate clause may also express causation, as in (104).

(104) burr a biji ngurr nyilaningarri
       burr a1-a-n-garri
       lock.up 3msg-go-PRS CMPLV hit 3fsg.O:3sg.S-PUT-PST-SUB
   ‘He gets locked up because he has hit her’ (090812JENGPDi, 2:35-2:37)

The two examples in (105) contain two subordinate constructions each and both combine a temporal and a causal meaning.

(105) a. Commenting on the Family Problems picture task saying that there is no picture of relatives coming to visit the man who in the story is locked up for beating his wife.

   balya arnngarri liny onga jailhouse-da
   balya a1-a-rn-ngarri liny ong2-a jailhouse-da
   go 3msg-go-PRS-SUB see 3msg.O:1sg.S:FUT-GO jail-LOC
   amangarri wurlawurlakų yuno jailhouse-da malyarn jinda
   a1-ma-ŋ-ngarri wurla-wurla-ku yuno jailhouse-da malyarn jinda
   3m-do-PRS-SUB talk-REDUP-DAT you.know jail-LOC nothing m.DEM
   ayinangka
   ayi-nangka
   nothing-GEN

   ‘There is nothing in this picture, nothing at all about when they are going when he wants to go see him in jail, to talk in jail’ (090812JENGPDk, 4:05-4:12)
b. **dambun malwa minyingarri** di **burruru wulwa** (.08) **kudu**
   **dambun ma-l-wa ma₂-y₂-yi-ngarri** di **burruru wulwa** **kudu**
place nₐ-bad nₐ-be-PST-SUB nₐ-ANAPH men evil chase
   **wurroneeringarri**
   **wurr-w₁ u-n-yirri-ngarri**
   3nₐ.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-PRS-CONT-SUB

‘When the place was still bad because the men were [lit.: are] chasing evil’ (= lines 189 and 190 on page 335)

A second and final type of ‘subordinate’ constructions are conditional clauses formed with the conditional marker *wana* ‘if’. Example (106) illustrates a conditional construction.

(106) **karrabirri mindi way irrkungurli** (.15) **mindimu**
   **karrabirri mindi way irr-w₂a₂-ngurli-ø** mindi-mu
boomerang nₐ-ANAPH NEG 3msg.O:3pl.S-IRR-give-PRS nₐ-ANAPH-EMPH
   **kulinbi bирrke** (.035) **wana kulin bundanyirrikarra**
crooked.shins 3pl-IRR-BE-PRS if touch 3pl.O:3sg.S-go-DU=MAYBE
   **di budmara**
   **di burr-ma-ra**
   nₐ-ANAPH 3pl-do-PST

“They never givim boomerang. They can’t touchim twopela bin say they might get crooked leg baby”

‘The don’t give him any boomerangs. They said: “They might get crooked shins (*saba tibia*) if these two would maybe have children” ’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 14:42-14:48)

The marker *wana* ‘if’ is often combined with the subordinate clause suffix -ngarri, as the examples in (107) illustrate.

(107) a. **wana mara bungonngarri** ngala joli ngilu
    **wana mara bungaq₂-w₁ u-n-ngarri** ngala joli nga₁-yi-y₂i=lu
if see 3pl.O:1sg.S-ACT.ON-PRS-SUB animal return 1sg-FUT-BE=PROX
   ‘If I find meat I will come back’ (100722-12NGUS, 3:41-3:45)

b. **burraka wana mara bonjonngarri**
   **burra=ka wana mara bungaq₂-w₁ u-n-ngarri**
later=Q if see 3pl.O:2sg.S-ACT.ON-PRS-SUB
   ‘Will you maybe find it later on?’ (100722-12NGUS, 6:51-6:53)
2.5. Conclusion

This chapter has introduced the key areas of Ungariniyn grammar, as a reference but also as a way of setting the ground for two broader grammatical topics that will re-emerge at several places over the following chapters.

The first topic is the issue of discourse reference and referential ambiguity. As was shown, Ungarinyin has several pronominal devices and complex referring nominal expressions and I will aim to demonstrate how these may be employed in expressions of reported speech and thought.

This chapter has also exemplified a number of multi-word constructions (e.g. sections 2.2.3, 2.3.3, 2.3.2, 2.4.1 and 2.4.2) with a variety of internal syntactic relations and differing degrees of semantic compositionality. The discussion of these constructions will serve as a useful background to discussion of syntactic relations within the framing constructions later on.

With these preliminaries in place I will now turn to the construction at the heart of the present study, the Ungarinyin framing construction.
Chapter 3. Framing constructions

‘ROSE. You’ve got what? How could you have a message for me, Mister Riley, when I don’t know you and nobody knows I’m here and I don’t know anybody anyway’

— Harold Pinter, *The Room*, 1957

3.1. Introduction: Ungarinyin reported speech construction

The Ungarinyin framing construction in (3), repeated here as (108) can be interpreted in any of the following ways:

(108) [[ ngurrba nyungiminda ] ama jirri ]
     [[ ngurrba nyungagiyinda ] a₁-ma-o jirri ]

‘He says: “I will hit her”, or: He says that he will hit her’

‘He thinks: “I will hit her”, or: He thinks that he will hit her’

‘He wants to hit her’ (090813AJMJSMPDc, 3:14-3:15, redacted)

In this chapter I will take a closer look at the framing construction and address the question of whether and how it is possible to distinguish between each of the functions of the framing construction as in (108), focussing on formal properties of the construction alone.

I will begin the section with a brief contextualisation of the topic in section 3.2. Section 3.3 considers each of the forms and functions of the Ungarinyin framing construction and section 4.2 considers a few alternative constructions to framing constructions in anticipation of the chapters to come.

3.2. Reported speech and thought: the basic concepts

The functions associated with the Ungarinyin framing construction have been studied within a rich research tradition, which has spawned a wide variety of theoretical concepts and interpr-

1For clarity I have removed the emphasis marking suffix -yalh, which occurred in the framing clause of the original example (see 3 on page 2) and is not a required element in the framing construction.
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tations. Section 3.2.1 motivates and defines the notion of ‘framing’ and section 3.2.2 provides a typological overview of some of the forms and functions associated with framing constructions cross-linguistically.²

3.2.1. The framing relation

Reported speech is a phenomenon in which a speaker represents the (purported) locution of some discourse entity who is (typically) not present, to some addressee. Figure 3.1 is a schematic representation of the prototypical reported speech situation with the three discourse entities involved: the current speaker who is doing the reporting, the reported speaker (who is often an identifiable person but who may be an ‘authority’ or anonymous source) and the addressee to whom the report is made. The reported speech situation consists of two events, the current speech event, labelled A, and the reported speech event (called ‘narrated speech event’ in Jakobson, 1957), labelled B. Crucially, the prototypical addressee in figure 3.1 does not have direct mental access to the utterance attributed to the reported speaker and has to rely on the representation of the message by the current speaker, which is represented by the circles marking the intersubjective relations that only intersect within the mind of the current speaker.

There is nothing exceptional about the reported speech situation in itself: very little of what humans communicate has not (partially) originated in communicative interaction with other humans, so figure 3.1 can be taken as a schematic representation of how cultural and practical knowledge spreads in a speech community. However, speakers do not consistently linguistically mark whatever information they pass on by indexing the reported speech situation (at least not in languages without morphological evidentiality); they only do so under specific pragmatic, semantic and discursive circumstances by using the dedicated linguistic construction type for indexing the reported speech situation, reported speech constructions. Children have to learn to communicate information told to them using reported speech constructions rather than with non-attributed declarative utterances (Hickman, 1993) and the meaning, form and

²This section only introduces concepts and references that are directly relevant to the Ungarinyin framing construction and my analysis thereof. The topic of reported speech has been studied from a wide range of angles, however. For a recent, comprehensive overview of theoretical approaches to reported speech, see Buchstaller (2014: chapter 2). Over the past decade there has been a surge in interest in reported speech in the linguistic and language related literature with the publication of a series of edited volumes (the typologically oriented volume Gündemann and von Roncador, 2002, the sociolinguistic volume Holt and Clift, 2007 and Buchstaller, 2014, the language philosophical papers in Brendel et al., 2011 and the interdisciplinary volume Buchstaller and Alphen, 2012) and many more individual studies (e.g. Dinwoodie, 2007; Aikhenvald, 2008; Michael, 2010; Rumsey, 2010b; Verstraete, 2011; Evans, 2012; Munro et al., 2012; Nikitina, 2012; Oropeza-Escoba, 2013; Pascual, 2014). These follow a benchmark typological volume on direct and indirect speech (Coulmas, 1986a), influential linguistic anthropological studies such as Besnier (1993), McGregor (1994) and Hill (1995b). Another great source for the typology of reported speech are the grammars in the questionnaire-based Routledge descriptive grammar series edited by Bernard Comrie and Norval Smith, treating direct and indirect speech in the opening sections. For a fuller recent bibliography of studies of reported speech see Buchstaller and Alphen (2012).
usage conditions of reported speech constructions are typologically varied. But when speakers use a reported speech construction they represent the reported speech situation in a linguistically meaningful way and in doing so present a grammatically interpretable model of social interaction.

This is the fundamental insight of Vološinov ([1929] 1973). In reflecting the reported speech event B in the current speech event A the current speaker interprets and evaluates the reported utterance by the reported speaker while at the same time communicating this utterance with some communicative intention to the reported addressee. For Vološinov ([1929] 1973) this means that reported speech necessarily involves the expression of two perspectives, that of the reported speaker and that of the current speaker and it does so ‘in the stabilized constructional patterns of the language itself’ (Vološinov, 1973: 116).

The section ‘Exposition of the problem of reported speech’ in Vološinov (1973: 115–123)\(^3\)

\(^3\)In Vološinov ([1929] 1972) the title of the chapter is ‘Экспозиция проблемы чужой речи’, with ‘reported
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introduces the topic as follows:

‘Reported speech is speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also speech about speech, utterance about utterance.

Whatever we talk about is only the content of speech, the themes of our words.\(^4\) [...] A reported utterance, however, is not just a theme of speech: it has the capacity of entering on its own, so to speak, into speech, into syntactic makeup, as an integral unit of the construction. In so doing, it retains its own constructional and semantic autonomy while leaving the speech texture of the context incorporating it perfectly intact. [...] Once it becomes a constructional unit in the author’s speech, in which it has entered on its own, the reported utterance concurrently becomes a theme of that speech’ (Volosinov, 1973: 115).

‘[The forms used in reported speech] reflect basic and constant tendencies in the active reception of other speakers’ speech’ (Volosinov, 1973: 117). The subtle ‘syntactic, stylistic and compositional norms’ (Volosinov, 1973: 116) used in reported speech constructions provide a unique opportunity for studying the conventionalised patterns of how speakers evaluate and transmit the words and ideas of others in grammar.

Mirroring the double event structure of the reported speech situation, reported speech constructions typically consist of an element reflecting the reported speech event and another element signalling the relation of the reported speech event and the reported message to the current speech event. Following the characterisation of reported speech in Rumsey (1982: 158ff), McGregor (1994; 1997; 2004) calls the syntactic relation between these two elements a framing relation. The element expressing the reported speech event B is the framed clause, the one expressing the current speech event A the framing clause. Adopting these notions, I will call the combination of a framed and framing clause a framing construction. McGregor (1994: 77–78) writes:

‘the interclausal relationship involved in reported speech constructions can be modeled as per the relationship between a picture and its frame. [...] [The framing clause] delineates the clause from the surrounding clauses, and indicates that it is to be viewed and evaluated [...] as a demonstration, rather than a description. [...] Viewing a clause as a demonstration represents a type of modification that clause expresses. [...] The difference [with modification through modal particles] is that whereas these particles modify the proposition by indicating the speaker’s speech’ (in Russian literally ‘speech of another’) between quotes to indicate that the term is newly coined.

\(^4\) The notion ‘theme’ is used to refer to ‘a definite and unitary meaning’ that represents the ‘significance of a whole utterance’ (Volosinov, 1972: 101) and in a footnote Volosinov (1973: 99) offers the notion ‘thematic unity’ as an alternative, SS.
3.2. Reported speech and thought

evaluation of its truth or falsity, reporting modifies the proposition by indicating its evidential status (McGregor, 1994: 77–78)

The framing analysis directly addresses the challenge set in Vološinov ([1929] 1973): first, it provides a syntactic notion for addressing the exceptional status of the framed clause as a reported utterance with a certain degree of independence in terms of grammatical features (e.g. prosody, structural integrity, modal scope) and information structure and second, it shows that a reported speech construction is about how the speaker presents the reported utterance. The notion of demonstration is adopted by McGregor (1994) from Clark and Gerrig (1990), who use this term to point out that any aspect of the reported speech event (its pronunciation, wording, general or precise meaning etc.) may become the topic of framed clause: the current speaker ‘demonstrates’ the relevant aspect that motivates bringing it into the current speech event.

In the following I will use the term reported speech to refer to the communicative situation represented by figure 3.1 and the types of utterances involved. Reported speech constructions are the conventionalised grammatical means of representing a reported speech situation and are the most prototypical type of framing construction. Framing constructions are any type of construction signalling a syntactic framing relation. Exploring the semantic range and structural expression of framing relations in Ungarinyin will be the objective of this study.

3.2.2. Typological diversity in reported speech constructions

The classic structural and semantic distinction in framing constructions is the opposition between direct and indirect speech (or discourse, or quotation) (Coulmas, 1986a). The opposition is traditionally defined as: ‘A Direct Quotation gives the exact words of the original speaker or

---

5McGregor (1994) suggests the framing relation as an alternative to the standard claim formulated in Halliday (1985: 197) that direct speech is encoded with a paratactic clause and that indirect speech follows a hypotactic pattern, providing the following arguments: (1) ‘It is not clear that the say clause in indirect speech is the main clause, the other dependent on it; (2) indirect speech does generally not show signs of reduced discourse status (encoding backgrounded, given, presupposed information), which makes it unlikely that they should be analysed as a dependent clause; (3) changing the order of the clauses in direct speech does not effect the semantic relations between them, which is atypical for parataxis and the order of the clauses in indirect speech is mostly rigid, which is atypical for hypotaxis; (4) ‘[i]n direct speech, the clause of speech may be interpolated within the reported clause. [...] Such interpolations are not permitted in paratactic combinations of clauses; (5) ‘clauses of speech may be omitted without affecting the character of the quote as a quote [...]. The reported piece is often uttered with a special voice quality. This phenomenon cannot happen elsewhere in parataxis’; (6) ‘[t]he fact that the deictic centre of a direct quote remains that of the reported utterance, but shifts to that of the present speech situation in indirect quotation goes unexplained [under ‘syntactic’ or traditional accounts of reported speech]’; (7) ‘[a] clause of speech may frame another clause, or a syntagm of clauses, i.e. a complex sentence. It may also frame a set of complex sentences corresponding to a paragraph’; (8) as the sentence ‘Who did you say would come?’ shows, a wh-argument from the message clause may occur in the say-clause, which is atypical for hypotactic constructions (McGregor, 1994: 66–68).

6As Romaine and Lange (1991) point out, the use of the word ‘like’ in English as a marker of reported speech can be directly linked to this demonstrative function of reported speech.
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writer [...]. An Indirect Quotation adapts the words of the speaker or writer to the construction of the sentence in which they are quoted [...]’ (Greenough et al., 1916: 374). In an influential account, Wierzbicka (1974) refined the semantic distinction between these notions as direct speech having a ‘theatrical aspect’, in which the speaker imagines herself saying the reported message (Wierzbicka, 1974: 273), ‘showing’ its content as presented by the reported speaker (Wierzbicka, 1974: 282) whereas with indirect speech she states the content of the reported message in the current speech event. More particularly,

’in direct quotation one assumes the role of the original speaker, i.e. one imagines oneself as that original speaker; in indirect speech one undertakes to state the content of the speech as though one were prepared to assert it oneself, that is to say one imagines that one wants to assert (ask, etc.) here, now, to the present addressee, whatever the first speaker asserted (asked etc.) when he spoke to his addressee’ (Wierzbicka, 1974: 284–285).

The theatrical account of the direct/indirect speech opposition in Wierzbicka (1974) removed the original emphasis on the actual form of what was (allegedly) said in the reported speech event to perspective: with a direct speech construction the speaker takes the perspective of the reported speaker in the reported speech event B in figure 3.1, with indirect speech the perspective is that of her own in the current speech event A.7

All Australian Aboriginal languages have constructions associated with direct speech; consider the following Bunuba (109a), Gurindji (109b), Kwini (109c) and Jaminjung (109d) examples.

(109) a. mayi wuruqar-ngarragi milwirri-ingga miy
food steal 3sg<3sg:PST:RA2-1sgOBL dove-ERG 3sg:say:PST
‘ “You have been stealing my food” said the dove’ (Rumsey, 1994b: 146)

b. [[ Parnkarrang-ma nyamu=-rna ngayu-waju kurr-warra nyamu=yi-nta
[ murderer-TOP C=1sgS me-CAUSE blame-EXT C=1sgS-2plS
yuwa-ni ] nyawa ngu=rna-ngjurra jarrak ma-lu ]
put-PAST ] this CAT=1sgS-2plO talk say-FUT ]
‘I want to talk to you people because you have accused me of being the murderer.’
Lit. ‘[because I am the murderer] you blamed me] this I want to talk to you’
(McConvell, 2006: 114)

7As Plank (1986: 285) points out, a strict interpretation of direct speech representing ‘the exact words of the original speaker’ (Greenough et al., 1916: 374) was always going to be absurd since even direct speech abstracts away from a majority of the acoustic, prosodic and even morphological features of the ‘original’ utterance, such as the exact intonation contour, interjections and hesitation markers and, most obviously, personal voice quality. For a detailed summary of the debate about direct speech as a ‘verbatim’ representation of a reported message, see Vandelanotte (2009: 118–130).
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c. bayanga  bamangu
   come:here you:tell:her
   ‘Tell her to come here’ (McGregor, 1993: 55)

d. ngay+y=gai  gurrany  medicine  nga-minda-ny  nga-yu=bunyag
   1sg=ALSO  NEG  medicine  1sg:3sg-eat-PST  1sg:3sg-say/do.PST=3du.OBL
   ‘Me too, I didn’t take the medicine,” I said to the two’ (Schultze-Berndt, 2000: 118)

In constructions deictically patterning as direct speech, subject pronouns in the framed clause refer as in the reported speech event: second person referents and imperatives (109a, 109b and 109c) address the reported addressee (or another participant in the reported speech situation), framed first person subjects are coreferential with the subject of the framing clause (example 109d, also cf. figure 1.1 on page 3).

In indirect speech constructions, deictic elements refer in the current speech situation, with pronouns mapping onto discourse participants as in (110) (cf. Nikitina, 2012).

(110) current interlocutors  vs.  others
     ↓  ↓
    1st and 2nd  3rd

Although less common than direct speech patterning, indirect speech constructions are found all over Australia, in Kimberley languages such as Gooniyandi (111a), the Northern Territory language Wardaman, spoken in the Katherine region (111b), or the central Australian language Pitjantjatjara (111c).

(111)  a. yan-gin-ba  nyoonyi-yirra  ward-giri
       ask-FUT+2sgNOM+A which-ALL  go-PRES+3sgNOM+I
       ‘Ask him, where he’s going’ (McGregor, 1994: 73)

   b. ngan-yana-rrri  ya-0-nyangi-we  yiwarna  wiyan
      3SG/1SG-say-PST  3-3SG-come-FUT  next  rain
      ‘She told me she will come next year’ (Merlan, 1994: 205)

   c. Trevor-lu  watja-nu  Mary-nya  nga-kuntjatjanu-ngku
      Trevor-ERG  say-PAST  Mary-ABS  see-ANT  SS-ERG
      ‘Trevor said that he had seen Mary’ (Bowe, 1990: 69)

As per the mapping in (110), the third person subjects in the framed clauses of the Gooniyandi (111a) and Wardaman (111b) refer to referents who are neither the current speaker or the addressee and would have had second and first person values, respectively had these examples represented direct speech constructions. The Pitjantjara example (111c) contains a third person subject in the framed clause as well (rather than a ‘direct’ first person subject) and
additionally marked by a ‘same subject’ morpheme, signalling the coreferentiality with the third person subject of the framing clause.

Merlan (1994) remarks that indirect speech constructions are rare in Wardaman, and similar comments are frequently found in other Australian descriptive grammars. For example, Evans (2003) finds that in Bininj Gun-Wok ‘[r]eported statements and questions are virtually always direct: the quoted speech or thought are given with the TAM and other deictics as actually uttered or thought, most commonly in the non-past, while the locutionary verb has absolute tense [...] There is typically an upward resetting of the intonation pitch range, as well as other voice-quality indicators that the speech is quoted’ (Evans, 2003: 637).

In some languages indirect speech constructions are not attested at all. For example, Heath (1984: 559) observes for Nunggubuyu that ‘all quotation, including quotation of unspoken decisions and other mental [...] is direct. A special intonation is characteristically used for the quoted material [...] and there may be additional signals such as beginning the quotation with an exclamation like ‘hey’’. Similarly in the Worrorran language Wunambal Carr (2000) translates the framing construction in (112) as being both interpretable as direct and indirect speech in English.

(112)  
\[Giriyangga \ nyinda \ burrme-nyarru\]
\[glrri=yang-ga \ nyinda \ burr=me-nyarru\]
2PL=YANG-IMM here 3PL=MA’say’:PAST-EX:PL:OBL

‘ “You people come here,” they said to us’/’They told us to come here’ (Carr, 2000: ch. 4, p. 158)

Ungarinyin falls into this category as well, and as the example in (113), taken from a dream-time story in Appendix F illustrates, the direct speech patterning affects not only regular pronouns, but also other types of deictic morphology.

(113)  
\[mindiranga \ bug \ nyangka\_di \ nyanamalam\_i\]
\[m.PROX-LOC-ONLY \ arrive \ 3fsg\_GO-PST \ n\_w\_ANAPH \ 3fsg\_hand-EMPH\]
\[winjangun \ bay \ winjora\_ \ ngiyangamala\_ \ bunda\]
\[winjangun \ bay \ wunjaj\_\_u-ra\_i \ ngiyangamala\_ \ bunda\]
\[fire \ spin \ 3n\_w\_O:2sg.S-ACT.ON-IMP-1sg.IO:1sg\_hand \ pl.AMBIPH\]
\[bunguluweanyirri \ dubala \ birringarri \ nyumara\_\_\_\_\_\_\不认识\_\_\_\_\_\]
\[bunga1-uluwa-n-nyirri \ dubala \ birri-yi-o-ngarri \ nyoa\_\_1-MA-ra\]
\[3pl.O:1sg.S-be.afraid-PRES-DU \ red \ 3pl.DEFS-BE-PRES-SUB \ 3fsg\_do-PST\]
\[walamba \ ba \ angkerri\]
\[walamba \ ba \ a\_1-a-ngka\_\_yirri\]
plains.kangaroo arrive 3msg\_GO-PST-CONT
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“She came right here: “Spin the fire to my hand here, I am afraid of those two because they are red,” she said. The red plains kangaroo emerged” (= example (72) on page 319)

The word -anamala ‘hand/paw’ in (113) is one of a set of inalienably possessed terms\(^8\) that carries a pronominal prefix and appears in a prefixed feminine 3rd person form outside the framed clause, agreeing with the female kangaroo protagonist (indicated with the subscript ‘i’), but inside the framed clause is prefixed with a first person marker. The first person indirect object in the framing clause (-ra ‘to me’) is also coreferential with the subject of the framing clause.

The last line of (112) does not so much indicate that for languages with a single framing construction the translation is arbitrary, but rather that in those languages the distinction between direct speech and indirect speech is nonexistent: although framing constructions in which the referential elements index the reported speech event, as in (109), are often translated as direct speech,\(^9\) the semantic distinction only applies in those languages in which there is a type of indirect speech construction. The Wunambal framing construction in (112) is clearly cognate with the framing construction in Ungarinyin. In the absence of an opposition between direct and indirect speech, Rumsey (1990: 348) justly states, ‘the use of [framing constructions] in Ungarinyin invites no inference specifically about wording’. Despite their consistent direct speech patterning framing constructions in Ungarinyin do not explicitly present the reported message from the perspective of the reported speaker or that of the current speaker.

However, under the perspective analysis of the (in)direct speech distinction additional questions remain to be asked. Starting from De Roeck (1994) typological studies of framing constructions have begun to cast doubt on the binary nature of the direct-indirect speech opposition, following descriptive studies suggesting intermediate categories such as ‘semi-indirect speech’ (e.g. Aaron, 1992) and ‘semi-direct speech’ (e.g. Hill, 1995a; Aikhenvald, 2008) adding to a long tradition of research into ‘free indirect speech’ (e.g. Bally, 1912; Lips, 1926; Vološinov [1929] 1973), i.e. framing constructions without a framing clause.\(^10\) Classicists analysing reported speech constructions in corpora have consistently found that the expected deictic and mood distinctions in indirect speech are frequently violated (cf. Postgate, 1905; Salmon, 1931;

\(^{8}\)See section 2.2.3.2.

\(^{9}\)In Capell (1972a: 1–127), a collection of 85 ultrashort Ungarinyin stories 65 of which contain at least one framing construction, the English free translation includes one indirect speech construction (on page 75) direct speech constructions of various forms. Just 25 framing constructions are simply translated with a framed clause followed by a framing clause with the verb ‘say’ in English, as is the order in Ungarinyin; 12 framing constructions are translated with a framing clause with the verb ‘say’ followed by the framed clause and the rest either have another lexical framing verb (17), a non-standard word order in the framing clause (e.g. ‘said he’, 5) or no framing verb at all (6). One single example represents reported thought.

\(^{10}\)Munro et al. (2012: 70) make the interesting observation that in Matses, which predominantly uses direct speech constructions, a form of free indirect speech is only available to elders, signalling that variation in the expression of reported speech can be sociolectal.
Andrewes, 1951) and languages vary as to what pronominal and other deictic elements refer to the reported speech event or the current event depending on the intended meaning of the entire framing construction (e.g. Munro et al., 2012; Evans, 2012). Given these findings, the observation that Ungarinyin does not have indirect speech constructions of the type as in (111) may not go to the heart of what the direct-indirect speech opposition expresses: the calibration of perspectives between that of the reported speaker and that of the current speaker. Evans (2006; 2012) demonstrates that these perspectives may become entangled in interesting ways. The conceptualisation of reported speech as representing the perspective of the reported speaker and the current speaker within the same utterance is a defining property that brought the phenomenon to the attention in Vološinov ([1929] 1973) in the first place. Over the course of the next few chapters I will explore the implications of this approach for the interpretation of subtle variation in the expression of reported speech in Ungarinyin.

In this chapter, however, I will primarily focus on the form and meaning of the framing construction as in (108), which raises other questions of typological interest. While the problem of perspective addresses variation in the expression of reported speech, the question of the formal unity of the framing construction draws attention to its semantic range, which apart from reported speech at least also includes reported thought and reported intentionality (‘want’).

The polysemy between ‘say’ and ‘think’ constructions in Australian languages (and beyond) appears to be particularly widespread. Following the analysis in Rumsey (1982; 1990) authors describing related Worrorran languages such as Kwini (McGregor, 1993: 55) and Wunambal (Carr, 2000), as well as unrelated Kimberley languages, such as Jaminjung (Schultze-Berndt, 2000: 357–363), have explicitly referred to the formal and semantic similarities between framing constructions in these languages and in Ungarinyin. Apart from these language the polysemy of the framing verb between a (generic) action verb and speech/mental state meanings has also been specifically discussed for Bunuba (Rumsey, 1994b; Knight, 2008) and Nyulnyulan languages (McGregor, 2014). Strikingly similar constructions are also found in some South American languages (e.g. Larson, 1978; van der Voort, 2002; Everett, 2008), African languages (Güldemann, 2008), Tibeto-Burman languages (Saxena, 1988) and in languages of Papua New Guinea (e.g. Reesink, 1993; Loughnane, 2005). All of these languages show polysemy between reported speech and thought, but framing constructions of reported intentionality are also common (e.g. Larson, 1978; Loughnane, 2005; McGregor, 2007; Everett, 2008; Güldemann, 2008).

Still, there is much typological evidence demonstrating that reported thought and reported intentionality are by no means the only additional meanings expressed by reported speech constructions. Surveying a large set of reported speech constructions in African languages, Güldemann (2008: 398–473) lists an extensive set of functions, including the ones in (114).
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(114) • Naming;
• ‘Reported evidence’;
• ‘Illocution reinforcement and related discourse functions’;
• Similarity and manner;
• Internal awareness (intention, proximative and future, deontic modality and indirect causation);
• Clause linkage (proposition-type (“complement”), manner clauses, purpose clauses, reason clauses, conditional and concessive clauses, relative clauses).

Apart from signalling that the framed clause represents a reported speech event (‘reported evidence’ in 114), the constructions may express different varieties of reported thought, reported intentionality (‘intention’ in 114), evaluations and assessments by the reported speaker (‘deontic modality’ in 114), one event following from another (indirect causation, similarity in 114, also see Larson, 1978: 86ff. and e.g. van der Voort, 2002: 320) and tense and aspectuality, involving two events following each other (‘proximative and future’ in 114). As additional functions Güldemann (2008) lists ‘naming’, ‘illocution reinforcement’ (e.g. explicitly marking an utterance as declarative) and clause linkage.

An example of a reported speech construction conventionalised with an aspectual interpretation is (115), from the Highland New Guinea language Usan, cf. qamb ‘say (same subject)’ expressing an inceptive meaning.

(115) munon um-ib qamb qindeind qob ete acem-ib-a
  man die-sg:FUT:SS say:SS delirium talk thus say-3s:FUT
  ‘(when) a man is about to die he will rave and say thus:...’ (Reesink, 1993: 222)

An evaluative ‘modal’ use of a conventionalised reported speech construction from the same language is (116), literally translating as ‘we abstain, the yams say: “wilt”’.

(116) mi qei-qei mani umer-iner qamb gitab ig-oun
  thing some-RED yam wilt-3s:UF say:SS abstain:SS be-1p:PR
  ‘We abstain from various things lest the yams wilt’ (Reesink, 1993: 222)

In the concluding chapter 7 I will comment on the semantic consistency of these various constructions, and discuss whether and how their interpretations can be related to the reported speech situation in figure 3.1. The wide-ranging meanings of conventionalised reported speech constructions introduced above are important for the analysis of Ungarinyin framing constructions for two reasons, however: First, they contextualise the polysemy of Ungarinyin framing constructions by demonstrating that although this polysemy is not unique, the limits of the semantic range of framing constructions in Ungarinyin are not inevitable: there are
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languages in which there is less polysemy (e.g. only between reported speech and reported thought) and there are languages in which the functions of framing constructions are much more extensive. Ungarinyin framing constructions are exclusively used to talk about the minds of discourse entities, whether reflected in talk, thought or intention. Second, the polyfunctionality of framing constructions raises the question of whether there are any identifiable formal distinctions by which the respective functions can be differentiated. Identifying such structural variation in Ungarinyin may lead to hypotheses about form-functions patterns within framing constructions elsewhere. This is what the present chapter sets out to do.

3.3. Ungarinyin framing constructions: A closer look

The Ungarinyin framing construction consists of a framed clause, a framing clause with the framing verb -ma- ‘say, do’, resulting in the generalised schematic representation in (117) (repeated from 4 on page 2).

(117) [ [ ... ]framed clause -ma- ]framing clause

Within this skeleton construction, the functions of reported speech (section 3.3.1), reported intentionality (section 3.3.2) and reported thought (section 3.3.3) can each be related to the presence or absence of specific features that I will discuss below (cf. Rumsey, 1982: 157). Section 3.3.4 introduces a type of framing construction with the peripheral function ‘naming’ and section 3.3.5 summarises the formal and functional distinctions within the Ungarinyin framing construction.

3.3.1. Framing constructions of reported speech

The most frequent function of Ungarinyin framing constructions is to express reported speech. Consider the reported dialogue in (118a).

(118) a. [[ wul ngama wali balya buma buri ngama ] [ wul nga1-ma-ø wali balya ba2-ma buri nga1-ma-ø ] [ sleep 1sg-DO-PRS wait IMP-DO be.satisfied 1sg-DO-PRS ]

   ngamernangka ngaji (.05) [[ yaw nyumara ] balya nyumara nga1-ma-ra-nganka ngaji ] [ yow nga2-ma-ra balya nga2-ma-ra ]

   1sg-DO-PST-3sg.IO my.mother [ yeah 3sg-DO-PST ] go 3sg-DO-PST

   ‘I am falling asleep, you go for a while, I am full,” I told my mom. “That’s fine,” she said and she went’ (100903-31NGUN, 0:05–0:09)
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Example (118a) contains two framing constructions with framed clauses of various lengths: the long wul ngama wali balya buma buri ngama ‘I sleep, you go for a while, I’m full’, containing three simple clause constructions and the interjection yaw. In this study the term ‘framed clause’ will not refer to a clausal unit in the traditional sense, i.e. as one of the simple clause types introduced in section 2.4.1: it denotes a framed element in the framing construction. As (118a) and (118b) demonstrate, this can be anything that can be said, a sequence of syntactic clauses, a complex sentence or a single word utterance or a soundsymbolic word, such as the bird sounds koko and kurda kurda. Framing clauses are often short, typically containing not more than two referents, such as the (self-)reported speaker and the reported addressee in the framing clause ngamernangka ngaji ‘I said to my mother’ and even more frequently only the reported speaker, as in nyumara ‘she said’.

The framing relation between the framing clause and the framed clause is not morphologically marked in Ungarinyin, unlike, e.g., in the neighbouring language Worrorra, which has the same polysemy between ‘do’, ‘say’, ‘think’ and ‘want’ (the non-cognate root -yi-), but the framing construction in (119).

(119) dambeewunya ngeyu kunjunganangka awa
     dambee-wunya ngeyu kun-ø-yi-ng-anangka awa
     home-GOAL 3msg.FUT.go 3n.w.O-3sg.S-do-PST-3sg.IO 3msg
     “I want to go home,” s/he said to him’ (Clendon, 2000: 116–117, gloss added)

Syntagmatically and semantically (119) resembles the Ungarinyin framing clause, but a notable difference lies in the prefix kun-, which Clendon (2000) glosses as a verbal complementiser prefix.11 As the examples show, this marker appears to be a pronoun in object position referencing the neuter ‘w-class’ (Clendon, 2000: 76–77, 116–117), which in Worrorra, as in Ungarinyin, is the noun class/gender of concepts associated with time and language. Under this analysis, the Worrorra construction in (119) is trivalent, with a subject prefix indexing the reported speaker, an indirect object suffix indexing the reported addressee and an object prefix indexing the reported message.12

---

11 An example shown earlier of a language that marks the framing relation with a complementiser, while maintaining direct speech patterning was the Gurindji example in (109b) on page 76.

12 Morphologically, the verbal prefix complex in kunjunganangka ‘s/he said it (w-neuter) to him/her’ in (119) is similar to, e.g., the Ungarinyin verb (wa) wanyirrko ‘we do not do it (w-neuter)’ in (154) on page 120 or wunjon ‘you do it (w-neuter)’ in (162) on page 127, but this construction is not used as a framing verb in Ungarinyin.
As Rumsey (2010b: 1654) notes, ‘there is a considerable diversity among the world’s languages in how the framing relationship is formally expounded, and in many of them the framed locution is at least in certain respects treated like a grammatical object.’ The Pilbara language Martuthumira is an exceptionally striking example of this tendency, with a framing construction in which the reported message is marked with accusative case, as illustrated in (120).

(120) yartapalyu wangka-nguru parna-ngka-rru kangku-lha-a, yartapalyu others say-PRES head-LOC-NOW carry-PAST-ACC others wangka-nguru warrayyi-lalha-a say-PRES drag-PAST-ACC

‘Some say they carried it on their heads, others say they dragged it’ (Dench, 1995: 223)

In Ungarinyin no such morphological link exists between the framed and framing clauses: in the transcription in (118a) the relation between the independent simple clause constructions in the first framed clause, the sequential actions yaw nyumara balya nyumara ‘she said “yes” and went’ and the framed and framing clauses all seem asyndetically juxtaposed. There does appear to be, however, a distinctive intonation pattern in framing constructions: a framing construction normally starts with a pitch ‘reset’ at the beginning of a framed clause to a relatively higher pitch level, which normally continues to fall over the course of the framed clause and transitions into the framing clause with no or hardly any perceptible intonation break. Non-attributed clauses or clauses between which no change in perspective occurs, on the other hand, appear to be more prosodically diverse and less marked.

Figures 3.2-3.4 include the pitch contour (the speckled lines) and intensity (the thin uninterrupted lines) of examples (121a–121c). In the figures, the pitch ranges between 0 Hz and the value shown at the top of the vertical axis (these values are different for each picture), the intensity ranges consistently between 0 and 100 dB between the intersection with the horizontal axis and the top of the vertical axis (to prevent clogging the picture these values have not been represented). As the intensity contours show, the framing constructions are realised as acoustically independent clauses, within which discernable pauses may occur within the framed clause, but pauses between the framed and framing clauses are often minimal. These example sentences are consecutive lines from a narrative text, preceding the text transcribed in appendix C as the Bowerbird story told by Pansy Nulgit (see section 4.4). They describe a bowerbird stealing the belongings of a Ngarinyin man, who finds his money gone. Lines (121a) and (121b) are reporting utterances from the man, line (121c) expresses the perspective of the bowerbird.

---

13Rumsey (1994b) illustrates this with the Bunuba example in (109a) as well, since the subject of the framing clause (here milwirri ‘dove’) is (optionally) suffixed with an ergative marker, as if it were a regular transitive clause.
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Figure 3.2.: Pitch and intensity contours of example (121a)

Figure 3.3.: Pitch and intensity contours of example (121b)
Example sentences (121a–121c) show the translation and morphemic analysis of the utterances represented in figures 3.2-3.4. The duration of prosodic breaks longer than five milliseconds appears in round brackets in the transcription with the time period in milliseconds expressed at two decimals (i.e. times ten), e.g (.18) stands for 18 milliseconds (0.018 s) and (.08) for 0.008 s.

(121) a. [[ Manjarn kuno wirriyara nginingka (.21) narnburr (.08)]
[[ manjarn kuno w-irriya-ra nginingka narnburr]]
[[ money nₜ-DIST nₜ-IGN-LOC 1sg.POSS bank.note]]
[[ wungininganingarri ] ama ] (.07)
[[ wunga₂-ininga-ni-ngarri ] a₁-ma-ø ]

‘Where is that money of mine, where are the banknotes I left here?” he (the man) says’

b. Linyba ayirri burray (.13) [[ Nyangki rimij budmara ]
[ liny-ba a₁-ø-yirri burray ] [[ nyangki rimij burr-ma-ra ]
see-ITRV 3msg-GO-PRS-CONT NEG ] [[ who steal 3pl-do-PST ]
ama ]
a₁-ma-ø ]
3msg-do-PRS ]

‘He looks around, but finds nothing. “Someone has robbed me” he says’
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c. (.21) [[ Buluba ngiya (0.07) ngin rimijbarda ] ngala ama ]
[[ buluk-ba nga1-iy-a ngin rimij-barda ] ngala a1-ma-ø ]
[[ look-ITRV 1sg-FUT-go 1sg steal-AGENT animal 3msg-do-PRS ]

‘I’ll go and have a look around, I am a thief,” says the bird’ (100903-21NGUN, 2:48-3:11)

The pitch ‘reset’ occurs in the onset of the framing constructions, which means at the beginning of figure 3.4 (contrasting with the last part of figure 3.3) and the first and second intonation unit in figure 3.3. In both instances the framed clause sets in at a considerably higher pitch level than the preceding clause. In contrast, between the framing clause in the last intonation unit in figure 3.2 and the non-attributed clause in the first intonation unit of figure 3.3 no such intonational discontinuity exists. Also, while (121a–121c) show a close correspondence between grammatical clauses and prosodic units, the intensity does not (figure 3.3) or only very briefly (figures 3.2 and 3.4) drop between the framed and framing clauses. For example, compare the long pause in 3.2 between the first framed clause manjarn kuno wirriyara nginingka ‘where is my money?’ and the second framed clause narnbur wungininganingarri ‘where I put (down) the banknote’ to that between the framed and framing clauses. Note that the pitch reset in between the framed clause and a preceding non-framing clause is not necessarily completely sharp or discrete: the rise in intonation appears to be anticipated at the end of the non-framed intonation units in figures 3.2 and 3.3. Such observations suggest that although the pitch rise in a framing construction appears to be motivated by the onset of the framed clause, this interpretation also involves situated, and not necessarily formally contrastive judgements.

Intonation and voice dynamics often play a role in the expression of reported speech and may be used to demarcate and specify properties of the framed clause in the languages of the world. Kibrik (2011: 352, footnote 12) cites a particularly interesting case in the Niger-Congo language Pulaar:

‘According to Antonia Koval (personal communication), Pulaar (as well as other Pulaar-Fulifide dialects) storytellers pronounce speech belonging to different animals in different voices (for example, low and hoarse voice for the hyena), and such alternation of voices is obligatory, almost as a grammatical rule; this apparently helps to ensure the identity of reported speakers\(^\text{14}\)

In Ungarinyin the pitch reset does not specifically mark the framed clause but the entire framing construction, as per the characterisation in Evans (2003) in combination with a mul-

\(^{14}\)Pulaar has an extensive noun class system but refers to all (and also personified animals in stories) with an undifferentiated ‘human class’ marker, resulting in a high degree of referential ambiguity in narratives (Kibrik, 2011: 352). The Pulaar example may be functionally similar to code-switching to the original language of a reported speech event, as introduced in Evans (2012).
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titude of acoustic and prosodic clues. It is questionable, however, whether reported speech intonation is a consistent marking pattern in a strictly phonological sense (cf. Blythe, 2009b).

Pitch resets appear to be common in framing constructions of reported speech, but are not limited to this function. This is perhaps illustrated by figure 3.4 (example 121c), describing the bowerbird sitting alone by itself on a branch. Although in the Ungarinyin narrative world animals are frequently portrayed as speaking, the solitary situation with the bowerbird looking down on the Ngarinyin man without the company of a potential addressee suggests that the framing construction is to be interpreted as reported thought. Nevertheless a pitch reset occurs.

The description of the inferential process leading to an interpretation of reported thought as opposed to reported speech is indicative of deciding between the functions of framing constructions more generally: it rests on a combination of grammatical and contextual clues ruling one interpretation more likely over alternative ones.

The contextual clue that most distinctively points towards a reported speech interpretation is the opposite of that which lead to a reported thought reading in the example above: explicit reference to an addressee in the situation the framing construction describes. As soon as it is clear that the event presented in the framed clause is spoken to someone, this necessarily implies that the framing construction expresses reported speech, not an unspoken thought or intention. An example of such a case was illustrated in the first framing construction in (118a), where the first person subject directed the framed clause to her mother. In the framing clause this addressee was cross-referenced with the pronominal suffix that on intransitive verb roots can introduce an object (and refers to indirect or oblique objects in all other instances, see section 2.3.1.1). This suffix is illustrated in example (122), where it equally occurs on the intransitive root -ma- ‘do, say’, but in a coverb construction not a framing clause.

(122) aka ngurr amernangka lemarnkarda
aka ngurr a₁-ma-ra-nangka lemarnkarr-ru
NOT.SO hit 3msg.S-do-PST-3sg.O temple-LOC

‘No, he hit him on the temple’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 6:36-6:38)

In (122) -nangka can be characterised as a third person singular direct object, the discourse entity affected by the hitting event. On a framing verb this suffix may refer to the reported addressee, i.e. the discourse referent at whom the reported message was allegedly directed in the reported speech event, formulated in the current speech event, as also seen in (123). This type is most commonly translated as reported speech.

(123) [ [ koj ba ] budmanangka ]
[ [ koj ba₂-a ] burr-ma-na-nangka ]

‘“Come drink,” they say to him’ (090812JENGPDi, 1:10-1:12)
A caveat: Given the underspecification of semantic roles in Ungarinyin nominal and verbal morphology, however, framing verbs with pronominal suffixes as in (118a) and (123) are no foolproof strategy for expressing reported speech: the suffixes may equally be translated as obliques, i.e. ‘say/think about $x$’,¹⁵ in which case a reported thought or even a reported intentionality reading can be allowed.

In summary, reported speech is the most common function of framing constructions and is generally marked by a distinctive pitch reset, although interpretations often remain polysemous. What can positively identify a framing construction of reported speech is explicit reference to an addressee, but a pronominal suffix on the framed clause is not necessarily sufficient to express this meaning. The only situation in which the presence of an addressee is absolutely unambiguous is in reciprocal framing constructions of the type ‘$x$ and $y$ said to each other’. In this rather marginal case the reported speech function of framing constructions is formally transparent as well, since in reciprocal saying events the framing verb -ma- is replaced with the root -ininga- ‘put’ (Rumsey, 1982: 103–104).

(124) burroru wamal numarerri || anja dowaya ngadinangka
burra2-(w)uru wamal ma2-ma-ra-yirri || anja dowaya ngarr2- $y_2 i$-ø-ngarri
3pl-ear wonder 3n,-do-PST-CONT || what lean.on 1pl.INC,S-BE-PRS-3sg.IO
| bidingayinangka |
| bIRR-inga-$y_1 i$-nangka |
| 3pl.S-put-REFL-3sg.IO |

‘They wondered in their mind [lit.: ‘their ears’]. “What can we lean on?” they asked each other about it (Coate and Oates, 1970: 104, lines 1–2; orthography, gloss and translation adapted)

I will conclude this section with a brief observation about the recognisability and glossing of framing constructions of reported speech. As the second framing clause in (118a) on page 82 illustrated, framed clauses can be very short. In some sound(specific) expressions this may occasionally create difficulty in distinguishing between coverb and framing constructions. The minimal pairs in (125) and (126), both including animal sounds, illustrate this problem.

(125) a. wurla wurla nyengarri wak wak nyuma
wurla wurla nyao2-$y_2 i$-ø-ngarri wak wak nya2-ma-ø
talk talk 3fsg-BE-PRS-SUB caw caw 3fsg-do-PRS

‘She says: “Wak, wak!” ’ (100722-02NGUS, 2:30–2:32)

¹⁵Such an ambiguous example is shown in (31) in appendix H on page 359.
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b. anjaku  wak  nyengarri
   anja-ku  wak  nyɔ2-ŋɔ-ŋarri
what-DAT caw 3fsg-be-PRS-SUB

‘Why is she caw-ing?’ (100722-02NGUS, 6:19-6:21)

(126) a. ngarl  budma  burrolingarri  malngonara
    ngarl  burr-ма-о  burrolingarri  malngona-ra
bark  3pl-do-PRS dog   creek-LOC

‘The dogs bark in the creek’ (100722-01NGUS, 6:56-6:59)

b. ngarl  birrinyi  nak  bungomindani
    ngarl  бирри-ɔ-ні  nak  bunga2-minda-ni
bark  3pl-be-PST hear 3pl.O:1sg.S-take-PST

‘They barked, I heard them’ (100722-01NGUS, 8:10-8:12)

In (125a) and (126a) wak and ngarl representing bird and dog sounds, respectively, are
combined with the -ма- ‘do, say’ root and hence possible framing constructions. In (125a)
the construction wak wak nyuma ‘she cawed’ is preceded by the wurla wurla nyingerri ‘when
she was talking’, which seems to set up the following clause as reported speech. In (125b) and
(126b) the same onomatopoeic expressions are shown, but instead of the framing verb -ма-,
the verb root -ʌ2- ‘be’ is used, indicating a coverb construction.

In these cases of ambiguity I will always choose to interpret the -ма- construction as a
framing clause of reported speech. As per the convention introduced in section 2.3.2 this
decision is evident in the interlinear gloss since inflecting verbs in coverb constructions are
printed in lower capitals, while framing verbs, which are treated as independent verbs, are not.

3.3.2. Framing constructions of reported intentionality

Framing constructions with an interpretation of reported intentionality require two features
that framing constructions of reported speech or reported thought do not: first of all they only
allow one single type of coreference relation between the subject of the framing clause and that
of the framed clause. The subject of the framed clause has to have a first person singular form
and is construed as coreferential with the subject of the framing clause, as in the examples in
(127).

(127) a. [[ kangin  ngiwinangka   | amara   ]
     [[ kangin  ngә1-и-ŋә2-нәкә   | a1-ма-ra ]
     [[ deceive  1sg.S-FUT-be-3sg.O   | 3msg-do-PST ]

‘He wanted to trick him’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: 234, entry: gaŋin, my translation.)
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b. [[ ngin minjala bongo ] amara ]
[[ ngin minjala bungk_a₂-w₁-u-∅ ] a₁-ma-ra ]

‘He wanted to eat those’ (101001-04DCPN, 1:04-1:06)

c. [[ ngurr ngimanangka ] budmara ]
[[ ngurr nga₁-iy-ma-nangka ] burre-ma-ra ]

‘They wanted to hit it’ (= line 77 from the Bowerbird story in Appendix C)

In (127a), the subject of the framed clause kangin ngiwinangka ‘I will trick him’ is coreferential with the third person form amara ‘he said’ in the framing clause. Example (127b) shows that free pronouns in the framed clause follow this referentiality pattern as well: ngin ‘me’, which has contrastive focus, is interpreted as referring to the subject referent of the framing clause. As (127c) demonstrates, even when the subject of the framing clause is plural the subject of the framed clause is invariably first person singular in a framing construction of reported intentionality: the third person plural subject of the framing verb budmara ‘they say/think/do’ is coreferential with the first person subject of ngimanangka ‘I will do with respect to him/her/it’.

The subject of the framing clause in framing constructions of reported intentionality is predominantly third person singular or plural.

The second property that is required for an interpretation of reported intentionality concerns the choice of tense in the framed clause, which has to be future tense. While future tense may suggest an intention on the part of a grammatical subject outside of framing constructions, in a way describing a future action perhaps inherently does (cf. Rumsey, 2001: 355), it only acquires the specific meaning of ‘to want’ in the context of a framing construction of reported intentionality (cf. Rumsey, 2001: 359).

As indicated, the future tense in framing constructions of reported intentionality is occasionally replaced by two moods that like future tense describe events that have not (yet) happened in the real world, optative and irrealis. With an irrealis the framing construction expresses a negative meaning, i.e. ‘not want’/‘intending that not’, as evidenced by (128).\(^\text{16}\)

\begin{equation}
\text{(128) The speaker describes a picture from the Family problems picture task (see appendix L) in which a man appears to cover his ears, from which the speaker deduces he does not want to hear what is being said.}
\end{equation}

\(^{16}\text{The irrealis form in (128) expresses negation, which currently appears to be the most common function of the Ungarinyin irrealis. In this function the verb is often preceded by the negation particle wa, but may not be, as in (128); see section 4.3.5.}\)
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He doesn’t want to listen and he shuts his ears’ (090831AJMJSMPDm, 1:21-1:23)

The alternation between future tense and irrealis in framing constructions with a reported intentionality interpretation has a plausible semantic explanation, but from a morphosyntactic perspective there is an additional (or alternative) motivation based on the fact that the future tense morpheme takes the same morphological slot in the verbal template as the irrealis: the two categories simply cannot be combined within a single verb (see 62 on page 43 in section 2.3). Under this analysis in negative framed clauses as in (128), the future tense category could be notionally present but the expression of the future tense marker is precluded by the irrealis morpheme.

McGregor (2004: 244) writes that ‘say’/‘do’ framing constructions of reported intentionality occur in ‘[a] geographically contiguous block of languages including [Ungarinyin], Unggumi, Bunuba and Warrwa’ and Capell and Coate (1984: 44) claim that this block includes all Worrorran languages.

In Warrwa, McGregor (2007: 28–31) describes the parallel construction (which the author calls the ‘desiderative construction’) as a formally bi-clausal construction which is interpreted as a single clause due to the tight prosodic, referential and syntactic integration of the ‘framed’ and ‘framing clauses’. McGregor (2007) finds no noticeable pitch break/reset between the framed and framing clauses, the framed clause subject necessarily has a first person form and the framing clause follows the framed clause; (129) shows an example of the Warrwa construction (brackets indicating the framed and framing clauses added).

Although the Warrwa framing verb does not appear to be cognate with Ungarinyin -ma- ‘do, say’, the verb -ji ‘do, say’ has the same polysemy as in Ungarinyin and the construction in (129) is characterised by exactly the same features that were identified for reported intentionality above. McGregor (2007: 31–33) suggests that the ‘want’ meaning arises from the fact that ‘what is wanted’ is necessarily a future event (with respect to some current or reported time path) and that the ‘desiderative’ meaning has conventionalised due to the language internal

92
oppositions with which the reported intentionality construction in Warrwa contrasts, including ‘normal’ future tense constructions (which may imply a ‘desiderative’ meaning) and reported speech and thought. The meaning of the Warrwa desiderative complement construction itself, McGregor (2007: 33) argues is ‘not compositional’, i.e. the meaning of the construction cannot be logically derived from the lexical meaning and morphology of its individual constituents. A strong argument in favour of this analysis is that in Warrwa desiderative constructions the framing clause strictly follows the framed clause, whereas in reported speech and thought constructions McGregor (2007) finds no strong clause order preference.

Clause order is not a defining feature for Ungarinyin framing constructions of reported intentionality: the order of framed and framing clauses in reported speech or reported thought are relatively fixed. The prosodic characterisation of reported intentionality as opposed to reported speech in McGregor (2007), however, does appear to be reflected in the contrast between framing constructions with these functions in Ungarinyin as well. This can be demonstrated by the admittedly sketchy and impressionistic comparison of randomly selected framing constructions in each function in figures 3.5 and 3.6, which show an overlay of the pitch contours of ten framing constructions with reported speech and ten with a reported intentionality interpretation.

Figures 3.2-3.4 suggested that the pitch reset in Ungarinyin framing constructions appears to occur between the onset of the framing construction and the surrounding discourse. Consequently, there is no noticeable intonation break in either reported speech or reported thought in Ungarinyin, but the pitch contour of the framed clause often shows a development from relatively high to low. The evidence shown by figures 3.5 and 3.6 is admittedly impressionistic, but figure 3.5 is consistent with the H-L pattern, whereas figure 3.6, representing reported intentionality, is more diverse. Unlike the pitch contours of framing constructions of reported speech, the pitch contours of the reported intentionality framing constructions in 3.6 are nearly flat, show very little vertical development or even rise. In this sense, intonation may also serve to help distinguish between reported speech and reported intentionality.

Rumsey (1982) distinguishes a second type of reported intentionality construction that I will label reported intention-causation. Two examples are shown in (130).

---


20 The fragments used for measuring the pitch contours in figure 3.6 are the following: 090813AJMJSMPDc, 1:21-1:22, 090813AJMJSMPDm, 0:09-0:10, 090813AJMJSMPDh, 1:49-1:50, 090814AJMJSMPDm, 0:39-0:40, 100903-04NGUN, 0:33-0:34, 100903-24NGUN, 8:56-8:57, 101001-04DCPN, 1:04-1:05, 110924-01DSES, 0:28-0:29, 110924-01DSES, 1:45-1:46, 111013-01NGUN, 0:20-0:21.
Figure 3.5.: Ten randomly selected pitch contours of framing constructions of reported speech

Figure 3.6.: Ten randomly selected pitch contours of framing constructions of reported intentionality
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(130) a. [[ yinda warndij irrora ] ] amarerndu 
[[ yinda warndij irr-w1 u-ø-ra ] ] a-ma-ra-rndu 

‘They\textsubscript{j} will make a spear for me\textsubscript{i},’ he\textsubscript{i} did with respect to them\textsubscript{j}’ or:
‘He wanted them to make him a spear’ or:

‘He forced them to make him a spear’ (Rumsey, 1982: 162, spelling and glosses adjusted)

b. [[ liny nyuno ] ] amaranyarriku 
[[ liny nyun-w1 u-ø ] ] a\textsubscript{j}-ma-ra-ngarriku 

(\textsubscript{0.01}) liny

anyijilani:: (\textsubscript{0.01})

anyirr-y1 ila-ni::

3msg.O:1pl.EXC.S-HOLD-PST

‘He wanted us to look at it and we looked at it’ (= 9 on 294)

Like framing constructions of reported intentionality, reported intention-causation as in (130) has a framed future tense, signalled here in both cases by the absence of a present tense suffix. As with reported intentionality, framing constructions of intention-causation express some wish or intention of the subject referent of the framing clause. What distinguishes the (admittedly rare) examples of this type from reported intentionality is the patterning of coreferentiality between the framed and framing clauses: unlike framing constructions with a reported intentionality interpretation, framing constructions as in (130) do not show coreferentiality between the subjects of the framed and framing clauses but the subject of the framed clause is coreferential with the object suffix in the framing clause. In the translation of (130a) taken from Rumsey (1982) I have indicated this by the subscripts S\textsubscript{j}/O\textsubscript{i}: the indirect object suffix -ra ‘for me’ in the framed clause is coreferential with the subject of the framing clause. The same is true for the example in (130b), which literally translates as ‘I\textsubscript{j} will make you\textsubscript{i} look na,’ he\textsubscript{j} said to us\textsubscript{i}.’

There is one interesting syntactic distinction between framing constructions of reported intentionality and intention-causation on the one hand and all other functions of framing con-

---

\textsuperscript{21}In an explicit comparison of the Warrwa desiderative complement construction and the Ungarinyin framing constructions of reported intentionality McGregor (2007: 36) states that the obligatory coreferentiality between the subject of the framed and framing clauses distinguishes the Warrwa desiderative from Ungarinyin reported intentionality and that reported intentionality is less strict in Ungarinyin since it does not require ‘the nominative bound pronoun [i.e. my subject prefix, SS\textsubscript{j}] in the matrix verb’ to ‘be cross-referenced by a nominative pronominal prefix to the complement verb [i.e. my framed verb, SS\textsubscript{i}].’ While I agree that the intention-causation interpretation expands the possible functions of framing constructions in Ungarinyin I do not think that this makes the reported intentionality framing construction ‘less strict’, since the the want interpretation, i.e. the event ‘somebody wants something’ (as opposed to ‘someone wants someone to do something’) does obligatorily require a first person singular framed subject.
structions: while framed clauses are normally uninterrupted sentential units, Rumsey (also see 1982: 163–164, 166) makes the important observation that there are some framing constructions within which discontinuous framed clauses are permitted, viz. those expressing reported intentionality and intention-causation. Example (131) shows the framed clause nyuminda warmarlayu ‘s/he takes her to the desert’, which is interrupted by the framing clause kudmararri ‘you two said’.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
nyuminda & kudmararri & warmarlayu \\
\hline
nyα₂-minda-∅ & kurr-ma-ra-rri & warmarla-yu \\
\hline
3sg.O:3sg.S-take-FUT & 2pl-do-PST-DU & desert-LAT \\
\end{array}
\]

‘You two wanted me/him to take her to the desert’, or: ‘You two made me/him take her to the desert’ [lit.: ‘you two said: ‘he will take her to the desert’] (Rumsey, 1982: 164)

Example (131) has an embedded third person subject, which means that in spite of the framed future tense form it cannot express reported intentionality since that would have required a framed first person subject. The literal translation of the sentence is ‘S/he will take her, you two did, “to the desert”, which results in the referentially ambiguous interpretation of (131) (if the framed third person is understood to refer to the current speaker the translation is ‘me’, if it refers to someone other than the speaker the translation is ‘him/her’.22). The most striking feature of (131), however, is the discontinuous framed clause. In chapter 6 I will show a second striking type of discontinuous framed clauses, but what is relevant for now is that these are never found in regular reported speech.

The combination of tense/mood and coreferential restrictions, prosodic features and the apparent ‘looseness’ of the framed clause are clear diagnostic criteria distinguishing between two fundamental types of framing constructions: those that express a (most typically spoken) message attributed to a reported speaker/cognisant (reported speech and thought) and those that attribute some intention, perhaps formulated by the current speaker (reported intentionality). Note, however, that even in this clearest case in which structural distinctions can be made within the Ungarinyin framing construction, ambiguity remains: out of context all examples in this section could be translated with sentences of the type ‘x said: “I/y will p’’. Despite the formal features identified in this section all framing constructions of reported intentionality and intention-causation are polysemous.

---

22This meaning would have been disambiguated by either a first or third person suffix in the framing clause. A second person reading is ruled out because in that case the framing clause, which contains a second person subject, would have had to be reflexive, also see Rumsey (1982: 164).
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3.3.3. Framing constructions of reported thought

Of all the functions of framing constructions, identifying reported thought is the most problematic, at least without an appropriate discourse context. In example (133), repeated from (2) on page 1 the first clause preceding the framing construction provides such a context. In (132) the coverb *ni* ‘think’ occurs in a transitive complex verb construction and is combined with a nominal object representing the object of the thought. In (133) the coverb occurs in an intransitive construction and represents a general thinking event, suggesting that the following framing construction expresses reported thought (also see section 4.2).

(132) *jowarda jina ni admindan*

h*orse m.PROX think 3msg.O:1pl.INC.S-TAKE-PRS

‘We think about the horse’ (= line (195) on page 336)

(133) *nini e [[kunya nguma kanda ] ama ]

ni-ni *a1-iy-ma [kunya nga1-iy-ma kanda ] a1-ma-o*

think-REDUP 3msg-BE-PRS [what 1sg-FUT-do nw.PROX ] 3msg-do-PRS

‘He is thinking. “What can I do here?” he thinks’ (090813AJMJSMPDm, 2:01-2:02)

As suggested in section 3.3.1, reported thought is mostly characterised by the absence of specific features: no reference to a reported addressee in the framing clause since reported thought describes an individual process and also no restrictions on tense, mood and person reference in the framed clause. Prosodically and acoustically there is no meaningful distinction between a framing construction of reported speech and thought: reported speech is enacted as an internal monologue and can be performed with any kind of theatricality (exclamative intonation, affective voice colouring etc.) that is typical of reported speech.

In connection with these properties an interesting observation concerns the polysemy between ‘mind’ and ‘ear’ (-oru), as shown in the first clause in (124) on page 89. Ungarinyin shares this polysemy pattern with many other Australian languages (Evans and Wilkins, 2000) but the pattern underlines the strong metaphorical link that exists in Ungarinyin between the external world of speech and the internal world of thought. I have repeatedly tried to elicit utterances of the type ‘*x* thought *p* but *x* did not say *p*, but Ungarinyin does not allow framing constructions to express such an opposition between speech or thought.

3.3.4. Framing constructions of naming

One final function of Ungarinyin framing constructions that has not been discussed so far is that of naming. The function is relatively common, particularly in mythological narratives as the examples in (134), mostly taken from Coate (1966), demonstrate.
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(134) a. alngun wirriwiningan [[ marro:rrorro nyialngun ] ]
alngun wurr-wuwa2-ninga-n [[ marro:rrorro nyia-lngun ] ]
msg-name 3n.O:3pl.S-put-PRS [[ expert 2sg-name ] ]

budmanangka ]
burr-ma-ø-nangka ]
3pl.S-do-PRS-3sg.IO ]

'They give him a name. “Your name is ‘expert’,” they say to/about him’ (Coate, 1966: 107, lines 64–65)

b. [[ Yilurrun ] di 1sg.ANAPH kunya budmanangka 1sg.ANAPH di ]
[[ Yilurrun ] di kunya burr-ma-ø-nangka di ]
[[ Yilurrun ] nw..ANAPH where 3pl.S-do-PRS-3sg.IO n.w..ANAPH ]

‘Yilurrun is what that place is called’ [lit.: ‘Yilurrun’ is what they say/do to/about it]’ (= line (11) on page 311)

c. [ malyannga 1pl.INC.FUT-do-3sg.IO for.nothing-ONLY ]
[ junba jandu jirri dance designer m.ANAPH ]
[ ngarrkumanangka designer ]

‘We don’t just call him ‘corroboree designer’ for nothing’ (Coate, 1966: 106, lines 39-40)

d. [ di nyandu nyina ngarrun ‘rai’ ]
[ di nyandu nyina ngarrun ‘rai’ ]
[ n.w..ANAPH 3fsg.AMBIPH 3fsg.PROX 1pl.EXC rai ]

ngarrimenangka ]
ngarr-iy-ma-nangka ]
1pl.INC-FUT-do-3sg.IO ]

‘Then we will call her ‘rai’’ (Coate, 1966: 109, line 88)

The first clausal construction in (134a) illustrates the lexical strategy for expressing ‘to name’ and the subsequent framing construction mentions the name, marro:rrorro nyialngun budmanangka ‘your name (is) marro:rrorro they say to/about him’. As in (134b), (134a) remains close in meaning and form to regular reported speech: the ‘naming event’ consists of a specific reported speech event. Framing constructions (134c) and (134d) do not refer to a specific speech event but describe a generic naming event.

Examples (135a), taken from the story in appendix F and (135b) do not include a pronominal suffix in the framing clause as in (134) but represent naming as well. Example (135a), munda Yilurrun kudma, may be translated as ‘you (pl.) say ‘Yilurrun’ here’ and (135b) includes two framing constructions the first of which, nyolki nyindi budmara ‘they called (her) ‘nyolki nyindi’’ represents naming.
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(135) a. [[munda [Yilurrn] kudma ] irrumara ]
     [[ n,m.PROX [Yilurrn] kurr-ma-ø ] a1-irra2-ma-ra ]
     [[ n,m.PROX [Yilurrn] 2pl-do-PRS ] 3msg-DEFS-do-PST ]

‘He said: “You call this place Yilurrn” ’ (= line (49) on page 316)

b. nyandu ba nyangkangarri [[ nyolki nyindi ] budmara ]
   nyandu ba nyol2-a-ngka-ngarri [[ nyolki nyindi ] burr-ma-ra ]
   f.AMBIPH be.born 3fsg-GO-PST-SUB [[ fsg.first.born f.ANAPH ] 3pl-do-PST ]

   (18) [[ nyandu burdu nyindi ] budmarangirri ]
   [[ nyandu burdu nyindi ] burr-ma-ra-nyirri ]
   [[ fsg.ANAPH small f.ANAPH ] 3pl-do-PST-DU ]

“When that girl was born they called her ‘first born’, “she is the little one,” they said’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 12:30-12:37)

Framing constructions of naming often include a pronominal suffix in the framing clause, but may also occur without this suffix. The framed clause often consists of a single word or collocation, the name, which is not marked with a pitch reset. As the examples in (134) and (135) indicate, some formal/functional continuity exists between reported speech and naming, but most framing constructions of naming do not index a specific reported speech event.23

3.3.5. Distinguishing framing constructions

In the previous sections I have identified five separate functions of the Ungarinyin framing construction: reported speech, reported thought, reported intentionality, reported intention-causation and naming. What all of these features have in common is that they attribute some fragment of discourse to a another discourse participant (or the speaker herself at another time). This fragment of discourse can be construed as speech, an inferred thought or intention or a general label speakers can attach to some object, place, person or concept. This fragment can be long and involve several grammatical clauses or it can be limited to one single word. In all instances the discourse fragment, an utterance understood as belonging to some reported speech event or a metaphorical extension thereof is represented with a framed clause. The discourse participant to whom the content of the framed clause is attributed is the subject of the framing clause.

23From a formal semantic perspective the observation that Ungarinyin expresses reported speech (‘demonstrating a reported speech event’) and naming with the same construction (like the African languages G¨uldemann, 2008 cites) presents an interesting angle on the debate surrounding the treatment of quotation within that framework. Saka (2006) states the with regard to the question to what extent the framed clause (the ‘quoted matter’) ‘is part of the quoting sentence’ (Saka, 2006: 455) formal semantics has two main theories, (1) the demonstrative theory, which proposes that the framed clause is like a deictic expression pointing to the quote (our ‘indexing the reported speech event’) and (2) the proper name theory, which suggests that in terms of information status the framed clause is similar to personal names. The polysemy of framing constructions of reported speech and naming seems to indicate that this distinction should not be overplayed.
Although framing constructions are inherently ambiguous, it was shown that the form of a framing construction makes some interpretations more likely than others. The clearest division is between reported intentionality and reported intention-causation on the one hand and all other functions: if a framing clause does not have a future tense, optative or irrealis and/or no first person framed subject it cannot express reported intentionality. If a reported addressee is indexed, the framing construction would have to be interpreted as reported speech and in this way a good number of diagnostic features can be identified (also see Rumsey, 1982: 166).

Based on these diagnostic features it is possible to slightly further specify the skeleton construction from the introduction repeated below as (136a) to represent the most prototypical construction for each function. Note that this prototypical construction is often not the only form a framing construction expressing the respective meaning can take, but the schematic representations in (136) most fully incorporate the structural and semantic clues presented in the previous sections. For clarity, similar elements in each construction schema are aligned, relevant semantic and referential functions of referents are given in subscript and elements in the framing clause are underlined.\(^{24}\)

\[(136)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framed clause} \quad \text{-ma-} \quad [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framing clause} \\
\text{b. } & [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framed clause} \quad \text{-ma-} + O_{\text{RepAddr}} \quad [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framing clause} \rightarrow \text{SPEECH} \\
\text{c. } & [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framed clause} \quad \text{-ma-} \quad [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framing clause} \rightarrow \text{THOUGHT} \\
\text{d. } & [ \ldots S_i + \text{FUT} ] \quad \text{framed clause} \quad S_i \quad \text{-ma-} \quad [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framing clause} \rightarrow \text{INTENTION} \\
\text{e. } & [ \ldots S_j + \text{FUT} ] \quad \text{framed clause} \quad S_i \quad \text{-ma-} + O_j \quad [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framing clause} \rightarrow \text{CAUSATION} \\
\text{f. } & [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framed clause} \quad \text{-ma-} + O_{\text{ONamed}} \quad [ \ldots ] \quad \text{framing clause} \rightarrow \text{NAMING}
\end{align*}

The schematic representations in (136) involve a certain degree of iconicity: reported speech presupposes both someone who tells the reported message, i.e. a reported speaker and someone to whom the content of the message was told in the reported speech event, a reported addressee (RepAddr) and these are both represented in (136b). Reported thought, on the other hand, is an internal process, involving one single cognisant and this is reflected by the absence of an addressee in (136c). The semantics of ‘wanting’, as expressed in reported intentionality presupposes an unrealised, future event, which is reflected by the future tense forms in the framed clauses (136d) and (136e). The subtype of intention-causation necessarily involves multiple (or reflexive) referents (see Rumsey, 1982: 164-165) and this may explain the indirect object suffix in (136e). Naming has to involve some object named (ONamed), which is explicitly referred to in (136f).

\(^{24}\)Note that future tense in the schematic representation of reported intentionality in (136d) may be replaced by optative mode or irrealis. Because reported intention-causation is closely related to reported intentionality this probably also applies to (136e), but I have not found examples of reported causation with framed optative or irrealis moods.
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However, the interpretation of a framing construction remains a dynamic process; individual structural properties within the framing construction can never fully disambiguate its function and the precise semantic distinction often remains implicit. In the analysis of Rumsey (1990), the persistence of this ambiguity in Ungarinyin is taken to be consonant with a linguistic ideology in which making a sharp distinction between treating language as belonging to the external world and to the mind is not particularly valued.

3.4. Conclusion

This chapter began by introducing the notion of framing in the grammatical sense of Rumsey (1982) and McGregor (1994) and sketched a typological context against which to interpret the Ungarinyin data. It was indicated that the functional range of Ungarinyin framing constructions is not exceptional among languages in Australia and elsewhere but also that the Ungarinyin framing construction stands out with respect to its formal regularity and semantic coherence, exclusively relating to speech, thought and intention attribution. Subsequently, the form and functions of Ungarinyin framing constructions were introduced, and the semantic, morphological and syntactic features contributing to disambiguating these functions were demonstrated.

One syntactic aspect that was identified concerned the integrity of the framed clause and the degree of integration within framing constructions. This is an aspect that I will examine in more detail over the course of the next chapters, since it relates to how framing constructions contribute to the encoding of perspective.

Since this chapter has shown that framing constructions by themselves are often semantically underspecified, it is important to examine them in context. Before doing that, however, I will in chapter 4 begin this exploration by considering other elements in Ungarinyin that may contribute to the expression of reported speech and ask what happens when framing constructions are not used to express the meanings indicated here, viz. reported speech, thought and intentionality.
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‘5.634 [...] Alles, was wir überhaupt beschreiben können, könnte auch anders sein’
— Wittgenstein (1922)

4.1. Introduction

The syntactic framing relation, of which framing constructions are the conventionalised expression, consists of two components: on the one hand it delineates a framed element from the surrounding discourse, separating a discourse fragment attributed to some reported speaker/cognisant from non-attributed discourse, and on the other hand it specifies how the framed element should be viewed (McGregor, 1994; 1997).

These functions are not dissimilar to those Besnier (1993) describes in a seminal account of reported speech in the Tuvaluan dialect Nukulaelae. Example (137) shows a simple direct speech construction in the language.

(137)  *Muna mai a Ioane ‘au kaa fano maataeao’*
  word  Dxs of Ioane  I  Irr  go  tomorrow
  ‘Ioane said to me, “I am leaving tomorrow” ’ (Besnier, 1993: 168)\(^1\)

Elements within the framing construction can be divided into two types of meaning, Besnier (1993) states, a referential meaning and an ‘affective meaning’. The table reproduced as table 4.1 below lists several grammatical elements in Nukulaelae reported speech according to their referential and affective functions. It demonstrates how referential and affective elements in the framing construction relate to the central framing functions of boundary marking and presentation of the framed utterance.

Without discussing the specific details of the Nukulaelae constructions referred to in table 4.1, the interesting analysis Besnier (1993) puts forward is that in an utterance of reported speech, specific elements deal with how the framed utterance is presented and related to the perspective of the speaker (e.g. focus of empathy) and others serve to indicate the distinction between the reported utterance and the surrounding non-attributed discourse (e.g. boundary

---

\(^1\)Glosses as in the source, except for interpunction. The gloss ‘Dxs’ stands for ‘deictic adverb’.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framing device</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Referential function</th>
<th>Affective function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quoting strategy</td>
<td>direct, indirect</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>socially acceptable reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech-act expression</td>
<td>muna ‘word’,</td>
<td>boundary marking</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fai ‘say’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense and mood</td>
<td>e ‘present’,</td>
<td>shift in point of reference</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kaa ‘irrealis’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deictic adverb</td>
<td>mai ‘hither’,</td>
<td>direction of action</td>
<td>focus of empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>atu ‘thither’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosodies</td>
<td>intonation, pitch</td>
<td>boundary marking</td>
<td>presentation of quoted speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporting style</td>
<td>lengthy/planned,</td>
<td>description of quoted turn</td>
<td>presentation of quoted speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brief/unplanned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1.: Structure and function in Nukulaelae reported speech (Besnier, 1993: 176)

marking, referring to elements in the reported speech event). According to this proposal the framing relation can be signalled through a variety of structural means. McGregor (1997: 257) explicitly suggests this possibility, stating that while a framing construction is the primary grammatical structure through which framing relations are expressed, ‘there are other ways of achieving the same end’:

‘A written quote may be framed by quotation marks; a spoken by gestured quotation marks (particularly in academic discourse). Some languages employ quotative particles or enclitics [...] Another, rather different, way of indicating the status of an utterance as a report is to utter it with a special voice quality, and with a distinctive intonation pattern’ (McGregor, 1997: 257).

In this chapter I will investigate the elements in Ungarinyin that contribute to the interpretation of reported speech, thought and intentionality other than framing constructions. As a playful variation on the notion of insubordination (Evans, 2007) I will label instances in which a meaning normally expressed by a framing construction is expressed without the use of a framing construction as in chapter 3 examples of ‘defenestration’. Defenestrated clauses have a similar meaning to framed clauses of reported speech, thought or intentionality, i.e. to ‘regular’ framed clauses. The only difference between a defenestrated clause and a framed clause is that the former lacks the main dedicated syntactic device in Ungarinyin to signal that it expresses a framing relation: a framing clause. Defenestration means no more or less than expressing the meaning of a framing construction without a conventionalised framing clause as introduced in chapter 3. As a first example consider (138).
The clause *anjaku murlnbun kujilenyina* ‘why are you arguing with each other?’ in (138) expresses reported speech, but unlike in a framing construction it is not followed by a framing clause. It is preceded by the clause *balya bungoni* ‘I went to them’, which refers to the current speech event of the narrative and introduces the reported speaker to whom the reported speech clause following it has to be attributed. Instead of a framing clause, the speaker inserts a pause after the reported message and, like an afterthought, adds the single pronoun *ngen* ‘I’, clarifying the identity of the reported speaker.\(^2\)

The single set of square brackets in (138) signal that the defenestrated clause is functionally similar to a framed clause in a framing construction, but the framing clause to complete this framing construction is absent. Instead, the defenestrated clause in (138) is introduced by the clause *balya bungoni* ‘I went to them’, which is an example of what Verstraete (2011: 498) calls a ‘perspectivising clause’. Perspectivising clauses ‘are different from typical framing clauses […] in that they are not explicitly metalinguistic but simply describe a non-linguistic event in the narrative’, yet, ‘they put a specific participant into perspective and thus anticipate a shift to their speech or thought’ (Verstraete, 2011: 498–499). Perspectivising clauses are one type of defenestration-introducing elements, and I will examine similar multi-clausal strategies that present an alternative to framing constructions in section 4.2.

But following the approach in Besnier (1993) I will not confine the framing interpretation of (138) to elements preceding (or following) defenestrated clauses. Apart from the perspectivising clause, (138) contains a second property that conspires with the perspectivising clause to signal the defenestration interpretation: the shift in illocution from declarative to interrogative, with the associated intonation pattern. This shift achieves two goals, first, it creates a contrast between the defenestrated clause and the preceding one, signalling a framing boundary and second, it addresses a question to the reported addressee, which indexes the perspective of the reported speech event. I will discuss this point in detail in section 4.3, introducing the perspective categories involved in establishing similar indexical meanings, which all belong

\(^2\)Rumsey (2010b: 1662) cites a very similar strategy in Bunuba.
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to a grammatical domain I will call the stance domain. Section 4.4 demonstrates the relevance of the defenestration-introducing perspectivising clauses and stance constructions for the expression of reported speech, thought and intentionality in a perspective-rich Ungarinyin narrative text, comparing regular framing constructions and defenestrated clauses. Section 4.5, finally, presents a brief discussion and summary of the meaning of the framing signalling devices discussed in this chapter in contrast to conventionalised framing constructions.

Throughout the chapter it has to be kept in mind that defenestration, despite its regularities, is a relatively peripheral way of expressing reported speech, thought or intentionality in Ungarinyin. Table 4.2 lists the number of framing constructions in two sessions of the Family Problems picture task (see see section 1.2.2/appendix L). The column ‘# IUs’ shows the number of intonation units in the transcription, the column ‘framed RST’ lists the number of framing constructions representing reported speech and thought, ‘framed RI’ those representing reported intentionality and ‘defenestrated’ shows the number of unframed attributed clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILE NAME</th>
<th># IUs</th>
<th>Framed RST</th>
<th>Framed RI</th>
<th>Defenestrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>090812JENGPD</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>8 (67 %)</td>
<td>2 (17 %)</td>
<td>2 (17 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090813AJMJSMPD</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>32 (71 %)</td>
<td>9 (20 %)</td>
<td>4 (9 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Framing constructions in two sessions of the Family Problems picture task

According to table 4.2, only 6 intonation units show defenestration against 51 framing constructions. By comparing framing constructions to defenestrated clauses, however, this chapter digs deeper into the functionality of framing constructions by suggesting some things defenestrated clauses can do framing clauses cannot, examine where their functions can be supplemented by other means and finding environments and meanings for which defenestration fails, i.e. contexts in which framing constructions are essential.

4.2. Defenestration contexts

In this brief section I will first consider the main types of framing-introducing clauses (section 4.2.1). Section 4.2.2 subsequently discusses how these clauses may occasionally result in constructions resembling indirect speech.

---

3 From the counts in file 090813AJMJSMPD 13 (potential) framing constructions, whose exact interpretation was in doubt have been excluded.

4 Instances in which discourse participants supplemented a framed clause in the utterance of another speaker with a framing clause, which occurred several times in recording 090813AJMJSMPD (see section 4.3.1) were also counted as canonical framing constructions.
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4.2.1. Framing-introducing clauses

The Bowerbird story, a narrative told by Pansy Nulgit, and transcribed in appendix C, starts with the lines shown as (139) below:

(139) a. *nyina nyalwangarri buluba nyangka* (.11)
   *nyinda ny-alwa-ngarri buluk-w1a nyaq-a-ngka*
f.PROX fsg-old-NMLZ look.around-ITRV 3fsg-GO-PST
   'This old woman was looking around'

b. *manjarn nyangki rimij wudmanira kanda narnburr* (.16)
   *manjarn nyangki rimij wurr-ma-ni-ra kanda narnburr*
stone who steal 3n$_w$.O:3pl.S-TAKE-PST-1sg.IO n$_m$.PROX paperbark
   'Who stole my coins and banknotes?'

c. *nyingankarra rimij wunjumanira* (.14)
   *nyingan=karra rimij wunjaj2-ma-ni-ra*
2sg=MAYBE steal 3n$_w$.O:2sg.S-TAKE-PST-1sg.IO
   'Maybe you’re the one stealing my things'

d. *anjaku rimij nginkenungarri ngin maji buluk ba anju-ku rimij ngin-w2$_2$-y2$_2$-i-ø-nu-ngarri ngin maji buluk ba$_2$-a*
   what-DAT steal 1sg.S-IRR-BE-PRS-2sg.IO-SUB 1sg MUST look.around IMP-GO
   *wura jadarn* (.21)
   *wura jadarn*
sideways properly
   'Why would I steal from you? Why would I rob you? You should look around properly'

e. *bidningengkerri* (.08)
   *birr-ninga-yi-ngko$_2$-yirri*
3pl-put-REFL-PST-CONT
   'they said to each other'

Example (139) uses the framing verb -(i)ninga- ‘put, say’ in line (139e), ‘say to each other’ (see page 89), which frames the entire dialogue (139b-139d). But how is the current addressee to know in line (139b) whose perspective it represents? The only lexical clue given to the addressee is the perspectivising clause in (139a) introducing the referent *nyina nyalwangarri* ‘this old woman’ looking around.

Although the clauses in (139a) and (139b) appear syntactically independent, the prosody of the first clause suggests that this may not entirely be the case, cf. figure 4.1. As earlier, the
pitch range in this figure is indicated in Hz along the y-axis and the length of the the y-axis equals a scale between 50 and 100 dB.\textsuperscript{5}

The vertical fine line through the middle of figure 4.1 represents the boundary between (139a) and (139b), and as the intensity contours show, there is no vocalisation between the two utterances. However, the pitch contour in (139a) displays a rise throughout the utterance in anticipation of the HL pattern in the framed clause in (139b).\textsuperscript{6}

There are two reasons to expect that the purpose of these perspectivising clauses is slightly different from the function of a framing clause. First, if both elements were functionally equivalent, the reported dialogue in (139) would be framed by two different elements, i.e. the perspectivising clause and the framing clause. Second, Ungarinyin framing clauses do not normally occur in initial position. I would suggest that the function of the perspectivising clause is similar to that of other elements regularly occurring right before a framing construction specifying aspects of the reported speech event, such as the reported speaker, cf. (140).

(140) \begin{verbatim}
yirranangka jinda (.06) [[ balu amanangka walawi ]
yirranangka jinda [[ bɔ₂-a=lu a₁-ma-o-nangka walawi ]
father 3m.PROX [[ IMP-go=PROX 3msg.S-do-PRS-3sg.IO son ]
\end{verbatim}

‘This father, he says “Come” to his son’ (090812JENGPDi, 1:42-145)

The construction yirranangka jinda ‘this father’ in (140) specifies the subject referent of the framing clause amanangka walawi ‘he says to his son’ in pre-framing construction position. As indicated in section 2.4.1, Ungarinyin rarely expresses both the subject and (indirect) object referents of a predicate as lexical constructions (cf. Du Bois, 1987, also see chapter 5), which means that speakers would avoid expressing both the reported speaker and the reported addressee lexically in the same framing clause. Example (140) demonstrates that in this case the position immediately preceding the framed clause can be used to specify referential properties of the framing clause. I propose, then, that the function of a perspectivising clause is exactly that: to specify additional elements of the reported speech event and the necessity to do this is higher in the case of defenestration, i.e. when the framing clause is omitted.

Since the framing clause does not normally include verbal constructions other than the framing verb, the principle that the position immediately preceding the framing construction

\textsuperscript{5}Figure 4.1 has been slightly redacted in order to eliminate some interference effects due to background noise.

\textsuperscript{6}Note that in figure 4.1 there is also a striking increase in intensity from about 30 dB for (139a) to about 50 dB in (139b), which adds to the prominence of the framed clause.
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Figure 4.1.: The intonation (speckled) and intensity (solid line) contours of lines (139a – 139b).

Figure 4.2.: The intonation contour of line (138)/(18) on page 276.
specifies referential and lexical properties of the reported speech event extends to verbal constructions as well. For example, in (141), representing line 32 in the dialogue on page 306 in appendix F, the construction *nyindiyali ke onerri* ‘she calls out to him’ lexically specifies the manner of speech in the reported speech event.

(141) *nyindiyali* | *ke* | *onerri*  
*nyindi-y* | *ke* | *a_1-w_1 u-ni-yirri*  

f.AMBIPH-Indeed call 3msg.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PST-CONT 1sg-arm be.too.short  

*mumennyirri* | *winjangun bay winjora*  

3n_m=DO-REFL-PRS-CONT fire turn 3n_w.O:2sg.S-ACT.ON-IMP-1sg.IO  

*bunda* | *bunguluwannyirri* | *baba* | *biyerringarri*  
*bunda* | *bunga_1-uluwa-n-nyirri* | *ba-ba* | *ba_2-iy-y_2-i-yirri-ngarri*  

pl.AMBIPH 3pl.O:1sg.S-be.afraid-PRS-DU arrive-REDUP 3pl-FUT-BE-CONT-SUB  

*dubala nyumanangka* | *walambayali jinda*  
*dubala nyoa-ma-o-nangka* | *walamba-y_3ali jinda*  

red 3fsg.S-do-PRS-3sg.IO plain.kangaroo-Indeed m.PROX  

‘She’s the one who calls out to him: “My two arms are too short, you twirl the fire for me. I am afraid of those two, when they are red,” she said to the plain kangaroo’ (= lines 81-82 on pages 320–321)

The specification of the reported speech event as an event involving ‘calling’/‘shouting’ in (141) implies a reported speech situation, which reduces the necessity for a full-fledged framing construction. This may explain the absence of a framing clause following *ngiyanamala burruba mumennyirri winjangun bay winjora* ‘my two arms are short, twirl the fire for me’ and the relatively long pause, but the construction- final framing clause *nyumanangka walambayali jinda* ‘she said to the plain kangaroo’ lexically specifies the reported addressee of the entire reported speech event, thereby framing all three grammatical clauses as a framed clause. The initial clause specifying the reported speech event creates a contextual environment in which defenestration is allowed to occur, as (142) illustrates.

(142) *nyinda wurla on* | *yirrkalngarri balya bumalu*  
*nyinda* | *wurla a_1-w_1 u-n* | *yirrkalngarri balya ba_2-ma=lu*  

f.PROX talk 3msg.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PRS policeman go IMP-DO=PROX  

‘She tells the policeman to come’ (= line 32 in appendix E)

The fact that the inflecting verb in the complex verb construction *balya bumalu* ‘come’ in (142) is homonymous with the framing verb -ma- ‘say, do’ may contribute to the acceptability of defenestration in this example as well.
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Apart from general speech verbs, an illocutionary verb such as ngayak ‘ask’ may also be used in framing-introducing position as the example with a framing construction in (143a) and the defenestrated construction in (143b) illustrate.

(143) a. ngayak bumara nyingalngun wirriya buma ngayak bo2-ma-ra nyinga-lngun w-irriya bo2-ma ask IMP-do-1sg.O 2sg-name n_w-IGN IMP-do

‘Ask me what my name is’ [lit.: ‘Ask me, say: “What is your name?”’] (100721-01NGUS, 23:10-23:12)

b. dubulangarri buk biyengkangarri (.18) ngayak nyumarni dubulangarri buk birr-a-ngkə2-ngarri ngayak nya2-ma-rni\(^7\) red come.out 3pl-GO-PST-SUB ask 3fsg-TAKE-PST

nyangkiku jinda (.06) yila nyangki-ku jinda yila who-DAT m.PROX child

‘When the white [child] was born, he asked her ‘Whose child is that?’’

All Ungarinyin speech act verbs, of which table 4.3 lists a sample based on Coate and Elkin (1974), may potentially take the framing-introducing position. A fuller description of each verb is given in the lexicon of language terms in appendix I.

Apart from speech verbs, cognitive verbs can be used in framing introducing clauses, cf. (144) (also cf. 2 on page 1) as well as perception verbs, as in the example with a framing construction in (145a) and the defenestrated example in (145b).

(144) bandu buna wurrngijanyirri. \(^{“anjaku dambun ruluk bandu buna wurr-ngi-janyirri anja-ku dambun ruluk} \)

3pl.AMBIPH 3pl.PROX 3n_w.O:3pl.S-wonder-PRS-CONT what-DAT camp shift


‘They are wondering about it. “Why does he shift his camp to one side?” those people said’ (Coate, 1966: 110, lines 119–120)

\(^7\)This is the only tense morpheme in my corpus that does not correspond to the description in Rumsey (1982). It is only found with transitive -ma- ‘take’ and I have interpreted it as an idiosyncratic innovation by the speaker.
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Table 4.3.: Some speech act and manner of speech terms from Coate and Elkin (1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>ENTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>advise, warn counsel</td>
<td>bariljani, burwingga, -eriya, woj, wulaawiri, wunumin-darajali, wure, wurwalunjiri, jowalul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argue, discuss, protest</td>
<td>-awal-, bayawayudngari, bengawenjal, bill, buralwal, daŋgan, daŋan, daru, dilaj, don, ilad, ilarr, ilug, -iren-, yun, -unaŋaja-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask, question, doubt</td>
<td>barwidj, burgaŋdj, uler, injawan, -ijani-, galagadad, galiwad, ledga, lida, -naŋyunadjayunadja-, yunad, -yunadjayuna-, yunajad, -yuniŋjilunjiri-, -yuniŋudja-, -njawa-, njambalunjebada, njandja, -uyunudja-, wegarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curse, swear</td>
<td>balgure, irijami, -iŋa-, -djan-, djardi, djirimbj, djogga, lalamba, wuramondja, jamuwa, -jana-, julugba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defend</td>
<td>amalamala, bijuba, -malumalunji-, umalamalawi, wulawu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farewell</td>
<td>-anawadje, -anawe-, anawendjuwi, barriwin, doru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praise, hail, pride</td>
<td>baledj, bali, bow, idjodo:dani, ija, -ododa-, -olbaru, wod-jolbani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promise</td>
<td>-anawa-, anawajin, -anawaye, dowayan, jowayen, jowe, waye, yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(145)  

a. liny liny anyijilan anjamangarn ngunngurli
   liny liny anyi-y ila-n anjamangarn ngun-ngurli-ŋ


amangarri karnangkurr
a₁-ma-ŋ-ngarri karnangkurr
3msg-do-PRS-SUB dog

‘The dog looks intently at you, while it thinks: “When will you give me something?” ’ (= lines 16 and 17 on pages 353–354)

b. di mara andon a diyali buŋma
   di mara anday-w₁ u-n a di-y₂.ali buŋ₂-ma

nᵢw-ANAPH see 3pl.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PRS ah nᵢw-ANAPH-INDEED IMP-do

‘And then he sees them. “Ah, that’s how you should do it” ’ (Coate, 1966: 110, line 112)

4.2.2. From framing-introducing clauses to indirect speech

The clauses following the framing-introducing clauses in the previous section, both framed clauses and defenestrated ones all patterned as direct speech, i.e. referring as in the reported
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speech event. In a small number of cases, however, they do not. Consider, for example, (146).

(146) a. ngayak admanga kunya mok nyinyingarri
    ngayak arr-ma-nga kunya mok nya2-y2i-nyi-ngarri
    ‘We asked him where he had hid her’ (110925-04NGUN, 9:12-9:15)

b. wali wa barra ngunkumerdju juwibarn rimij
    wali wa barra ngun-w2a2-ma-y1i-rndu juwibarn rimij
    moment NEG story.telling 1sg-IRR-DO-PST-3pl.IO bowerbird steal
    amarangarri
    a1-ma-ra-ngarri
    3msg-DO-PST-SUB
    ‘I did not tell them yet that the bowerbird had been stealing’ (= line (27) on page 277)

Example (146a) consists of a finite and a defenestrated subordinate clause describing the content of the question asked in the reported speech event. This subordinate clause, however, does not refer as in the reported speech event (i.e. with a second person subject) but with a third person subject, referring from the current speech event. Example (146b) equally consists of a finite clause describing a reported speech event and a subordinate clause. If the subordinate clause is interpreted as the content of the reported speech event the pronouns pattern as indirect speech and in fact the translation of (146b) given by the speaker was: ‘I never tell them juwibarn bin robim’. It is however possible for both examples in (146) to be interpreted as regular finite-cum-subordinate clause constructions, i.e. ‘They asked him when he had hidden her’ and ‘I did not tell (it) to them yet when he was stealing’.

This interpretation is not available in (147).

(147) ngayak admara kunya waj nyebini
    ngayak arr-ma-ra kunya waj nya2-y1 ibu-ni
    ‘They asked him where he buried her’ (110925-06NGUN, 6:32-6:35)

Example (147) contains two clausal units, a clause describing a reported speech event and one describing the content of the reported speech event. The second clause appears to function as a defenestrated clause but refers as in the current speech event (third person instead of second person subject in the reported speech event). As figure 4.3 demonstrates, the intonation of the two clauses in (147) also differs considerably from the constructions with the framing-introducing clauses in figures 4.1 and 4.2.

8In this translation ‘never’ is the general Aboriginal English marker of negation (‘did not’).
The examples in (148) show that the clause describing the ‘asking event’ (here with the synonymous coverbs *burrkaj* and *ngayak* ‘ask’), which is in initial position in (147), may also follow the defenestrated clause.

(148) a. *yala wijika jan-mi:imbu barnmarn nyangan-nangka=wula, burrkaj ijebunngarri irr-yi ibu-n-ngarri*  
   1sg.O:2sg.S-show-FUT magician 2sg-GEN=PROX ask  
   3msg.O:3pl.S-PUT-PRS-SUB

‘Friend, will you show us how you became a magician, when they ask him’ (Coate, 1966: 112, lines 161-162)

b. *Describing the court scene from the Family problems picture task*

   *bunda diyu ngurrbakarra nyumindani kundi*  
   *bunda di-yu ngurr-ba=karra nyu2-minda-ni kundi*  
   3pl.PROX *n_w-.ANAPH-LAT hit-ITRV=maybe 3fsg.O:3sg.S-TAKE-PST husband*

   *jina andu jina malngarri ngayak nyilan*  
   *jina andu jina malngarri ngayak nyu2-y1 ila-n*  
   m.PROX m.AMBIPH m.PROX white.person ask 3fsg.O:3sg.S-TAKE-PRS

‘And then these here. “Did this husband maybe hit her?” this white man here
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asks her’ (090813AJMJSMPDm, 01:07-01:16)

Coate (1966: 100) translate the first clause in (148a) as an unframed reported message clause (note the direct speech patterning): ‘“Friend, could you show me your professional position?” That is how they ask him’, but the function of the subordinate clause *burrkaj ijobunngarri* ‘they ask him’ seems close to that of a framing verb. In (148b) the asking event is expressed with a finite clause following a clause describing the content of the question with pronouns referring in the current speech. The example describes a situation from the Family problem picture task in which a woman testifies in court after having been beaten by her husband and she is the only woman depicted, strongly suggesting that the objects of *ngayak nyilan* ‘he asks her’ and *ngurrbakarra nyumindani* ‘maybe he hit her’ are coreferential. Also note the initial element *bunda digu* ‘and then these here’, which resembles a framing-introducing construction.

Example (148b) suggests a connection between defenestrated clauses and indirect speech in Ungarinyin. But (148b) is only a singular example in my corpus: there is no productive, structural opposition in Ungarinyin between ‘direct speech’ framing constructions and indirect constructions as in (148b).

Nevertheless, (148b) draws attention to the possibility of representing the mind of another speaker or cognisant not as a ‘re-enactment’ but as a description (i.e. the property that distinguishes direct speech from indirect speech in terms of Wierzbicka, 1974). In utterances of reported speech this strategy is exceedingly rare, but it appears to be slightly more acceptable in representing thinking events, as in (149).

(149) a. *jinda ni ni e ngurrba nyumindannngarri*

*m.PROX think 3msg-be-PRS hit-ITRV 3fsg.O:3sg-take-PRS-SUB*

*jinda jinda*

m.PROX

‘He is thinking [about the moment] when he hits her’ (090813AJMJSMPDe, 6:22-6:24)9

b. *ninikarra e kunyakarra emerri*

*ni-ni=karra a1-y1-i-Ø kunya=karra a1-ma-i-yirri*

think-REDUP=maybe 3msg-be-PRS where=maybe 3msg-do-PRS-CONT

‘He might be thinking about what he can do’ (090813AJMJSMPD, 0:22-0:23)

In (149a) the clause representing the reported thought is subordinated to the clause describing the thinking event and refers from the perspective of the current speaker, i.e. in the

9The inflecting verb *e ‘he is’* in the first clause is inaudible on the recording but was added in consultation with Pansy Nulgut during the transcription.
current speech event. Example (149b) consists of two independent clauses with the first one representing the thinking event and the second one the content of the thinking event, again referring to the participants in the reported thought from the current speech event.

In my interpretation, constructions as in (149) have less to do with framing constructions and defenestration than with another type of mind-representing expression that always refers to its participants as in the current speech event. These are constructions of ‘knowing’, with the coverb *layburru* ‘to know’. The examples in (150) illustrate *layburru* ‘know’ in a finite clause preceding a clause representing the knowledge (150a), in a clause following the what-is-known clause (150b) and with the object (not) known expressed as a subordinate clause (150c).

(150) a. *andu* *di:nqa* *laybirru i-yirri* *marrorrorro*
   *andu* *di-nqa* *laybirru a₁-y₂-i-yirri* *marrorrorro*
   m.PROX n Prox-Anaph-only know 3msg-BE-PRS-CONT expert
   *i* *ari* *jirri*
   a₁-y₂-i-ø *ari* *jirri*
   3msg-Be-PRS man m Anaph

‘That was the moment he understands that he is an expert’ (Coate, 1966: 108, line 75)

b. *wa* *layburru ngarrke* *kungarra bidinganyirri*
   *wa* *layburru ngarrka₂-y₂-i-ø* *kungarra birr-inga-nyirri*
   NEG know 1pl.EXC-Be-PRS what 3pl-put-DU

‘We don’t know what they are talking about to each other’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 1:30-1:33)

c. *anja* *minjarl andonngarri* *wa* *laybirru*
   *anja* *minjarl ando₂-w₁-u-n-ngarri* *wa* *laybirru*
   what eat 3pl.O:3msg.S-Act.on-PRS-Sub NEG know
   *ngarrke*
   *ngarr-w₂-o₂-y₂-i-ø*
   1pl.Inc-Irr-Be-PRS

‘We don’t know what he eats’ (Capell, 1972a: 102)

The knowing constructions in (150) represent instances in which the knowledge described is just as much situated in the mind of the speaker as in that of the discourse referent who is indicated as possessing this knowledge (i.e. they are factive constructions in the sense of Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970). No reported speech event is invoked in this case: the ‘what-is-known clause’ refers in the current speech event. The constructions in (146-149) balance between framing and a more descriptive way of representing a mind as in (150).
I will not discuss indirect speech patterning in Ungarinyin further, simply because it does not play a systematic role in the expression of reported speech, thought and intentionality in the language. But these sections have highlighted several points that are central to understanding defenestration and variability in the expression of attribution meanings. First, despite the regularity and polysemy of framing constructions as laid out in chapter 3 considerable variation exists in the structural representation of reported speech, thought and intentionality. Second, the sources of this variation can be traced to constructional oppositions within the language and contextual elements, with varying degrees of conventionalisation and grammaticality. Third, identifying referents as participants in the reported speech event is fundamental to interpreting defenestration.

In this section, the identification of participants in the reported speech event was illustrated on the basis of defenestration introducing clauses. However, more subtle ways exist for identifying the perspective in which a defenestrated clause is grounded. These constructions belong to the class of stance constructions, and they will form the topic of the remainder of this chapter.

4.3. An overview of perspective-indexing categories: stance in Ungarinyin

Stance is a broad semantic category of constructions dealing with how speakers evaluate, relate to and reach agreement and understanding about a discourse topic (cf. Du Bois, 2007). Stance constructions and strategies inevitably involve a notion of perspective, which I understand as a combination of an indexical relation between a discourse object (anything that can be talked about) and the mind of a discourse participant (present or non-present, real or imagined) and a qualification of this relation. Following this definition in this section I will exemplify Ungarinyin stance constructions from a discourse level down to the level of inflectional morphology.

Section 4.3.1 starts with the introduction of intersubjective alignment, a pattern in conversation and a class of constructions with which discourse participants signal (dis)agreement and mutual understanding of a discourse topic. Section 4.3.2 treats illocution, viz. declarative, interrogative and imperative sentence types and section 4.3.3 narrows down on a clausal and sub-clausal level discussing constructions which allow speakers to formulate positive or negative assessments of discourse objects: evaluative constructions. Section 4.3.4 presents an inventory of interjections and the final section addresses modality, more particularly the irrealis and mood particle constructions, which are combinations of an inflectional mood and a preverbal particle (section 4.3.5).

All of these stance constructions share the property that they can only be understood if the hearer/addressee knows in whose perspective the construction is grounded, i.e. if he is able to identify the discourse participant indexed by the construction, which is vital to understanding
their role in the expression of reported speech and thought. Before demonstrating this in section 4.4, however, I will first introduce each of the main Ungarinyin stance constructions in the context of regular, non-attributed speech.

### 4.3.1. Intersubjective alignment

Du Bois (2007: 144) defines intersubjective alignment as ‘the act of calibrating the relationship between two stances, and by implication between two stancetakers’. Intersubjective alignment is a pervasive strategy in dialogue to contrast and reconcile perspectives and involves a range of constructions and strategies, mostly signalling degrees of agreement, disagreement or solicitation thereof.

The simplest and most common way to express agreement alignment in Ungarinyin is shown in (151). It is a passage from the Family Problems picture task, in which the participants constantly express evaluations of each other’s judgements about what the picture under discussion describes. In (151) Jilgi Edwards indicates that she agrees with Pansy Nulgit’s description of the events depicted in the images.

(151) NG: `diyali wungay burr ininga`<br>`di-yali wungay burr a1-ninga`<br>`n_w.ANAPH-indeed woman lock.up 3msg.O:3sg.S-put`<br>

JE: `yow`<br>`yow`<br>`yes`<br>`‘The woman locks him up’`<br>`‘Yeah’ (090812JENGPDi, 7:51-7:53)`

In the animated passage in (152) from another version of the Family Problems picture task, Scotty Martin illustrates two alternatives to yow ‘yeah’, viz. the repeated affirmative marker yardunga ‘that’s right’ and a minimal response transcribed as hm at the beginning of the last line in (152).

---

10 Du Bois (2007) uses the single term ‘alignment’, but I will adopt the label ‘intersubjective alignment’ here in order to avoid confusion with the notion of semantic alignment (i.e. linking semantic roles to nominal constituents/verbal arguments), which interpretation is currently more common in grammatical analysis.

11 The word yardu ‘right’ in construction yardunga ‘exactly right’ also without the emphatic marker (e.g. in line 199 on page 336). The dictionary Coate and Elkin (1974) does not list either of these entries, however, so the words are not counted among the alignment interjections in table 4.5.
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(152) AJ: *kanda burrkaj janjilanngarri*

   *kanda burrkaj jan-yila-n-ngarri*

   n_w.PROX ask 1sg.O:2sg.S-HOLD-PRS-SUB

SM: *yardunga*

   *yardunga*

   exactly.right

AJ: *amanangka, yuno*

   *a1-ma-nangka yuno*

   3msg.S-do-3sg.IO you.know

SM: *hn yardunga*

   *hn yardunga*

   uhm exactly.right

AJ: ‘Here you’re asking me...’

SM: ‘That’s right’

AJ: ‘...he said to her, you know

SM: ‘Hm, that’s right’ (090813AJMJSMPDd, 12:54-13:00)

In the third line Alec Jilbidij code-switches to Aboriginal English displaying another alignment strategy *yuno* ‘you know’, for which Ungarinyin has the alternative *jangku* ‘you know’ as can be seen in the overview of interjections in the appendix B starting on page 267.

The most typical strategy for signalling negative intersubjective alignment or disagreement in Ungarinyin involves the dedicated negative alignment marker *aka* ‘not so’. This interjection signals a negation of an expectation the speaker assumes the addressee has or a direct contradiction of a previous statement. Functionally, *aka* ‘not so’ is close to constructions like French *mais non* or Russian *da net*, and the polar opposite of French *si* or German *doch*. The marker *aka* ‘not so’ (and negative intersubjective alignment in Ungarinyin more generally) is often found in responses to questions. One example is (153), taken from the dialogue transcribed in full in appendix F.

(153) A: *wanjinaka wembarr woni*

   *wanjina=ka wembarr w02-w1u-ni*

   Wanjina=Q break 3n_w.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PST

B: *aka, warrmuna*

   *aka warrmuna*

   NOT_SO possum

   ‘Did the Wanjina break [the bushes]?’

   ‘No (way), the possum’ (= lines (16) and (17) on page 311)
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By suggesting a referent who might have broken the bushes, namely the Wanjina, the speaker A has set up a presupposition that the Wanjina was involved in the event and the denial of this presupposition motivates the use of *aka* ‘not so’ by speaker B. The property ‘contrary to expectation’ distinguishes *aka* ‘not so’ from another negative interjection *burray* ‘no’. Example (154), again from the Family Problems picture task, illustrates the contrast between the negated presupposition in (153) and the ‘accepted presupposition’ here.

(154) NG: *wa* *warda* *wanyirrko*  
*wa* *warda* *wanyirr*-w₂a₂-w₁u  
NEG like 3n₁w₁.O:1pl.EXC.S-IRR-ACT.ON hit  
*nyijilanngarri*  
*ngurr* *wungay* *warda* *wunjon*  
*ngurrbangarri?*  
*ngurr*-ba-ngarri?  
hit-ITRV-SUB  
JE: *wije*  
*wije* different  
NG: *burray*  
*burray* NEG  
JE: *burray*  
*burray* NEG  
‘We don’t like it when they hit her. Do you like hitting?’  
‘Absolutely not’  
‘No’  
‘No’ (090812JENGPDi, 2:06-2:14)

In (154) Pansy Nulgit explicitly states the expectation that she and her interlocutor Jilgi Edwards agree about the topic of discussion, but still asks her if this is indeed the case. With *wije* ‘different’, interpreted here as a strong negation ‘absolutely not’, Jilgi Edwards indicates that she certainly does not approve of the event described in the question. Both interlocutors subsequently confirm this negative stance with *burray* ‘no’. In this context *aka* ‘not so’ cannot

---

12The Wanjina is the creator-ancestor being at the centre of Ungarinyin cosmology and the main character in creation (dreamtime) stories (see Rumsey and Redmond, 1999).
be used. Signalling agreement with a negative utterance may also be done with *yow* ‘yes’, the last turn of Nugget Gudud in (155) demonstrates.

(155) PN: *karrabirri mindi way irrkungurli mindimu karrabirri mindi way irr-wa2-ngurlu mindi-mu boomerang nₘ.ANAPH NEG 3msg.O:3pl.S-IRR-give nₘ.ANAPH-DEF*

JE: *malyan m-alyan nₘ-nothing*

NK: *yow yow yeah*

‘They didn’t give him this boomerang’
‘None’
‘Yeah’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 14:42-14:44)

Pansy Nulgit’s speech act of asking for agreement about a judgement in (154) demonstrates the central role intersubjective alignment plays in conversation: if an addressee does not offer signals of intersubjective alignment the speaker may actively seek agreement in order to ensure all speech participants share a perspective and evaluation of the discourse object. Strategies of intersubjective alignment are found throughout discourse with a wide variety of structural means, such minimal responses\(^\text{13}\) and the interjections shown above. However, a powerful yet much more subtle way of achieving interactive alignment is formed by employing what Du Bois (ms; 2014) calls ‘resonance’, ‘the activation of affinities across utterances’ (Du Bois, 2014: 372; also Du Bois, 2007; Zima et al., 2009).\(^\text{14}\) Put plainly, resonance in dialogue is a phenomenon whereby speakers imitate features from the utterances of other discourse participants. This strategy fundamentally shapes conversation. For example, in a task in which dyads of speakers were asked to describe a picture, Branigan et al. (2000) found that speakers frequently employ resonance by using similar terms (‘lexical cohesion’ in Halliday and Hasan, 1976), event construals (cf. McGregor, 2002) and morphosyntactic constructions (‘syntactic priming’ in Bock and Loebell, 1990).

\(^{13}\)Minimal responses serving as affirmations such as *hm!, e-e etc.* are very common in conversation as can be seen in the dialogue in appendix F, where this strategy appears in line (2) on page 310, line (19) on page 312, line (124) on page 326, line (150) on page 330, line (154) on page 330, line (157) on page 331, line (172) on page 333, line (176) on page 333, line (179) on page 334, line (184) on page 334 and elsewhere.

\(^{14}\)Du Bois (2014) credits Harris (1952) and Jakobson (1966) with discovering resonance, or ‘parallelism’, although neither author uses the terms resonance or parallelism in quite the same way: Harris (1952) does not use ‘parallelism’ at all (although he does mention ‘parallel sentences’ occurring in repetitive texts) and Jakobson (1966), the paper that is most often cited as the source of the term in the literature, uses ‘parallelism’ with explicit reference to analyses of poetry, focusing on types of rhyme and rhythm in literary language.
Resonating a full utterance or part thereof may simply signal positive alignment, i.e. agreement, in Ungarinyin, as in (156).

(156) **NG:** \textit{burr} a
\textit{burr} a_{1}\text{-}a_{-}\emptyset
lock.up 3msg\text{-}go\text{-}PRS

**JE:** \textit{burr} a
\textit{burr} a_{1}\text{-}a_{-}\emptyset
lock.up 3msg\text{-}go\text{-}PRS

‘He gets locked up’
‘He gets locked up’ (090812JENGDPe, 2:54-2:56)

Similar constructions are frequent in dialogue, such as the pair \textit{aniyangarri wan}/\textit{aniyangarri jino} ‘that one is good’ in lines (1) and (2) on page 297 in the dialogue transcript in appendix E. The same pair occurs in lines (9) and (10) on page 299 and the example of resonance in (17-18) on page 301 demonstrates that resonating construction does not always involve a literal repetition of the previous turn. Other examples in the dialogue in appendix F include line (46) on page 315, line (36) on page 314, line (44) on page 315, line (122) on page 326 and line (137) on page 328.

Apart from construction resonance, the dialogue in appendix E illustrates a second type of resonance that demonstrates how subtly interactive alignment is integrated in conversation: resonance of intonation and, more particularly, pitch height. From line (22) on page 303 the pitch range of Ngalkad’s utterances undergoes a remarkable transformation: whereas she does not noticeably adjust her pitch range to match that of Jilgi Edwards’s utterances prior to line (22), after this Ngalkad’s pitch per utterance (as indicated by the lowest and highest pitch frequency in Hz shown in the margin under the pitch contours) mirror those of Jilgi Edwards’s contributions with increasing accuracy: the pitch range of Ngalkad’s turn in (32) on page 306 after Jilgi Edwards’s line (31) is a close match: 85-219 Hz compared to 88-209 Hz, respectively. The pairs in lines (35)/(36) on page 307 are even closer: 203-226 Hz and 202-226,\textsuperscript{15} and the pairs in (37)/(38) on page 307 are identical: 201-225 Hz and 201-225 Hz. After these sequences of ‘prosodic resonance’, in line (40) on page 308, Pansy Nulgit disrupts the pattern of reproducing Jilgi Edwards’s pitch range and produces a sharp pitch drop (while sitting back in her chair), suggesting an end to the picture task, and the dialogue.

As can be seen in the transcript in appendix E, Ngalkad’s prosodic resonance coincides with a long stretch of talk in which Jilgi Edwards contributes very little to the conversation.

\textsuperscript{15}Jilgi Edwards’s minimal contribution in line (35) on page 307 is a false start yi... (presumably intended as a construction resonant utterance \textit{yirrkalngarri} ‘policeman’, a few microseconds after the onset of Ngalkad’s turn in line (34) on page 34, which starts with that word.)
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except for three turns signalling intersubjective alignment/agreement. In my interpretation, the function of the prosodic resonance employed by Ngalkad serves to entice Jilgi Edwards to further contribute to the dialogue task. By prosodically resonating her utterances Ngalkad positively aligns with Jilgi Edwards and thereby qualifies the conversation as a collaborative enterprise. Jilgi Edwards responds to this attempt by mimicking Ngalkad’s pitch range in her next utterance (in line 39 on page 308).\footnote{Jilgi Edwards also shows prosodic resonance in uttering the alignment marker \textit{yow} ‘yeah’ in line (16) on page 301.}

An alignment strategy that takes resonance one step further is constructing an utterance that represents a variation on the words of discourse participants, or anticipating their words by completing their turns. Consider example (157).

\begin{verbatim}
(157) A: anjaku     di?     (.07)
     anja-ku     di
     what-DAT n\(_w\).ANAPH
B: balowa    ngiywanya    amara    (.07)
     balowa    nga\(_2\)-iy-w\(_1\) a=nya    a\(_1\)-ma-ra
     spread.out 1sg-FUT-FALL=DIST 3msg-do-PST
A: wul    ngima    amara
     wul    nga\(_1\)-yi-ma    a\(_1\)-ma-ra
     sleep 1sg-FUT-DO 3msg-do-PST
B: amarayali
     a\(_1\)-ma-ra-y\(_1\)ali
     3msg-do-PST-INDEED
A: ‘But why then?’
B: ‘He wanted to spread it out’
A: ‘He wanted to sleep’
B: ‘That’s what he said/wanted’ (= lines (33)–(36) on page 313)
\end{verbatim}

Variation resonance is a strategy that is particularly well-suited for co-constructed narrative.\footnote{Jilgi Edwards also uses this strategy repeatedly in the dialogue transcript in appendix E as well. A clear example can be seen at the beginning of the narrative, where Ngalkad introduces the two main characters of the story in line (3) on page 298, using the dual form \textit{biyerr} ‘they two are’, to which Jilgi Edwards adds the comitative form \textit{yilakurde} ‘with the child’ in line (4) on page 298. Although Ngalkad acknowledges Jilgi Edwards’s contribution in line (4) with the alignment marker \textit{yow} ‘yeah’, uttered under her breath at the beginning of line (5) on page 298, she continues to use the dual in that turn: \textit{bidirri} ‘they two are’, to which Jilgi Edwards responds in line (6) with \textit{bidi} ‘they are’, the non-dual plural form of the same inflecting verb. In terms of conversation analysis, the suggestions by Jilgi Edwards (construing the event as involving more than one participant) are underlined by the use of the dual form in Ngalkad’s turn.} In (157) speaker A starts by asking an explanation for the behaviour of a protagonist (who has broken off some branches) to which speaker B responds by saying that he wants
to clear an area in order to lie down. Speaker A adds to this explanation that the protagonist wants to sleep, a suggestion speaker B agrees with by resonating the framing verb of the previous utterance affixed with the emphasising morpheme -yali ‘indeed’.

The variation resonance strategies in (157) occur within a framing construction in the third line and with a framing clause in the last: in response to a framing construction of reported intentionality by B, A proposes a different framing construction of reported intentionality, to which B reacts by signalling full agreement with the content of A’s framing construction.

Framing constructions are a natural grammatical environment for alignment strategies to be expressed in because of their central function of communicating about (internal) dialogue. If aligning is a prototypical process in dialogue and framing constructions have the function of representing dialogue, they should regularly include explicit strategies of intersubjective alignment. Utterances of reported speech introduce one or more perspectives from a reported speech event and alignment constructions and strategies provide an excellent way of opposing and reconciling these perspectives. This is the function of aka ‘not so’ in (158), which serves to contrast stances and, by occurring clause-initially, demarcates the framed clause, thereby introducing a shift in perspective.

(158) Describing a picture from the Family problems picture task in which two men offer the protagonist beer and he refuses:

\[
\text{køj ba budmanangka aka wa warda wangka} \\
\text{køj ba₂-a burr-ma-nangka aka wa warda wangka₂-(r)a} \\
\text{drink IMP-go 3pl-do-3sg.O NOT.so NEG like 3n₁w₁.O:1sg.S:IRR-GO.TO} \\
\text{kokoj kudirri amarndirri jinda} \\
\text{ko-køj kurr-ŋ₂irri a₁-ma-rndu-rri jinda} \\
\text{REDUP-drink 2pl-BE-DU 3msg-do-3pl.IO-DU m.PROX}
\]

‘“Come drink,” they say. “No I don’t like it. You two can drink,” he tells them two’  
(090812JENGPDi, 1:10-1:17)

In (158) aka ‘not so’ is used to reject a proposition by the subject referents of the first framing clause: the ‘offer’ to the protagonist to come and drink with his friends, which they expect him to accept. By using aka ‘no so’ rather than the more neutral negative interjection burray ‘no’, the reported speaker strongly rejects the offer to drink and refutes the expectation by two people, as opposed to an event that can be described with a dual form) could be interpreted as an attempt at other-initiated repair (Sidnell, 2010: 117ff.): an effort by Jilgi Edwards to revise Ngalkad’s interpretation. As Sidnell (2010: 133) phrases it, repair is often used by speakers ‘as a vehicle for action’: by challenging Ngalkad’s version of the story Jilgi Edwards could be seen as offering a alternative version of the co-constructed narrative, which means that the slight grammatical differences between Jilgi Edwards and Ngalkad’s turns are a potential source of conflict. Interestingly, this is not how the differences in dual/plural reference are treated in the dialogue, although both speakers stick with their own interpretation of the pictures.
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the reported addressee indexed with the postverbal dual pronoun suffix in the second framing clause. In this way, framing constructions allow speakers to discuss intersubjective alignment.

4.3.2. Illocution

Illocution, i.e. marking an utterance as declarative, interrogative or imperative is a stance category due to the fact that an illocution type inevitably indexes at least one discourse participant and signals how the indexed participant(s) relate to what the utterance describes. Longstanding philosophical debates have pondered the precise semantic nature of this relation, for example, whether asking a question ‘means’ ‘I, the speaker, do not know p and request you, the addressee, to provide knowledge of p’ (cf. Hamblin, 1958; Groenendijk and Stokhof, 1994) or if a declarative sentence expresses that the speaker holds p true (cf. Ross, 1970; Kisseine, 2009). In recent years, the relation between knowledge, perspective and illocution been elucidated with considerable typological evidence. For example, the discovery of so-called conjunct/disjunct pronoun systems in which the form indexing the speaker in a declarative utterance is the same as that for an addressee in an interrogative utterance appears to demonstrate that in these languages these inflectional forms index the perspective of the presumed ‘holder of the knowledge’ or ‘epistemic authority’ (cf. Curnow, 2002; Dickinson, 2000; Evans, 2006; Bickel and Nichols, 2007: 223–224). Recent fieldwork on South American languages in particular demonstrates that the analysis of illocution as a combination of perspective-indexing and knowledge/intention qualification explains specific interactions between declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives and specific perspective categories such as evidentiality (e.g. Gipper, 2011; Bergqvist, 2012; Bruil, 2014).18

For the present discussion the exact semantic nature of illocution can largely be left aside. I will assume that a declarative utterance at least indexes the perspective of the speaker, whose mind stands in some relation to what is being talked about. Interrogative utterances minimally index the perspective of the addressee, to whom the question is directed (this may be a hypothetical discourse participant) and that of the speaker, by default, as do imperative utterances, which index the addressee as the discourse participant to whom the respective order is directed and the speaker as the one who issues the order (for a fuller discussion of the intersubjectivity of illocution, see Verstraete, 2007). What is most relevant for the contribution of illocution to framing constructions and defenestration is not the illocution type itself but the shift between illocution types, as exemplified in the first example of defenestration in (138) above. A change in illocution value may signal a change in perspective. I will exemplify this point further at the end of this section, but first, I will introduce the ways in which illocution

18For example, citing sources from several South American languages Bruil (2014: 2) writes that, apart from the language described there, Ecuadorian Siona, ‘there are many other languages in which the reportative and the interrogative do not co-occur’.
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is marked in Ungarinyin.

Ungarinyin has four ways of forming interrogatives, the most structurally overt strategy being that in (159), which includes the question particle *wuji(ka)* in preverbal position combined with rising intonation.

(159) \begin{align*}
\text{wuji} & \quad \text{irroden} & \quad \text{di}\,? \\
\text{wuji} & \quad \text{a\textsubscript{1}-irra\textsubscript{2}-ode-n} & \quad \text{di} \\
\text{Q} & \quad 3\text{msg-DEFS-be.painted-PRS}\; n\textsubscript{w}.\text{ANAPH} \\
\end{align*} \\
‘Is it *his* painting?’ (= line (57) on page 317)

A second morphological strategy is provided by the question clitic =ka, as in example (160a). This suffix may either appear on the element that is most directly under question (which may be called ‘narrow scope’) or attached to the verb. As the question and answer pair in (160) illustrates, word order is not distinctive in the encoding of Ungarinyin interrogatives.

(160) a. \begin{align*}
\text{dulkoka} & \quad \text{kanda} \\
\text{dulko}=\text{ka} & \quad \text{kanda} \\
\text{cliff} & \quad n\textsubscript{m}.\text{PROX} \\
\end{align*} \\
‘Is there a cliff here?’

b. \begin{align*}
\text{dulko} & \quad \text{kanda} \quad \text{wanangkalu} \\
\text{dulko} & \quad \text{kanda} \quad \text{wa-a-nangka}=\text{lu} \\
\text{cliff} & \quad n\textsubscript{m}.\text{PROX} 3n\textsubscript{w}.\text{S-go-3sg.IO}=\text{PROX} \\
\end{align*} \\
‘A cliff runs from there in this direction’ (= lines (43) and (44) on page 315)

The continuation of the dialogue in 160 is given in 161. This resonant question and answer pair illustrates a third type of interrogative in Ungarinyin, one that is only marked by rising intonation. The intonation contours of the subsequent question and answer pairs (160-161) are shown in figure 4.4. Note that the intonation of (161a), i.e. the third pitch contour in figure 4.4, is distinctly rising, while the the pitch for example sentence (160a), i.e. the first pitch contour in figure 4.4, rises until the question clitic =ka and then drops sharply.

(161) a. \begin{align*}
\text{wo} & \quad \text{wurrwan}\,? \\
\text{wo} & \quad \text{wu-irra\textsubscript{2}-wa-n} \\
\text{flow} & \quad 3n\textsubscript{w}.\text{DEFS-FALL-PRS} \\
\end{align*} \\
‘Does it flow here?’

b. \begin{align*}
\text{wo} & \quad \text{wurrwan} \\
\text{wo} & \quad \text{wu-irra\textsubscript{2}-wa-n} \\
\text{flow} & \quad 3n\textsubscript{w}.\text{DEFS-FALL-PRS} \\
\end{align*} \\
‘It flows here’ (= lines (45) and (46) on page 315)
In utterances with the question clitic $=ka$ the low-high question intonation pattern is often less distinct, as figure (160) suggests, but in yes/no-interrogatives that are not morphologically marked question intonation is used. Figure 4.5, a representation of example (162) shows, a typical example of Ungarinyin question intonation.

(162) A passage from the Family Problems picture task, the speaker refers to a situation in which a man hits a woman and has previously indicated that she disapproves of that

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{warda wunjon} & \quad \text{nyingan?} \\
\text{warda wunjaj}_2-w_1-u-n & \quad \text{nyingan} \\
\text{like} & \quad 3n_{\text{w}.O:2g.S-ACT.ON-PRS} 2g
\end{align*}
\]

‘Do you like that?’ (090812JENGPDi, 5:03-5:04)

In (162) there is no overt marking of interrogative status except for the rise at the end of the utterance. The second person subject referring to the addressee explicitly references the perspective indexed by the interrogative construction.

The fourth strategy for expressing interrogatives is with the use of an interrogative pronoun, as in (163).
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Figure 4.5.: Yes/No question intonation

(163) kunyalwula wumangalu di?
kunyal-walu wu-ma-nga-lu di
where-PROX 3n_w-O:3sg.S-take-PST-PROX n_w.ANAPH

‘Where did he get them from?’ [about *yidmingkal* di ‘bushes’] (= line (26) on page 313)

The prosody of open questions as in (163) is less predictable than that of yes/no-questions, and often depends on the position of the interrogative pronoun/ignorative, which commonly receives a relatively higher pitch.\(^{19}\)

As in many languages, Ungarinyin declarative utterances are not marked through any morphological or syntactic means, only with a falling intonation as exemplified by the answer pairs, i.e. the second and fourth pitch contours in figure 4.4. Figure 4.6 shows the pitch contour of the declarative utterance glossed in (164). It has been taken from the same recording situation as the examples in figure 4.4 but illustrates an isolated statement rather than an answer from a dyadic pair. The intonation contour is almost the reverse image of the question contour in figure 4.5 and shows a large fall over a range of close to 300 Hz to almost 0 Hz.

(164) wa warda wanyirrko
wa warda wanyirrko-w1 u
NEG like 3n_w.O-1pl.EXC-ACT.ON

‘We don’t like it’ (090812JENGPDi, 2:14-2:16)

\(^{19}\)A slightly exaggerated example with a high-falling pitch was shown in figure 4.1 on page 109.
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Of all three illocution types in Ungarinyin, imperatives are most consistently marked morphologically. Example (165) illustrates this form.

(165) \( \textit{ada buma kanda} \)
\( \textit{ada } \text{ba}_2 \text{-} \text{ma } \textit{kanda} \)
sit IMP-do nsw-PROX

‘Sit down here’ (100721-01NGUS, 19:04-19:06)

Imperatives can only be used felicitously if the referential identity of the addressee is unequivocal. Although an imperative is directed at an addressee, the perspective of the speaker determines who is the addressee and how the action described in the imperative utterance is to be performed. In (165) the importance of the perspective of the speaker is evidenced by the fact that the proximal deictic pronoun \textit{kanda} ‘here’ refers to a location near the speaker, not (necessarily) near the addressee.\(^{20}\) Given that imperatives typically have contextually specific referents, it is unsurprising that in many instances Ungarinyin imperative constructions have no overt morphological actant marking (the imperative prefix replaces the object and subject prefixes).\(^{21}\) The only free pronoun that imperatives productively combine with are second person pronouns, such as in (166), underlining the intersubjective nature of imperatives.

\(^{20}\) Also compare (139d) above.
\(^{21}\) Imperative prefixes may be followed by a prefix denoting a secondary object as well, however, see Rumsey (1982: 98ff) and section 2.3.1.
Figure 4.7 represents the intonation contour of example (166): it illustrates that imperative intonation generally shows falling pitch, similar to declarative intonation but this fall is considerably less sharp.

The examples of interrogative, declarative and imperative intonation shown in figures 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7 represent clear tendencies in Ungarinyin, but considerable variation exists between individual utterances. This corresponds to what Fletcher and Evans (2000: 35) find in Mayali (also cf. Schultze-Berndt and Simard, 2012):

‘There was a great deal of variation, with some texts showing a near equal proportion of rising tunes at the phrase edge, suggesting that like other languages, choice of boundary tone in Mayali may have implications for discourse interpretation by signalling degree of ‘completeness’ or finality [...] It is not at all clear, however, whether these kinds of patterns were in any sense obligatory, in view of the high degree of inter- and intra-speaker variability with respect to tune-choice at phrase boundaries.’

Clause boundaries may have a similar effect on illocution intonation in Ungarinyin, as well as information structure, idiosyncratic variation and possibly the use of second person pronouns.
in the intersubjective illocution types interrogative and imperative. However, even while intonation patterns vary, Ungarinyin has distinct prosodic and morphological features available to differentiate between declarative, interrogative and imperative utterances.

These features can be put to use in framing constructions, such as (167), which shows a framed question (note that since the framing clause normally does not lexically differentiate types of speech act it does not signal illocution of the framed clause).

(167) rimijbardaka jina juwibarn ngamara
rimij-barda=ka jina juwibarn nga₁-ma-ra
steal-ACTOR=Q m.PROX bowerbird 1sg-do-PST

'“Is that a thief?” I asked’ (= line (42) on page 280)

The perspective shifting role of illocution contributes to the demarcation of the framed question in (167): in this framing construction the framed clause is marked as a question and the framing clause is interpreted as a declarative construction, forming two separate perspective-indexing units. The perspective-indexing role particularly contributes to the identification of a framed clause in sequences where a framed clause has a different illocution type to that of the preceding non-attributed clause, as it did in the defenestrated clause in (138) or if it indexes different perspectives, as in the sequence of framing constructions in (168).

(168) wulay ngawani balu balu ngarray (.08) aru mara
wulay nga₁-w₁-a-ni ba₂-a-lu ba₂-a-lu ngarray aru mara
my.word 1sg-fall-PST IMP-go-PROX IMP-go-PROX mother.VOC snake see
bungoni balu balu ngamara (.07) kunyal
bunga₁-w₁-u-ni balu balu nga₁-ma-ra kunyal
3pl.O:1sg.S-ACT.ON-ni IMP-go-PROX IMP-go-PROX 1sg-do-PST where
kunyal (.05) nga... (.11) kaja wurla nyumangarri
kunyal nga... kaja wurla nga₁-ma-ø-ngarri
where grandmother speak 3fsg-do-PRS-SUB

’“My word, I fell! Mommy, come, come, I saw snakes, come, come,” I said. “Where, where?”’ granny said’ (100903-31NGUN, 1:03-1:13)

Example (169) illustrates a defenestrated clause with an imperative construction, patterning as indirect speech.
A man who has just killed his wife because he found out he is not the father of her child is confronted by the woman’s parents and urged to confess his act to the community.

Example (169) consists of the perspectivising clause *ngarrangka yirrangu ngardu idmindanilu* ‘the mother and father came to him’, which establishes the mother and father as the grammatical subject from whose perspective the following defenestrated clause is to be interpreted and the object as the reported addressee, ‘he’, the man who killed his wife. The defenestrated imperative construction *bumarndu* ‘tell it to them’ marks the transition to the reported speech event and indexes the reported speakers as the discourse participants issuing the command and the reported addressee being commanded. Similarly, the interrogative clause headed by an interrogative pronoun *kunya ngurr nyinmerlangka* ‘where did you kill him/her?’ indexes the parents as the asking party and the husband as the person asked.

The English translation of (169) may suggest that *bumarndu* ‘tell it to them’ acts as a preposed framing clause for *kunya ngurr nyinmerlangka* ‘where did you kill him/her?’ invoking a second shift in perspective, to that of the husband. This interpretation is prevented by the referential values of the final clause, however, referring to the husband in the second, rather than first person (i.e. ‘I killed her’ you say’), which would have complied with the direct speech patterning expected for a framed clause. The indirect speech patterning maintains the perspective as determined by the initial perspectivising clause in (169): that of the parents talking to the husband. The role of illocution in the defenestrated clauses is to instantiate the shift in perspective from that of the initial declarative perspectivising clause indexing the current speaker, to that of the grammatical subject of the perspectivising clause. After the shift has occurred under defenestration, the use of two illocution types, which cannot be interpreted unless their indexical values are absolutely clear (referent asking/asked, referent commanding/commanded), maintains indexical reference to the participants introduced by the perspectivising clause, in this case further supported by patterns of pronominal reference.
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4.3.3. Evaluative lexis and evaluative multi-word constructions

While intersubjective alignment and illocution index perspectives often without explicitly referring to the respective stancetaker, evaluative lexis is predominantly used in syntactic frames in which the stancetaker corresponds to the grammatical subject of the referent whose perspective and evaluation of the discourse object it reflects.\(^{22}\) An example of evaluative lexis is the coverb *warda* ‘like’ in (170).

(170) *warda* midni  anbada
    *warda* murr-w\(_1\) u-ni  anbada
   like  3\(_{\text{m.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-PST}}\) Mt. Barnett

‘They liked Mt. Barnett’ (111005-01NGSNUD, 1:15-1:17)

The evaluative coverb *warda* ‘like’ in (170) was exemplified earlier in (162) and (164), and in all instances is grounded in the perspective of the grammatical subject of the main verb.

Evaluative lexis may occur in verbal constructions of various types, such as in (171) taken from a collection of elicited examples in Elkin (1974). Example (171a) contains the adverb *warndern* ‘true’, and (171b) and (171c) have the verb -*nguja*- ‘to question, doubt’ under negation. Transcriptions and glosses have been adjusted, translations are as in the source, except for an adjustment in tense in (171c).

(171) a. *warndern* wunginingan  diku  mare nyinyi
    *warndern* wungo\(_2\)-ininga-n  di-ku  mare ny\(_{\text{2-y2i-nyi}}\)
   true  3\(_{\text{w.O:1sg.S-TAKE-PST}}\) n\(_{\text{w..ANAPHi-DAT}}\) sick  3\(_{\text{fsg-BE-PST}}\)
   ‘I believe that made her sick’

b. *wa* wungungu\(_{\text{jara}}\)  diku  mare nyinyinga
   *wa* wungo\(_2\)-ngu\(_{\text{a-ra}}\)  di-ku  mare ny\(_{\text{2-y2i-nyi-nga}}\)
NEG 3\(_{\text{w.O:1sg.S-question-PST}}\) n\(_{\text{w..ANAPHi-DAT}}\) sick  3\(_{\text{fsg-BE-PST-ONLY}}\)
   ‘I did not question that she is sick because of that’ (Elkin, 1974: 80)

c. *wa* wungungu\(_{\text{jara}}\)  di  *Wanjina* wondij
   *wa* wungo\(_1\)-ngu\(_{\text{a-ra}}\)  di  *Wanjina* wondij
NEG 3\(_{\text{w.O:1sg.S-question-PST}}\) n\(_{\text{w..ANAPHi-Wanjina}}\) make
   *ngadoningarri*
   *ngad-o\(_{\text{2-u-ni-ngarri}}\)
   1\(_{\text{pl.EXC.O:5-S-ACT.ON-PST-SUB}}\)
   ‘I believed that the Wanjina was the one who made us’ (Elkin, 1974: 80)

\(^{22}\)There is a growing literature in (systemic) functional linguistics on evaluative lexis and evaluation in discourse under the rubric of Appraisal theory (Hunston and Thompson, 2000b; Martin and White, 2005; Gales, 2011), also see Lemke (1998); Van Linden and Verstraete (2011); Trnavac and Taboada (2012).
The examples in (171), more literally translated as ‘I take it as true, she was sick because of that’ (171a), ‘I did not question it, she was sick for that reason’ (171b) and ‘I did not question it when/because the Wanjina created us’ (171c), are similar to the ‘knowing’ examples in (150). Compare, for example, (171a) to (150a) on page 116 and (171c) to (150c). These constructions resemble framing constructions in that they also represent a cognitive event and another event, but here the cognitive event (knowing, holding true, not doubting) presents an evaluation of the second event, rather than a specific saying or thinking event as expressed by a framing construction or a defenestrated clause. Lexical verbs that qualify a belief or locution as true or untrue, a sample of which is shown in table 4.4, may potentially act as lead-ups to defenestrated clauses. As argued in section 4.2.2, through analogy constructions of this type may occasionally also account for the form of speech describing constructions that resemble indirect speech constructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>ENTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘confess’, ‘speak openly’</td>
<td>buladguru, bulodguru, burajiggal, buwaga, -maŋgala-, -umanga-, walgara, wudmaŋgala</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4.: Speech act terms for truth and lying from Coate and Elkin (1974) (spelling as in the source)

Since the perspective from which a predicative evaluative lexeme is judged is referenced by the subject pronoun on the verb, framing constructions containing such a lexeme attribute this perspective in the customary manner of direct speech, i.e. a framed first person evaluative lexeme is coreferential with the subject of the framing verb, a framed second person form with that of the reported addressee and a third person form with neither the reported speaker or a reported addressee. In section 4.4 I will consider several examples of evaluative lexis occurring within framing constructions.

### 4.3.4. Interjections

Wilkins (1992: 124) defines interjections as ‘[a] conventional lexical form which (commonly and) conventionally constitutes an utterance on its own, (typically) does not enter into construction with other word classes, is (usually) monomorphemic, and (generally) does not host inflectional

23 However, I have not found and have not been able to elicit examples in which a speech verb from table 4.4 was used as a defenestration introducing verb.
or derivational morphemes’. What makes interjections a stance category, however, is that they
they index a perspective, viz. ‘the speaker’s current mental state or mental act’ (Wierzbicka,

Loosely applying the formal and semantic criteria in Wilkins (1992) and Wierzbicka (1992)
I have extracted 92 interjections from the dictionary Coate and Elkin (1974), cited in the
appendix B.²⁴ I have aimed to make the list maximally inclusive, selecting those entries from
Coate and Elkin (1974) that are interjections only in the formal sense and some only based
on semantic criteria, in order to gain a broad overview of the category, including marginal
members. Based on this list I suggest the inductive functional categories shown in (172), each
followed by one or two examples from the list on pages 267–270.

(172) Alignment: expressing agreement or disagreement, e.g. yow ‘yes’, aka ‘not so’.
Attention grabbing: directed at some other discourse participant (either specific or
nonspecific) for the purpose of attracting attention, e.g. emay ‘hey you’, nyany ‘hey you’.
Call: undirected vocalisation associated with a specific activity, e.g. wa: ‘a hunting
call’.
Conversation structuring: demarcating macro-segments in the discourse, e.g. the be-
beginning of an episode, the end of one or the return to a particular topic, e.g. bubuy
‘keep going’.
Exclamation: evaluative, often emotionally charged vocalisation in response to some
situation or object of evaluation, e.g. irrakay ‘exclamation of surprise’.
Formulaic speech: a formulaic expression that often serves a specific culturally defined
social function (e.g. a greeting), e.g. amunkuri ‘success, good wishes’.
Hesitation marking: ‘floor holding’ strategy for when the speaker attempts to recall a
word (or simulates doing so), e.g. wondimi ‘what’s-its-name’.
Incitement: a vocalisation directed at some addressee in order to incite him to perform
some action (includes warnings), e.g. kokaykokay ‘hurry’.
Onomatopoeia: sound symbolic word (e.g. imitating an animal noise), e.g. wo ‘buzz’.
Swear word: type of exclamation to express discontent.

The inductive categories of the interjections in appendix B are wide-ranging and relate to
almost every conceivable aspect of language as (172) suggests: there are interjections dealing
with discourse, with relations between speakers and addressees, even some containing proposi-
tional content and multiple words. Several categories go against the morphological criterion of
monomorphemicity, others do not (necessarily) index a mental state, such as the category of

²⁴For comparison, table B.1 on page 271 lists the interjections Coate and Oates (1970) suggest for Ungarinyin,
which shows a similarly functionally heterogeneous set of words.
onomatopoeia and the residue category ‘formulaic language’, which involves standing expressions. Table 4.5 summarises the frequencies for each of the categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>FUNCTION, EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>exclamations, e.g. <em>irrakay</em> ‘exclamation of surprise’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>attention grabbing, e.g. <em>emay</em> ‘hey you’, <em>nyany</em> ‘hey you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>formulaic speech, e.g. <em>amunkuri</em> ‘success, good wishes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conversation structuring, e.g. <em>bubuy</em> ‘keep going’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>incitement (includes warnings), e.g. <em>kokaykokay</em> ‘hurry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONOM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>onomatopoeia, e.g. <em>wo</em> ‘buzz’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>alignment, e.g. <em>yow</em> ‘yes’, <em>aka</em> ‘not so’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>hesitation marking, e.g. <em>wondimi</em> ‘what’s-its-name’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e.g. <em>wa:</em> ‘a hunting call’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>swear word</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5.: Functions of the Ungarinyin interjections in Coate and Elkin (1974)

There are relatively large differences in how the functions are distributed over the different interjections listed in Coate and Elkin (1974) as shown in table 4.5. The numbers in the table certainly do not fully correspond to the item frequencies in spontaneously spoken Ungarinyin and the distributions of functions in table 4.5 may be slightly skewed due to duplicates and spelling alternatives, but I will take these functions as indicative of the functions and variety of Ungarinyin interjections.

The class of exclamations are interjections in the sense of Wierzbicka (1992) expressing ‘the speaker’s current mental state’ and forms the largest category of those in Coate and Elkin (1974). The exchange in (173) from the Family Problems picture task illustrates the use of the empathetic interjection *ngadaru*, equivalent to Kimberley Kriol/Aboriginal English expression *pubaka* (< poor bugger).

(173) SM: *nyandu nyinda warda nyuma yilakurde nyandu nyinda warda nya2-ma yila-kurde* 3fsg.AMBIPH 3fsg.DEM cry 3fsg-DO child-COM

25For example, the fact that the dictionary only lists one single swear word is probably a conscious decision on behalf of its authors rather than an accurate reflection of the variety of swear words in natural discourse. The nature of the recordings on which much of the dictionary has been based (in majority ancestral dreamtime stories) will also have contributed to this low number.

26For example, the second most frequent interjection type is the one labelled ‘attention grabbing’, which may probably be attributed to the fact that attention-grabbing interjections often consist of combinations of vowels and semi-vowels that may be transcribed in a number of different ways. Another factor contributing to the frequency of this category is that these interjections may specify certain features of the addressee (e.g. specific interjections for calling men, women, single/dual/paucal/plural addressees etc.).
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AJ: *hnhn! hnhn! hnhn!

MJ: *ngadaru ngadaru pubaka

SM: ‘She here is crying with her child’
AJ: ‘Hnhn!’
MJ: ‘Poor bugger...’ (090813AJMJSMPDc, 5:57-6:01)

The exclamation interjections listed in appendix B can only be interpreted as a response to some situation, typically involving other discourse participants and necessarily signaling some type of speaker attitude/mental state evoked by this situation. Interjections expressing incitement, alignment and swearing have this same property. For example, with *kokaykokay* ‘hurry’ the speaker incites the addressee to perform some action (‘do e faster’) and simultaneously signals the speaker’s attitude towards that action (paraphrasing: ‘from my perspective e is currently being performed too slowly’). With an incitement interjection the speaker expresses a command-like intention to the addressee. Alignment interjections (as in Alec Jilbidij’ turn 173) express an intersubjective evaluative relation (see section 4.3.1) and swear words are a specific type of exclamation in response to a negative situation.

Attention grabbing, conversation/discourse structuring and hesitation marking interjections index the perspective of one or more discourse participants but less clearly assess a discourse event by expressing a mental state or speaker attitude, in a similar way to the second and third turns in (173). Conversation structuring and hesitation marking interjections such as *eh* in (174) are expressions facilitating the advancement of a conversation, holding the floor and/or recalling words.

(174) *Summing up parts of meat served up during a meal*

\[
\text{eh oma balya mumara eh engen balya mumara} \\
\text{eh oma balya mu-ma-ra eh engen balya mu-ma-ra} \\
\text{ehm upper.arm go 3n_m-DO-PST ehm lower.arm go 3n_m-DO-PST}
\]

‘Ehm, the upper arm was served, ehm, the lower arm was served’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 9:42-9:45)

Like conversation structuring/hesitation interjections, attention-grabbing interjections do not necessarily express a speaker attitude. But an interjection interpreted as such needs to be understood in relation to a speech situation in which there is a speaker who draws the attention of one or more addressees with some intended goal in mind, cf. *ay* ‘hey’ in (175) .
Table 4.5 contains several categories which are even less straightforwardly characterised as semantic interjections than those exemplified in (174) and (175), particularly formulaic speech, onomatopeia and ‘calls’. The words belonging to these classes are monomorphemic and/or able to independently form utterances, but they do not necessarily index a perspective; they can be understood without identifying a discourse participant or mental state: The category of onomatopeia is mostly made up from sound-symbolic noises and imitations of animal sounds. The formulaic speech category consists of words or phrases that are conventionally used in social situations such as greeting, thanking, saying goodbye etc. These are expected to be used in predefined speech situations (meeting someone, receiving a gift etc.) and as such cannot be understood as expressions of individual mental states/speaker attitudes nor vary according to some norm. The category ‘call’ (either a war cry or a hunting call) comprises conventional, undirected vocalisations that accompany group activities. This class seems functionally very close to formulaic language in that it is equally tied to a conventional speech situation and does not index an individual mind or attitude.

A property almost all interjections in table 4.5 share, however, is that they are inherently tied to a speech event. While interjections have no referential meaning (Wierzbicka, 1992), they have to receive a ‘situated’ meaning, an interpretation that takes into account relevant features of the speech event and often a specific mental state. This aspect makes them especially suitable for occurring in reported speech and thought.

The examples in (176) are expressions of reported speech containing exclamations (176a-176c), an incitement interjection (176d) and an attention grabbing interjection (176e). Examples (176a-176d) are defenestrated constructions, the first three with perspectivising clauses, (176e) is a framing construction framing four inflecting verbs.

---

27 Evans (1992: 226) explicitly excludes onomatopeia from the category of interjections by stating that interjections are ‘not used to represent a non-speech sound’.

28 With the possible exception of non-speech sound symbolic terms.
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(176) a. ngarranangka yirranangka anjaku barrawa amindan
ngarra-nangka yirra-nangka anja-ku barr-va a1-minda-n
o kokoj inyi ngabun
o ko-koj a1-y1-i-nyi ngabun
oh! dink-REDUP 3msg-DE-PST beer

‘Her mother and father [ask:] “Why does she report him? Oh, he drank beer’
(090812JENGPDk, 4:39-4:43)

b. binkanya liny midni karri munda munda
binykanya liny mirr-w1-u-ni karri munda munda
overthere see 3nplsg.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-PST oh.yeah n1m.ANAPH n1m.ANAPH

‘They went over to look at that place: “Oh yeah, here it is, here it is’ (111005-01NGSNUD, 2:50-2:56)

c. joli awani wulay varij wanyidnirri
joli a1-w1-a-ni wulay varij wanyirr-w1-u-ni-rrri
return 3msg-FALL-PST hey! gather.up 3n1sg.O:1pl.EXC.S-ACT.ON-PST-DU

bija
bija
CMPLV

‘He returned:“Hey, we two have already gathered it”’ (100903-32NGUN, 00:34-00:38)

d. About chasing away a dog:

balya buma balyaw meymey
balya bu-ma baly-aw meme
go IMP-do go-VOC be.off

‘Go, shu shu’ (100903-04NGUN, 3:11-3:13)

e. The reported speaker has just seen a snake (see 168 on page 131)

wo wo jinda liny bo bawarrkurle ama
waw waw jinda liny ba1-w1-u bawarr-kurle a1-ma
look.out look.out m.PROX see IMP-ACT.ON emerge-first 3msg-DO

balu balu nyumara
ba1-a=lu ba1-a-lu ny02-ma-ra
IMP-go=PROX IMP-go=PROX 3fsg-do-PST

‘Look out, look out, look at him. He comes out first. Come, come!” she said’
(100903-31NGUN, 2:59-3:03)

Most of the interjections in (176) occur at the ‘left’ boundary of the framed or defenestrated
clause, except for the incitement interjection *me* ‘shu’ in (176d) and (176a), in which the boundary between the perspectivising clause and the defenestrated clause is signalled by a contrast in illocution type (declarative/interrogative). In this last instance the interjection occurs at the head of the following defenestrated declarative construction and continues to index the perspective established by the perspectivising clause.

The observation that interjections are particularly prone to occur at the boundaries of framing and defenestrated constructions could be interpreted as a further example of how a range of stance constructions contribute to the expression of reported speech and thought, as I will investigate further in section 4.4.

The dictionary entries that under the various definitions applied here have been classified as interjections in the list in appendix B form a mixed bunch in terms of diachronic source, morphological status and polysemy. Several interjections belong to more than one type of stance construction and this is particularly frequent for interjections ‘doubling’ as modal particles (cf. Wilkins, 1992: 126), such as *burray*. Modality concludes the discussion of stance from the level of conversational turns down to the level of inflectional morphology.

### 4.3.5. Modality

Of all stance categories presented here, modality is the most well-known and cross-linguistically best studied. I will discuss the definition of modality in relation to other categories within the stance domain in slightly more detail in section 4.5, but this section will be restricted to introducing and exemplifying the constructions and meaning used in Ungarinyin modality. There are two ways to express modality in Ungarinyin: by means of the verbal mood itself, and by means of what Coate and Oates (1970: 57) call ‘mode verb phrases’, more precisely, combinations of an inflectional mood and a preverbal particle, which ‘occur in construction with the whole sentence or clause with which they occur’ (Rumsey, 1982: 167, also cf. Verstraete, 2005b). The morphologically marked verbal moods in Ungarinyin are irrealis and optative.

The optative occurs infrequently in my corpus of contemporary Ungarinyin, but Rumsey (1982) provides the example in (177), showing a framing construction with an optative construction in the framed clause.

(177) \begin{tabular}{lll}
  badi & \textit{wingi} & \textit{budma} \\
  \textit{badi} & wa_1-\textit{y}_1\textit{i-ngi} & \textit{burr-ma-ø} \\

trans: abandoned \textit{3n}\textit{w}--BE-OPT \textit{3pl-do-PRS}
\end{tabular}

‘Let it be abandoned’, they say’ or ‘They decide to abandon it’ (Rumsey, 1982: 159)

In this section I will mostly focus on the contrast between irrealis marking and indicative (i.e. non-mood marked) verbs. The two most common functions of the irrealis are illustrated by the minimal pair in (178).

(178) \begin{tabular}{lll}
  badi & \textit{wingi} & badi \\
  \textit{badi} & wa_1-\textit{y}_1\textit{i-ngi} & \textit{wa}_1-\textit{y}_1\textit{i-ngi}
\end{tabular}

trans: abandoned \textit{3n}\textit{w}--BE-OPT \textit{3n}\textit{w}--BE-OPT
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(178) a. ngoy angkuma
   ngoy angkwa2-ma
   breathe 3msg-IRR-DO
   ‘He might breathe’

b. wa ngoy angkuma
   wa ngoy a-wz2a2-ma-ø
   NEG breathe 3msg-IRR-DO-PRS
   ‘He won’t breathe’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: 427, entry: ngoy)

Example (178a) illustrates the irrealis as a marker of epistemic modality: in this function the mood indexes a perspective, in non-attributed clauses that of the speaker and expresses an evaluation of a discourse object as a possible fact but not yet occurring or not yet having occurred in the real world. Example (178b) shows a second function of the irrealis that is perhaps the most common one, expressing negation. In this function the irrealis is usually accompanied by the preverbal particle wa ‘not’, but occasionally irrealis inflection may also express negation by itself (e.g. in 248b on page 221). Epistemic modality and negation are both also found in the irrealis in other Worrorran languages (Carr, 2000; Clendon, 2014) and polysemy between these two is cross-linguistically common (de Haan, 1997; Chafe, 1995; Nordlinger and Caudal, 2012: 103).29

The irrealis is a controversial grammatical category. Rumsey (1982: 89) uses the label reluctantly and among Australianists the core meaning of the irrealis has been disputed, as either ‘potential’ or ‘unrealised’ (cf. Merlan, 1981; Verstraete, 2005b; McGregor and Wagner, 2006; Van Linden and Verstraete, 2008; McGregor, 2009). Mithun (1995) argues in favour of using the notion with the practical argument that ‘[i]f the ‘Irrealis/Realis’ terminology were not used, the cross-linguistic convergences in the semantic nature of the distinction, and the contrasts in its application, might go unnoticed’. To the extent that the irrealis is a coherent grammatical category, Ungarinyin appears to tick the boxes that are most typical of it and, as McGregor and Wagner (2006) find, in Nyuhnyulan languages it ‘codes the meaning +unrealised, while the use of the clause in the irrealis as speech-act retroactively presupposes the potentiality of the situation’ (McGregor and Wagner, 2006: 366) (also cf. McGregor, 2009: 160).

The ‘unrealised’ meaning most consistently explains the specific semantics and distribution of the irrealis in particle-verb constructions, the full list of which is shown in (179) (also see Coate and Oates, 1970: 57–59; Rumsey (1982: 166–176)). In this list the second row indicates

29As the examples in (178) show, the irrealis morpheme fuses with the pronominal prefix complex (for a morphemic analysis see Rumsey, 1982: 89–95) and since it occupies the same slot in the verbal template as the future tense marker, future tense cannot be encoded in prefix position with irrealis forms. The absence of a present/past tense suffix in the postverbal tense slot may nevertheless signal future tense, as is the case in the examples in (178), which motivates the zero marker (-ø-) in the gloss in place of a present tense suffix.
whether the marker obligatorily occurs with a particular verb inflection: IRRealis, FUTure or INDicative. Particles for which this combination is not specified in (179) allow all moods.

(179)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Inflection</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>biya</td>
<td>+ IRR</td>
<td>‘ought’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biyarra</td>
<td>+ IRR</td>
<td>‘can’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burray</td>
<td>+ IRR</td>
<td>‘not’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kajinka</td>
<td>+ IRR</td>
<td>‘cannot’, ‘must not’, ‘never did’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaku</td>
<td>+ FUT</td>
<td>‘try’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maji</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘must’, ‘should’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marri</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘would’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>menya</td>
<td>+ IND</td>
<td>‘ought not (have)’/‘should not’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa</td>
<td>+ IRR</td>
<td>‘not’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As (179) shows, there are roughly two classes of mood particles: those that combine with a specific inflectional mood (particularly the irrealis) and those that most or exclusively combine with realis forms.31

The meaning of the irrealis meaning is brought out most clearly in constructions with the two modal particles that allow for combinations with both realis and irrealis mood: maji ‘must, should’ and marri ‘would’. The examples with maji ‘must, should’ in (180) combine with future tense (180a), indicative past (180b) and in (180c) and (180d) with the irrealis non-past (also see the imperative form in 139d on page 107).

(180)  

a. maji kulin ngima
   maji kulin nga1-iyma-ø
   SHOULD give.birth 1sg-FUT-do-N.PST
   ‘I must bear children’ (Coate and Oates, 1970: 59)

b. maji ngadungurlini
   maji ngada2-ngurli-ni
   SHOULD 1pl.incl.O:3sg.S-give-PST
   ‘He should have given to us’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: 325, madji)

30 As I’ll discuss below, yaku ‘try’ may also combine with optative mood and the imperative, but because these two do not allow the co-encoding of future tense and necessarily refer to future events, the label FUT can be interpreted as generalising over these instances as well.

31 Coate and Oates (1970) transcribe the marker that Rumsey (1982: 171–172) writes as menya as menyi but in order to avoid confusion I will adhere to the spelling as in Rumsey (1982). The dictionary Coate and Elkin (1974) in fact also only contains an entry for ‘menya’ (spelled ‘menja’), but three out of the five example sentences under that entry are spelled ‘menji’, which leads to the assumption that menya and menyi are variants. In some examples such as (187a) the spelling ‘menyi’ is used in the first line of the transcribed example to reflect the representation in the source.
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c. \( \text{wa maji mungkumara wunawarl} \)
\( \text{wa maji mung-w2a2-mara-ø wunawarl} \)
NEG SHOULD 3n,m,O:3sg.S-IRR-take-N.PST a.long.time

‘He must not take a long time’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: 325, \textit{madji})

d. \( \text{maji nyingembularu duk mungkumara} \)
\( \text{maji nying-embularu duk manga2-w2a2-mara-ø} \)
SHOULD 2sg-foot knock 3n,m,O:3sg,S-IRR-TAKE-N.PST

‘In case you knock your foot’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: 325, \textit{madji})

All of the examples in (180) are taken from written sources with little context provided, but the meaning distinction between the irrealis and the other forms is nonetheless evident: the non-irrealis constructions in (180a) and (180b) describe an event that the speaker describes as a positive deontic event: the ‘bearing of children’ in (180a) and the ‘giving’ in (180b) are both evaluated by the speaker as events that should occur, i.e. need to become realised and are likely to do so. The irrealis examples (180c) and (180d) express the reverse meaning: according to the speaker the event needs to remain unrealised, i.e. should not occur. In example (180c) maji ‘must, should’ is combined with the negative particle \( \text{wa} \) ‘not’, which always occurs with an irrealis, clearly demonstrating the negative deontic meaning ‘should not’. In (180d) maji ‘should’ plus irrealis similarly expresses ‘according to the speaker event \( e \) needs to not occur’ (a prohibitive meaning Coate and Elkin, 1974: 325 also list for maji ‘lest, in case, must, should’).

The particle \( \text{marri} \) ‘would’ can equally combine with both realis and irrealis forms, as (181) demonstrates.

(181) a. \( \text{marri barda ngankuwingi} \)
\( \text{marri barda ngan-w2a2-w1u-y1i-nqi} \)
WOULD kill 1sg-IRR-ACT.ON-REFL-PST

‘I would have been killed’ (Coate and Oates, 1970: 59)

b. \( \text{marri ngurr ngankumanangka} \)
\( \text{marri ngurr ngan-w2a2-ma-nangka} \)
WOULD kill 1sg.S-IRR-DO-3sg.O

‘I nearly hit him’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: 351–352, \textit{mari})
As examples (181a) and (181b) show, marri ‘would’, combined with an irrealis form, describe an event that does not or did not occur in the real world, i.e. is an unrealised event only occurring in the mind of the speaker. In (181c) the knowledgeable elder and law man Paddy Neowarra (Nyawarra) describes the danger if young women touch boomerangs, which would inevitably lead to their children being born with crooked legs. In this use, marri ‘would’ + realis describes a predictable consequence (according to the speaker) of an action A resulting in the realisation of event E (i.e. touching a boomerang leads to carrying children with deformed legs).32

The remaining modal particles in (179) strictly occur with only one specific mood, such as biya + irrealis ‘ought’, which expresses an event that according to the speaker must occur (or have occurred) but so far remains unrealised or is unlikely to become realised. Example (182) illustrates this construction.

(182) mani biya ngada:ngurlu
mani biya ngada:ngurlu-ø
money ought 1pl.INC.O:3sg.S-give-PRS

‘He ought to give us money’ (Rumsey, 1982: 171)

The particle biyarra ‘can’ in (183), is also obligatorily followed by irrealis inflection.

(183) a. biyarra laybirru burrke
   biyarra laybirru burr-w2-o2-ŋi-ø
   CAN know 3pl-IRR-BE-PRS

   ‘They can learn’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: 81, biyarra)

b. biyarra laybirru burrkekarra
   biyarra laybirru burr-w2-o2-ŋi-ø=karra
   CAN know 3pl-IRR-BE-PRS=maybe

   ‘Maybe they can learn’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974: 81, biyarra)

32This use appears to be less frequent than the marri ‘would’ + irrealis construction, in fact Coate and Elkin (1974) describes marri ‘would’ as an irrealis-only maker (contra Coate and Oates, 1970).
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With (183a) the speaker expresses the guess that the referents ‘they’ are able to learn the intended skill, i.e. can bring about the unrealised learning event. As (183b) demonstrates, this modal meaning can be further qualified with the epistemic modal marker =karra ‘maybe’, which evaluates an event as one that has the possibility of occurring. The observation that this combination is allowed suggests that biyarr ‘can’ + irrealis above all qualifies an event as a hypothetical event, rather than one whose occurrence, which the speaker regards as in doubt.

The remaining four particles in (179) mark negation: wa ‘not’, burray ‘not’ (introduced as an alignment interjection in section 4.3.2) and kajinka ‘cannot’ are exclusively accompanied by the irrealis. The fourth one menyi ‘should not’ only occurs with realis mood.

For burray ‘not’, Rumsey (1982) cites the example in (184).

(184) burray dalu winjaw ngabun
      burray dalu winjaa2-w1u ngabun
      NEG pour.out 3n.O:2sg.S-IRR-ACT.ON water
      ‘Don’t pour out the water!’ (Rumsey, 1982: 168)

The common negation marker wa ‘not’ was already illustrated in (178b) and (180c) above and is shown in (185) accompanied by the interjection burray ‘no’ and several the negative adverbs malyan ‘nothing’ and way ‘nothing’.

(185) JE: kanangkan malyan... wa lindiba burrkawi malyan
      kanangkan m-alyan... wa lindij-ba burr-u2-a2-w1u-yi malyan
      now n-m-nothing NEG flake-ITRV 3pl-IRR-ACT.ON-PST nothing

      PN: burray wa layburru burrke
          burray wa layburru burr-u2-a2-y2i-ø
          nothing, NEG know 3pl-IRR-BE-PRS

      JE: way layburru burrke
          w-ay layburru burr-u2-a2-y2i-ø
          nothing know 3pl-IRR-BE-PRS

      JE: ‘Nowadays nothing, they didn’t know how to make spearheads at all’

      PN: ‘No, they don’t know’

      JE: ‘They don’t know’ (11101502-PNNKDDJEUD, 4:36-4:43)

I discuss the meaning of =karra ‘maybe’ in more detail in section 6.2.1.

The words way and burray derive from the same root -ay ‘nothing’ (cf. Rumsey, 1982: 168) and malyan ‘nothing’ may occasionally also function as a negation marker, similar to burray ‘nothing’, as is shown in example (134c) on page 98.
Apart from the regular negation meaning, the particle *kajinka* ‘cannot’ adds an epistemic meaning, as illustrated in (186).

(186) a. kajinka ni wungkuminda
    kajinka ni wunga$_2$-w$_2$a$_2$-minda-ø
    CANNOT think 3n$_w$.O:3sg.S-IRR-TAKE-PRS
    ‘He can’t think about it’ (100809-01NGUN, 3:01-3:03, elicited)

b. mok buwa kajinka buk nyingkalu
    mok bu$_w_1$a kajinka buk nyinga$_2$-w$_2$a$_2$-a-ø=lu
    hide IMP-FALL CANNOT come.out 2sg-IRR-GO-PRS=PROX
    ‘Hide, you cannot come out’ (110925-NGUN, 2:45-2:48)

In (186a) *kajinka* ‘cannot’ + irrealis is the negative counterpart to *biyarri* ‘can’. Example (186b) shows an interesting combination of the negative epistemic modal *kajinka* ‘cannot’ in the context of an imperative construction (186b), in which case *kajinka* ‘cannot’ acquires the meaning ‘this cannot (or even: should not) happen according to me’.35

The final ‘negation’ mood particle is *menyi* ‘should not’, which exclusively occurs with realis mood, as illustrated in (187).

(187) a. bunda menyi jin nyirrwini
    bunda menya jin nyurr-iwa$_2$-w$_1$u-ni
    3pl.PROX UNFORTUNATELY chew 3fsg.O:3pl.S-DEFS-ACT.ON-PST
    ‘They shouldn’t have abused her’ [lit.: ‘They shouldn’t have chewed her up’] (Coate and Oates, 1970: 58, gloss and translation added)

b. bala wungo amara arri ngawa menyi
    bala wunga$_1$-w$_1$u-ø a$_1$-ma-ra arri ngawa menya
    spread 3n$_w$.O:1sg.S-ACT.ON-FUT 3msg-D0-PST about rain UNFORTUNATELY
    merr amanga
    merr a$_1$-ma-nga
    get.near 3msg.O:3sg.S-TAKE-PST

    ‘I’ll spread it out,’ he thought [Or: He wanted to spread it out]. And when there was rain it got close to him, although it shouldn’t have’ (= line (38) on page 314

The occurrence of a negative modal particle with realis mood may initially seem puzzling, given that all other negative constructions involved irrealis mood.36 This observation goes right

---

35Interactions between tense/moods and mood particle verb constructions are also expected with constructions using the particles *biya* ‘ought’, *biyarra* ‘can’, *kajinka* ‘cannot’, *maji* ‘should’ and *marr* ‘would’ along the lines described in Verstraete (2005b) and for future tense and imperative mood in Rumsey (2001).

36Perhaps as a consequence of this observation Coate and Oates (1970: 57) in fact misclassify *menyi* ‘should not’ as an irrealis-only particle, despite illustrating it with examples containing realis mood (Coate and Oates, 1970: 58).
to the heart of the meaning of the realis/irrealis opposition as signalling whether an event did occur or did not occur in the real world: with menyi ‘should not’ it is necessarily assumed that the described event actually occurred. With a mood construction including menya ‘should not’ the speaker evaluates a real-world or generically occurring event as one that she didn’t want to occur/have occurred, ‘this did/does happen but it ought not (to have)’ (Rumsey, 1982: 171) (also cf. Kayardild nginja, Evans, 1995: 757). For this reason, menya ‘should not’ never combines with irrealis mood, despite its negative translation.

In (187a) menya ‘should not’ thus receives the interpretation ‘this event happened but it shouldn’t have’. The meaning in (187b) is more difficult to translate and a closer approximation of the Ungarinyin menya ‘should not’ would be ‘unfortunately’, which I have used in the glosses.\footnote{The difficulty of translating menya ‘should not’ in the above context is reflected by the translation in Coate (1970) as ‘lest the rain comes too close’. Given that this translation would imply a relative future, unrealised event the realis past tense form of the verb in (187b) would be hard to explain. If menya ‘should not’ would allow collocation with irrealis mood or future tense, ‘lest’ would seem a very likely translation equivalent, but I am not familiar with any such example.} Based on the Aboriginal English gloss provided by Ungarinyin speakers, Rumsey (1982) translates the meaning of the marker as ‘too bad’, which is perhaps indicative of the lexical origin of menya as a type of interjection similar to ngadaru ‘poor bugger’. Example (187b) expresses ‘it was the case that it rained’ and ‘it should not have been the case’ (also see example 255 on page 227).

The marker yaku ‘try’ is similar to the other mood particles in that it shows regular interactions with the mood and tense of the verb, but rather than irrealis mood it only allows combinations with optative mood, the imperative and first person future tense (Rumsey, 2001: 356). However, example (189), consisting of a perspectivising and a defenestrated clause, shows that at least for some speakers non-future tense first person verbs can combine with yaku ‘try’ as well. Example (188) illustrates the first person (plural) realis use of yaku ‘try’.

\begin{flushleft}
(188) yaku ngarriya bikjaku
yaku ngarr-iy-a bikja-ku
\end{flushleft}

\textit{We’ll try to go to the movies} / \textit{Let’s try go to see the movies} (Rumsey, 2001: 356)

\begin{flushleft}
(189) yaku liny nyarri juwibarn jina anjakarra
\textit{We try to look at it first}. “What did this bowerbird get?” (100902-19NGUN, 1:55-1:57)
\end{flushleft}
Rumsey (2001) points out an interesting parallel between constructions with *yaku* ‘try’ and framing constructions of reported intentionality, which have the same combinatorial restrictions, only occurring with inflecting verbs in the framed clause that contain a first person/future tense form, an imperative or an optative mood.

Table 4.6 provides a summary of all modal markers introduced in this section. Those occurring with irrealis mood are shaded grey and the slightly lighter grey covering *yaku* ‘try’ serves to indicate that this marker obligatorily combines with a verb form other than the realis or irrealis, viz. future tense, imperative or optative. The markers in the table are classified along two parameters: polarity and epistemic-deontic modality. Polarity roughly coincides with whether a described event did or did not occur in the real world, except for the meaning of *menya* ‘should not’. Epistemic modality signals whether the event is qualified with respect to a participant’s knowledge status of the event or with respect to the judgement that it is necessary to come about. Those that are neutral for either of these functions occur in the middle column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPISTEMIC</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td><em>kajinka</em> ‘cannot’</td>
<td><em>marri</em> ‘would’</td>
<td><em>biyarr</em> ‘can’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td><em>wa</em> ‘not’</td>
<td>=<em>karra</em> ‘maybe’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td><em>menya</em> ‘should not (have)’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>biya</em> ‘ought (to have)’</td>
<td><em>maj</em> ‘should’</td>
<td><em>yaku</em> ‘try’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6.: The Ungarinyin mood markers reordered by modal meaning and polarity

Although the set of Ungarinyin mood markers is not unusually large and composite moods are very infrequent in my spontaneous discourse corpus, the inventory is nonetheless larger than in some neighbouring languages. This may be due to the limited number of inflectional modal categories in Ungarinyin.\(^38\) The main property of particle-verb modal constructions and inflectional moods is that both express a modal meaning that involves indexing the perspective of a discourse participant, usually that of the speaker and an evaluation of an event. This property characterises it as a core member of the category of stance constructions.

\(^38\)For example, Rumsey (2000: 100–101) attributes the relatively small size of the class of mood markers in Bunuba to the higher availability of inflectional categories and modal affixes in that language.
4.4. Framed perspectives, defenestrated views

In his analysis of framing constructions in African languages, Güldemann (2008: 41) observes that contexts in which framing clauses are regularly omitted include those in (190):

(190) • Turn-taking within a dialogue;
• Repetition of identical or parallel quotes;
• Immediately preceding background clause;
• Immediately preceding marker of event sequence;
• Immediately preceding predicate of motion, appearance, etc.

The first two contexts in (190) are examples of alignment strategies as described in section 4.3.1, the latter three are perspectivising clauses of various types similar to those discussed in section 4.2.1. The overview of stance categories in the preceding sections has suggested, however, that stance expressions may also play a role in contextualising defenestration: like framing clauses, the part of a framing constructions referring to a reported speaker, the stance constructions discussed in this chapter index a perspective. This means that a stance construction supports and can perhaps even replace the perspective-indexing functions of a framing clause. This is a proposal I will explore in this section.

I will do so mostly on the basis of the Bowerbird story, told by Pansy Nulgit and transcribed in full in appendix C. The story describes a humorous event in which a juwibarn ‘bowerbird’, or ‘stealing bird’, causes confusion among a group of Ngarinyin people. Bowerbirds are scavengers, notorious for picking up all kinds of objects – from shiny, colourful items to tobacco – to decorate their elaborate nests with (a picture of a bowerbird’s nest is shown on page 289) and this leads to a situation in which an old Ngarinyin woman accuses other community members of stealing possessions that in fact have been taken by a bowerbird. At the beginning of the story Ngalkad places the hearer right in the middle of the action, as can be seen in the opening lines cited in (139), repeated as (191) below.

(191) a. nyina nyalwangarri buluba nyangka (.11)  
    nyinda ny-alwangarri buluk-w1a nya2-a-ngka  
    f.PROX f-old.person look.around-ITRV 3fs-3s-go-PST

    ‘This old woman was looking around’

b. manjarn nyangki rimij wudmanira kanda narnburr (.16)  
    manjarn nyangki rimij wu-rr-ma-ri-ra kanda narnburr  
    stone who steal 3m.3pl.O-3pl.S-TAKE-PST-1sg.IO n13.PIII.PROX paperbark

    ‘Who stole my coins and banknotes?’

39Güldemann (2008) terms these ‘quotative indexes’.
c. nyingankarra rimij wunjumanira (.14)
nyingan=karra rimij wu-nja2-ma-ni-ra
2sg=maybe steal 3n=O-2sg.1sg.IO-TAKE-PST-1sg.IO

‘Maybe you’re the one stealing my things’

d. anjaku rimij nginkenungarri ngin maji buluk ba
anja-ku rimij ngin-u2a2-y2i-nu-ngarri ngin maji buluk ba2-a
what-DAT steal 1sg-IRR-2sg.IO-SUB 1sg MUST look.around IMP-GO

wura jadarn (.21)
wura jadarn
sideways properly

‘Why would I steal from you? Why would I rob you? You should look around properly’

e. bidningengkerri (.08)
birr-ninga-y1i-ngka2-yirri
3pl-put-REFL-PST-CONT

‘they said to each other’

Line (191a) introduces the protagonist of the story: an old woman looking for her belongings. In (191b) this woman directs a question at a group of bystanders not yet introduced, a locution that continues in (191c). The woman is answered in (191d) by (one of the) discourse participants addressed in (191b-191c) and the entire exchange is framed by a framing clause in (191e), containing the reciprocal framing verb -(in)anga- ‘put’ (see section 3.2, page 89).

Formally, lines (191b-191e) represent a framing construction but the framed ‘clause’ (191b–191d) consists of four distinct grammatical clausal constructions, in three clearly separated intonation units, reflecting the locutions of two different speakers. Therefore, while the framing clause places the entire framed clause inside the reported speech event, it cannot be the only factor contributing to the shift in perspective, since the perspective shifts between reported speakers occur within the framed clause.

The mechanism for signalling the perspective shift between lines (191a) and (191b) was discussed in section 4.2.1: the main difference lies in the illocution type of both clauses. Line (191a), a declarative and non-modal clause, introduces one of the main protagonists of the story, an old woman who finds her money gone and assumes somebody must have stolen it. It acts as a perspectivising clause for line (191b) in which the first person indirect object suffix in the verb phrase rimij wudmanira ‘they stole it from me’ refers to the protagonist introduced in (191a) and the interrogative pronoun nyangki ‘who’ is the subject (ignorative pronouns typically combine with the third person plural). The interrogative construction indexes an intersubjective relation between the referent of the first person indirect object and
the ignorative third person plural subject of the verb.

Lines (191c-191e) represent a perspective shift within a framed clause started by line (191b). The intensity and intonation of these lines are shown in figure 4.8, with the fine vertical lines in that figure indicating the boundaries between the transcribed lines/intonation units represented in (191c), (191d) and (191e), respectively.

The first intonation contour in figure 4.8 shows a high-low falling pitch, typical of questions headed by an interrogative pronoun (see section 4.3.2), followed by a reset to a higher pitch level at the onset of the second intonation unit representing the interrogative and imperative clauses in (191d). These are spoken without a noticeable pause and are both anchored in the perspective of the people responding to the question by the protagonist. The third contour in figure 4.8 represents the framing clause and receives a clause final intonation. Each pause and pitch reset in figure 4.8 coincides with a shift in perspective.

In the Bowerbird story, lines (191a–191e) are immediately followed by the lines cited below as (192).

\[(192) a. \textit{yow nyinganggayu ru rimij wunjumarnnira} \]
\[\textit{yow nyengan-nga-yu ru rimij wu-nj\dot{o}2-ma-ni-ra} \]
\[
ye\text{ah 2sg-ONLY-LAT just steal 3n\text{u}.O-2sg.S-TAKE-PST-1sg.IO} \]

‘Yes, you are the one who was taking those off me’
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b. *jajarrngaliku* (.06)
   
   *ja-jarrngali-ku*
   
   REDUP-play-DAT
   
   ‘just for fun’

c. *rimij wunjumanira* (.11)
   
   *rimij win-ja-2-ma-ni-ra*
   
   steal 3n.O-2sg.S-TAKE-PST-1sg.IO
   
   ‘You stole it from me’

d. and *nyalongarri nyina nyumara anjaku rimij nginkenungarri*
   
   *ny-alongarri nyina nyu2-ma-ra anja-ku rimij ngin-w2-y2-i-nu-ngarri*
   
   f-old.person f.PROX 3fsg-do-PST what-DAT steal 1sg-IRR-be-2sg-SUB

   *nyangkikarra rimij wudmarnni* (.17)
   
   *nyangki=karra rimij wur-rr-ma-ni*
   
   who=INDEF steal 3n.-3pl-TAKE-PST
   
   ‘This old woman said: “Why would I rob you? Someone stole it”

e. *nyumara* (.11)
   
   *nyu2-ma-ra*
   
   3fsg-do-PST
   
   ‘she said’ (= lines 6-10 on page 274)

Line (192a) represents a defenestrated utterance expressing the perspective of the woman protagonist accusing the speaker of the framed clause in (191d) of stealing her belongings. The defenestrated utterance starts with the first interjection of the narrative, *you* ‘yes’ and continues until line (192c). This passage also includes the emphatic suffix *-nga* ‘only’ on the first grammatical word of the utterance and the adverb *ru* ‘just’, leading to the interpretation *nyinganngayu ru* ‘it was you (and nobody else)’, referring to the reported speaker of line (191d). The form *jajarrngaliku* ‘for fun’ in line (192b) adds a qualification to the stealing event described in the the previous clause. Line (192c) literally repeats a part of (192c), *rimij wunjumanira* ‘you stole it from me’. Example (192d) has the English conjunction ‘and’ and a framing-introducing/framing clause40 *nyalongarri nyina nyumara* ‘this old woman says’ which demarcates the following reported message from the preceding defenestrated utterances. After a relatively long pause following line (192d), line (192e) adds a framing clause to the speech representing constructions *anjaku rimij nginkenungarri nyangkikarra rimij wudmarni* ‘and why would I steal from you?’ Somebody else did41, completing them as a framing construction.

40The same construction occurs in lines (59-60) later on in the story on page 283).
41I interpret the subordinate morphology in both line (191d) and (192d) as instances of insubordination with a discourse function that can be roughly paraphrased as ‘and why would I steal from you?’ (see section 5.2.2.2).
None of the expressions of reported speech in the opening lines of the Bowerbird story in (191) and (192) are canonical framing constructions as introduced in chapter 3. Lines (192a-192c) represent full defenestration, a reported message without a framing clause, but the framing constructions in lines (191b-191e) and (192d-192e) deviate from the simple framed clause-framing clause pattern as well: the first, reciprocal framing construction includes multiple shifts in perspective between two speakers, and in the second framing construction a supplementary framing clause was added after a long pause, seemingly as an afterthought. However, the first ten lines of the Bowerbird story also contain several additional strategies supporting the perspective shifting interpretation. Prosody appears to be such a strategy, as figure 4.8 suggested, the explicit marking of unbound and bound pronominal subjects and (indirect) objects, alternating between referents and so are the framing-introducing constructions preceding both of the framing constructions. But the passage involves yet a different type of strategy contributing to the expression of (changes in) perspective: the stance constructions introduced in section 4.3.

Illocutionary alternation furnish an example of such a stance construction: the perspective shift between the perspectivising clause in (191a) and the framed clause in (191b), between the defenestrated clause in (192c) and the framing-introducing/framed clause in (192d) and between every framed and framing clause in (191) and (192) are accompanied by a change in illocution type. The co-occurrence of illocution alternations and reported speech is perhaps not that surprising, since non-declarative illocution may be expected to be more common in dialogue than in non-attributed narrative utterances, and by implication to occur more frequently in reported speech. This expectation does not necessarily extend to the stance constructions belonging to the class of evaluative lexis, interjections and modality. The elements belonging to this group in the first ten lines of the Bowerbird story are listed in (193).

(193) a. \(=\text{karr}a\) ‘maybe’ (191c)
   b. \(\text{rimij n}g\text{inka}n\text{en}g\text{ar}ri\) ‘I would steal from you’ (191d)
   c. \(m\text{aji} ‘must’, jad\text{arn} ‘right’ (191d)
   d. \(y\text{ow} ‘yeah’ (192a)
   e. \(-\text{nga}-ru ‘only just’ (192a)
   f. \(j\text{a}j\text{arr}\text{ng}\text{al}\text{iku} ‘just for fun’ (192b)
   g. \(\text{rimij n}g\text{inka}n\text{en}g\text{ar}ri ‘I would steal from you’ (192d)
   h. \(=\text{karr}a \text{INDEF} (192d)

\(^{42}\)The respective verb constructions with \(\text{rimij ‘steal’ could also be taken as instances resonance, i.e. inter-subjective alignment. I have excluded the examples here because the distinction between referentially motivated repetition and resonance is not always clear-cut (but see Du Bois, 2014) but mostly for the same reason I have excluded illocution as well: resonance occurs across turns and is therefore inherently expected to be more frequent in reported speech than in non-attributed utterances.\)
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The stance constructions in (193) can only be understood if one question is answered: whose perspective(s) is/are involved? This is the perspective-indexical essence of stance. For epistemic and deontic modality (193a, 193b, 193c, 193g) the indexical interpretation involves the perspective of an entity whose knowledge or deontic force is involved in the modal meaning, for (alignment) interjections (193d) that of the entity whose mind aligns with that of the discourse participant’s and lexical qualifications of an event (193c, 193e, 193f) have to be judged against the estimation of some entity (e.g. more/less than can be expected) or the entity’s appeal to a (cultural) norm. Qualifying lexemes such as jadarn ‘properly’ in line (191d) invoke a scale, as is reflected in the explication of English ‘right’ in Wierzbicka (2006: 79), which includes the components ‘it is like this’, ‘people can know that it is like this’ and ‘people can say why it is like this’: in order to meaningfully use the term jadarn ‘properly’ it is pertinent that the addressee is able to interpret the ‘norm’ by which the proposition so evaluated should be judged, which requires the hearer to identify the entity from whose perspective the qualification is made. The crucial observation is that all of these stance constructions index the speech participant that is either referred to by the subject pronoun of the framing clause or, in lines (192a-192c), that would have been referred to by the subject of the framing clause should one have been present.43

The list in (193) contains ten stance constructions (if the emphasis markers in 193e are counted separately), and none of these occur outside a framed or defenestrated clause, i.e. none of the stance constructions index the perspective of the narrator, the current speaker. This suggests that both in the framing constructions and in the defenestrated clauses stance constructions help ground the perspective of the reported speaker.

To what extent is this a strategy that can be observed beyond the first ten lines of the story, i.e. are frequencies higher in framing constructions and perhaps particularly in defenestrated clauses than in regular non-attributed discourse throughout the Bowerbird story in appendix C? Table 4.7 lists the modal meanings for all non-attributed utterances, defenestrated utterances and framing clauses in the text.

As table 4.7 shows, there is not much variation between the types of stance constructions that occur over the three contexts: evaluative lexis, negation and ‘scalar’ emphasis are found in non-attributed constructions, defenestrated clauses as well as framing constructions. Even the alignment interjection you ‘yes’ occurs both in attributed and non-attributed clauses.44

43Functions such as negation and indefiniteness (193i), which necessarily involve some type of conceptualising entity would perhaps not be obvious stance categories under every approach to stance classification, but I have included ‘penumbral’ stance categories here as well in order to avoid arbitrary exclusions from the category (e.g. epistemic irrealis, yes, negation irrealis, no) under the assumption that there would be no a priori reason why these would be more or less likely to occur in (non-)attributed discourse, other than for their perspective meaning.

44The only marker in the Bowerbird story that only occurs in defenestration/framing constructions is =karra ‘maybe’, ‘indefinite’, but it is not restricted to these contexts in Ungarinyin more generally. For further discussion
Table 4.7.: Stance values in unattributed, framed and unframed attributed clauses in the Bowerbird story.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE(S)</th>
<th>STANCE VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-attributed</td>
<td>(11) on page 275 yow ‘yeah’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15-17) on page 275 yow ‘yeah’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27) on page 277 wali ‘wait’, NEG IRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28-29) on page 277 wadingarri ‘many’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47-49) on page 281 -y2ali INDEED, nga ‘yes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50-51) on page 281 burray ‘nothing’, -nga ‘only’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(65-70) on page 284 ru ‘just’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(79-87) on page 286 nimanima ‘too heavy’, nimanima ‘too heavy’ (repetition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defenestrated</td>
<td>(6-8) on page 274 yow ‘yeah’, -nga ‘only’, ru ‘just’,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jajarragaliku ‘for fun’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21) on page 276 =karra INDEF, jojongarri ‘really many’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30-31) on page 278 yow ‘yeah’, =karra ‘maybe’, way ‘none’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(74-75) on page 285 =karra ‘must be’, -nga ‘only’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framed</td>
<td>(3-5) on page 273 =karra ‘maybe’, IRR negation, maji ‘must’,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jadarn ‘properly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9-10) on page 274 IRR hypothetical, =karra INDEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12-14) on page 275 wali ‘wait’, =karra INDEF, =karra INDEF (repetition), =karra ‘maybe’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22-25) on page 276 -ah ‘ah’, =karra INDEF, wali ‘wait’, jadarn ‘properly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26) on page 277 yow ‘yeah’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34-35) on page 279 IRR negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(41-42) on page 280 ah ‘ah’, =ka epistemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46) on page 281 ah ‘ah’, yaku ‘try’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(58-60) on page 283 IRR epistemic modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87) on page 288 burraynangka ‘nothing’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of these stance constructions does strikingly differ for each class, as table 4.8, summarising the values from table 4.7, demonstrates.\(^{45}\)

Table 4.8 shows that the modal values in the Bowerbird story display a clear split between non-attributed constructions and attributed constructions: the proportion of stance constructions (again excluding illocution and resonance) for framing constructions and defenestrated of this marker, see chapter 6.

\(^{45}\)The unit of comparison used in this table is the intonation unit, i.e. fragments in the ELAN transcription preceded and followed by a noticeable pause. As can be seen in appendix C these units appear to closely coincide with grammatical clauses.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STANCE VALUES</th>
<th>TOTAL VALUES/ INTONATION UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-attributed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13/53 = 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defenestrated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11/14 = 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22/29 = 0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8.: Stance values summary

constructions is more than three times that of non-attributed constructions.

In defenestrated clauses there also appears to be a trade-off between framing-introducing clauses and the presence of evaluative lexemes, interjections or modal markers. The remaining defenestrated clauses account for all stance constructions listed in table 4.8.

The contrast between the frequencies of evaluative lexis, interjections and moods occurring in attributed as opposed to non-attributed clauses is replicated in table 4.9, based on counts of these constructions in the mythological narrative Coate (1966). Table 4.9 shows the three stance types per clause type and indicates the proportion of the total number of values per clause in the final column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EVAL LEXIS</th>
<th>INTER</th>
<th>MOOD</th>
<th>TOTAL VALUES/ CLAUSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-attributed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30/447 = 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defenestrated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17/56 = 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64/143 = 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/8 = 0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9.: Stance values in (Coate, 1966)

The total relative frequency of stance constructions in Coate (1966) is lower than in the Bowerbird story, which can most probably be attributed to differences in genre: a ‘solemn’ creation story in Coate (1966) as opposed to a lively personal narrative in appendix C. The contrast between stance values in non-attributed clauses in table 4.9 is even more extreme than in table 4.8. Defenestrated clauses in Coate (1966) are more than four times as likely to contain a stance value than non-attributed clauses (30% vs. 7%, respectively) and framed clauses are even more than six times as likely (45% of the framed clauses contain one or more

---

46 These occur in (18) on page 276, (19-20) on page 276, (43) on page 280 and (70-71) on page 284.
47 Lines (21) on page 276, (30) on page 278 and (74) on page 285.
48 I will analyse a number of discourse properties of the story in Coate (1966) in chapter 5. For details about how the counts reported in table 4.9 were performed, see appendix J from page 407.
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stance values).

The difference between the number of stance values in framed clauses and defenestrated clauses in Coate (1966) raises interesting questions about variation within stance strategies in reported speech. It could be hypothesised that stance constructions would be more likely to occur in defenestrated clauses than in framing clauses in order to ‘compensate’ for the absence of a perspective marking framing clause, which is an assumption that could be consistent with table 4.8 but is not supported by table 4.9. On the other hand, defenestration as introduced in this chapter involves a range of strategies, including intersubjective stance strategies such as illocution and resonance, which could perhaps account for the differences between framed and defenestrated clauses in table 4.9. Also, framing constructions often contain more than one framed clause, which necessarily means that many framed clauses are not adjacent to a framing clause, possibly creating a functional need to signal perspective more explicitly.

The ‘stance profile’ of a defenestrated clause resembles that of a framing construction more than that of a non-attributed clause, which suggests that the distribution of evaluative constructions, interjections and modality contributes to the identifiability of a perspective shift, in addition to changes in illocution, intersubjective alignment, prosody and perspectivising/framing-introducing clauses.

4.5. Discussion and conclusion: the stance domain

This chapter has outlined strategies and constructions of the Ungarinyin stance domain. Constructions within this domain frequently interact and cross boundaries with other stance categories, such as menyi and burray, which occur both as an interjection and a modal/negation particle. The polysemy of negation and epistemic modality within the irrealis is a further example that is paralleled by a polysemy of the interrogative marker =ka, which can act as a negation marker as well, as in (194) (also see Rumsey, 1982: 128–129).

(194) bidibidika budmareri
    bidibidi=ka burr-ma-ma-yirri
    small=Q 3pl-do-PST-CONT

    ‘They are not small, they were saying’ (Coate and Elkin, 1974, entry: bidibidi)

Such interactions are interpretable if grammatical categories such as illocution, interjections and negation/modality are understood as part of a class of conceptually related construction types.49

Framing constructions belong to the stance domain as well. McGregor (1997) points out one connection between framing constructions and illocution:

49 Also see Tomasello (2003: 226) on the conceptual connection between negation and modality.
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‘In uttering the proposition or proposal P, a speaker is normally asserting, questioning, proposing, etc. that P, depending on the character of the speech act constituted by the utterance. Framing P as a quote provides a means whereby the speaker can utter P without asserting, questioning, proposing, etc. that P; instead, what they specify is that someone else would assert, propose, question, etc. that P’ (McGregor, 1997: 265).

This connection is particularly apparent in Ecuadorian Siona, in which the marker signalling reported speech (more particularly reportative evidentiality) takes the same morphological slot as illocution markers (Bruil, 2014: 277), thereby replacing illocution marking in a reported speech construction. But (diachronic) links between reported speech and thought and speaker attitudes, e.g. using a reported speech construction rather than a non-attributed construction to express reduced commitment to a reported message are also widely found (cf. Vandelanotte, 2004; Squartini, 2012).

Within the definition of Du Bois (2007), stance consists of three complementary meanings: evaluating, positioning and aligning. Evaluating is ‘the process whereby a stancetaker orients to an object of stance and characterizes it as having some specific quality or value’ (Du Bois, 2007: 143), positioning is ‘the act of situating a social actor with respect to responsibility for stance and for invoking sociocultural value’ (Du Bois, 2007: 143) and aligning is, as per the definition introduced in section 4.3.1, ‘the act of calibrating the relationship between two stances, and by implication between two stancetakers’ (Du Bois, 2007: 144). Stance itself, then, is

‘a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field’ (Du Bois, 2007: 163).

Du Bois (2007) represents stance as an act between a ‘subject1’ and a ‘subject2’ (the discourse participants), and a discourse object (anything that can be talked about cf. Du Bois, 2007: 147–149), forming a ‘stance triangle’, as reproduced in figure 4.9 (also cf. Hunston and Thompson, 2000b; Kockelman, 2004; Kärkäinen, 2006; Englebretson, 2007a; Du Bois, 2007; 2014).

The definition of stance highlights the connectedness and situatedness of the stance domain: expressing stance is an ongoing activity in (linguistic) interaction, and ‘[i]t is the stance utterance with its dialogic context that is the relevant unit for stance interpretation’ (Du Bois, 2007: 158, emphasis in the original). However, Du Bois (2007) also writes:


\[51\] ‘Displaying stances is part and parcel of the interaction between participants who respond to prior turns and design their talk for the current recipient(s)’ (Kärkäinen, 2006: 703).
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The concrete localization of the overt words or other meaningful elements which ground the various components of stance is important for assessing the compositional contribution of the several evaluative words and constructions in a stance utterance (Du Bois, 2007: 158).

This brings us back to the analysis of reported speech in Besnier (1993) in section 4.1 and the list and functions of ‘framing devices’ in table 4.1. With respect to these devices Besnier (1993: 176) remarks that ‘[w]hile some linguistic strategies clearly [...] signal whether a particular string is reported or not, others do not have such a function; while some keys are affectively neutral, others are deliberately used by speakers to communicate affect’. Most of these constructions involve the perspective of one or more speakers and a meaning of evaluating, positioning and/or aligning and are therefore stance constructions according to the definition cited above.

Section 4.4 has shown that stance constructions whose function is not primarily to signal a framing relation (‘affective’ devices in terms of Besnier, 1993\textsuperscript{52}) can contribute to the identification of the reported speaker and hence to signalling a reported speech or thought interpretation in defenestrated clauses. These constructions can do this because they inherently index a perspective and in addition express a semantic relation of evaluation, positioning and/or intersubjective alignment between the mind in which this perspective is grounded and

\textsuperscript{52}By means of a definition for this concept Besnier (1993: 363) cites Irvine (1982): ‘Affective meaning is [...] a “metacommunicative commentary on a referential proposition” (Irvine, 1982: 32).’

Figure 4.9.: Stance triangle (Du Bois, 2007: 163)
some discourse object/another discourse participant.

The reported speaker indexing property of modal stance constructions is not dissimilar to what has been dubbed ‘protagonist projection’ in formal semantics (Holton, 1997; Stokke, 2013; Buckwalter, 2014) and is based on the definition of modality as an evaluation ‘mediated by an authority’ (Timberlake, 2007: 315), also referred to across functional and formal theories as ‘modal source’ (Verstraete, 2005a), ‘source of authority of the modality’ (Kimps and Davidse, 2008: 708), ‘point of assessment’ (von Fintel and Gillies, 2008) or ‘judge’ (Lasersohn, 2005; Potts, 2005; Anand, 2007; Stephenson, 2007). Cornillie and Pietrandrea (2012) relate the definition of modality most directly to that of stance by defining it ‘as the category that refers to the broad domain of attitudinal qualifications, i.e. qualifications expressing the speaker’s stance toward, or the speaker’s subjective evaluation of, what is being said or the speaker’s intersubjective awareness of the co-participant’s stance’ (Cornillie and Pietrandrea, 2012: 2109).

Under this broad interpretation of modality the category shares features with the other stance constructions that include an evaluative/attitudinal component: the ‘modal authority’ of interjections is ‘the speaker’s current mental state or mental act’ (Wierzbicka, 1992: 164), that of evaluative lexis ‘the expression of the speaker or writer’s attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about’ (Hunston and Thompson, 2000a: 5), with the provision that these may also be a reported speaker or cognizant. The notion of stance allows us to interpret these semantically related constructions as part of a coherent grammatical phenomenon, of which the expression of evaluative and aligning meanings in order to signal speech/thought attribution is an example.\footnote{Another field of research in which modality, interjections, evaluative lexis and constructional meaning are being addressed within a single framework is sentiment analysis and related approaches in computational linguistics/natural language processing (Turney, 2002; Shanahan et al., 2006; Buche et al., 2013).}

The expression of stance in defenestration illustrates a particular type of interaction within the stance domain: a specific evaluation of the discourse object and/or intersubjective alignment with a (reported) addressee positions this discourse object with respect to the current speaker as belonging to a reported speech event. If resonance is a typical expression of intersubjective alignment and modality of evaluation I will assume that the meaning of framing constructions is a primary example of a positioning meaning. Positioning has had a shorter history as linguistic topic than evaluating, but I will attempt to characterise it in relation to framing constructions in some detail in section 6.5.

An intriguing pattern that emerged in this chapter concerned another type of apparent interaction: that between stance constructions in reported speech and perspectivising/framing-introducing clauses. When introduced by a perspectivising or another type of framing-introducing clause, defenestrated clauses appeared to be less likely to include the evaluative/aligning stance
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constructions typical of defenestration elsewhere, the analysis of the Bowerbird story in tables 4.7 and 4.8 suggested. If stance constructions indexing the reported speaker are interpreted as a strategy for highlighting the reported speaker’s perspective the suggestion in section 4.2.2 that defenestrated clauses can resemble indirect speech-like constructions adds an interesting dimension to this observation: the most indirect speech-like construction in Ungarinyin contains fewer elements indexing the perspective of the reported speaker, consistent with the canonical interpretation indirect speech as expressing the reported speech event from the perspective of the current speaker (Wierzbicka, 1974; Evans, 2012). In this respect, the Ungarinyin analysis raises hypotheses about the expression of subjectivity that need to be addressed within a broader typological perspective, but that suggests that apart from pronominal reference a multitude of perspectivising and indexing constructions are involved in expressing the direct-indirect speech continuum.

This chapter has introduced alternatives to the Ungarinyin framing construction and examined elements within and immediately preceding such expressions that account for the interpretation of a perspective shift. The chapter began by introducing the notion of defenestration and by describing the discourse contexts in which it occurred. The following sections then presented stance constructions, indicated some specific ways in which these are relevant for utterances of reported speech and thought and then demonstrated that the distribution of stance constructions favours framing constructions and defenestrated clauses. This indicates that evaluative and aligning stance contribute to the identifiability of the speech and thought attribution interpretation even if they do not strictly mark it. As I have argued in this section, the distribution illustrates a particular type of interaction of elements within the Ungarinyin stance domain.

Defenestration contexts draw attention to the relevance of the discourse environment within which a framing construction or a defenestrated clause occurs. Perspectivising clauses and other types of framing-introducing clauses represent one strategy of applying sequence in discourse to effectuate a perspective shift, but there are many more ways in which framing constructions and defenestrated clauses shape and are shaped by their discourse context. This is the topic I will examine in the next chapter.
Chapter 5. Cohesion: through the fourth wall

Any grammatical sentence will seem unnatural in certain contexts, but conversely, contexts can be found where it will be heard as a natural thing to say.
— Pawley and Syder, 1983, p. 198

5.1. Introduction

Framing constructions are an explicit grammatical strategy for referring to reported speakers, reported cognisants and reported addressees. Framed clauses, typically describing a reported speech situation, introduce at least referents that usually contrast with discourse referents in the current speech situation, simply because the people and entities being talked about in reported speech are often not known or visible to the current addressee. And framing constructions are not randomly distributed throughout discourse: the choice between representing some information with a framing construction, a defenestrated clause or as a non-attributed, descriptive utterance is meaningful in itself, particularly within narratives.

The three observations in the preceding paragraph intimately connect framing constructions with the topic of discourse and discourse reference. In this chapter I will examine how the referents in framed and framing clauses are being integrated into a stretch of talk and what the contexts are in which framing constructions, as Pawley and Syder (1983) put it, appear ‘a natural thing to say’. These properties present a new angle on framing constructions as ‘theatrical devices’. The title of this chapter evokes the common notion in performance arts of a ‘fourth wall’, which is conceived of as separating the portrayed reality of the theatre from the current reality of the performance. In performing a framed speech event referential elements commonly refer in the portrayed reported speech event, but occasionally they permeate the ‘fourth wall’ between the reported speech event represented by the framed or defenestrated clause and the here-and-now referring discourse.

I will begin in section 5.2 with an overview of discourse devices and strategies in Ungarinyin, irrespective of whether they occur inside or outside utterances of reported speech, thought and intentionality. The section starts with a general discussion of discourse referential devices in section 5.2.1 and a summary of strategies for marking non-clausal dependencies in section 5.2.2. Section 5.3.1 addresses the distribution of framing constructions over the course of a
narrative and the specific functions these constructions may have, on the basis of a short narrative text. Collectively, I will refer to the three topics discussed in this section (discourse reference, extra-clausal relations and discourse organisation) as ‘cohesion’.

Section 5.3 considers how cohesion is expressed in and interacts with Ungarinyin expressions of reported speech, thought and intentionality. Section 5.4 concludes with a brief discussion of the relation between stance and cohesion.

5.2. An overview of discourse devices and strategies in Ungarinyin

This overview section of Ungarinyin discourse addresses strategies for reference tracking (5.2.1.1), information structure (5.2.1.2), discourse connectives (5.2.2.1) and insubordination (5.2.2.2).

5.2.1. Discourse referential devices and strategies in Ungarinyin

Perhaps the only two firm conclusions that can be safely drawn from the vast literature on discourse reference and discourse organisationⁱ are, firstly, that the choice of a referential device can rarely be reduced to one single principle or rule, and, secondly, that one process in discourse usually depends on another. As Fox (1987: 167) suggests, discourse reference and discourse organisation are closely connected: sometimes a particular referential device is chosen to mark a development in the discourse, sometimes a ‘discourse boundary’ prompts the use of a specific discourse referential device, and often the causality between the two is indeterminate.² The following passage from Coma, a thriller by Robin Cook, recounting a fight between two characters illustrates the basis for this assessment:

‘Susan herself was amazed at the effect and stepped into the amphitheater, watching D’Ambrosio’s fall. She stood there for an instant, thinking that D’Ambrosio must be unconscious. But the man drew his knees up and pulled himself into a kneeling position. He looked up at Susan and managed a smile despite the intense pain of his broken rib.

“I like ’em... when they fight back,” he grunted between clenched teeth.

Susan picked up the fire extinguisher and threw it as hard as she could at the kneeling figure. D’Ambrosio tried to move...’ (Fox, 1987: 167)

The referential expressions printed in italics above could be replaced by pronouns but are formed by more informative lexical nominal constructions or proper names, which are unexpected under a Gricean assumption of economy: these are not the minimal forms necessary

---

¹For a brief overview of studies relevant to discourse in Australian languages see Baker and Mushin (2008: 6–7), who suggest that the area of discourse studies best studied in the Australianist tradition is that dealing with the pragmatic effects of word order (Baker and Mushin, 2008: 8).

²For other references to authors making a similar point, see Stirling (2001: 9).
to express the intended meaning. The reason why these referential devices show up exactly in these places is because the sentences in which they occur describe events that are surprising *(the man)* and/or represent a new development in the story. In this way, the pragmatically marked referential devices signal stages of narrative structure (for a more detailed analysis, see Fox, 1987; also see Stirling, 2001; Verstraete and De Cock, 2008).

In this section I will discuss discourse reference as a combination of two processes: reference tracking (section 5.2.1.1), which is an intersubjective process in which the speaker refers to discourse entities in such a way that – she assumes – the addressee can identify these referents, and information structuring (section 5.2.1.2), which is a more explicit presentation of the discourse referents involved in the described event, either because the speaker intends to emphasize the role of certain referents or because the addressee fails to identify the referent. Neither of these two processes can be strictly isolated, nor are the expressions of discourse reference and information structuring independent from other aspects of discourse structure to be discussed below. But the two are partially associated with distinct constructions and strategies in Ungarinyin, which I introduce here.

5.2.1.1. Reference tracking

Discourse referential devices are grammatical elements, constructions and strategies used to refer to participants in depicted events and in the (reported) speech situation whose form and expression are guided by the speaker’s estimation of whether the addressee is able to identify the intended participant. Following Kibrik (2011) I will consider two types of discourse referential devices: *full referential devices* and *reduced referential devices*. Full referential devices include proper names and all noun phrase constructions (Kibrik, 2011: 38); reduced referential devices ‘fall into two categories: pronouns [...] and zero forms [...]’ (Kibrik, 2011: 39). The examples in (195) illustrate the main types of full referential devices in Ungarinyin (the relevant elements are underlined).

(195)  

a.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ari jirri</th>
<th>kali budmanangka</th>
<th>amalarrda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ari jirri</td>
<td>kali burr-ma-nangka</td>
<td>a-malarr-ra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{man m.ANAPH sit 3pl-do-3sg.IO 3msg-forehead-LOC}
\]

‘The man has sores on his forehead’ (lit.: The man, they sit on him on his forehead)  
(110924-04DSES, 08:08-08:15)

b.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>andu orroli</th>
<th>linynga</th>
<th>nyelan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>andu orroli</td>
<td>liny-nga</td>
<td>nya₂-y₁ ila-ŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{m.AMBIPH dingo see-EMPH 3sg.O:3sg.S-HOLD-PRS}
\]

‘This dingo is just watching her’ (100903-01NGUN, 00:53-00:54)
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c.  *jinda kundi ngurrba nyumindan yilakurde*  
   *jinda kundi ngurry-ba nyɔ2-ɔ-minda-n yila-kurde*  
   m.PROX husband hit-ITRV 3sg.O:3sg.S-TAKE-PRS child-COM

   ‘This husband hits her while she holds the kid [lit.: with the kid]’ (090812JENGPDc, 1:35-1:37)

d.  *andu jirri yila nongarrijkarra ama*  
   *andu jirri yila nongarrij=karra a1=ma*  
   m.AMBIPH m.ANAPH child run.away=maybe 3msg-DO

   ‘He, this kid might run away’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 10:25-10:27)

e.  *ari bern e arrangu:: wuranda*  
   *ari bern a1-i y2i arrangu:: wuran-ra*  
   man climb.up 3msg-BE on.top tree-LOC

   ‘The man climbs all the way up the tree’ (100903-09NGUN, 0:26-0:29)

The nominal constructions in (195a-195c) involve combinations of a noun and an adnominal anaphoric, ambiphoric or demonstrative pronoun, respectively. As indicated in section 2.2.3, anaphoric pronouns predominantly follow nouns in nominal constructions, whereas the order of other elements in nominal constructions is more flexible. The position of the pronoun is meaningful in that an initial pronoun focusses attention on a newly introduced or re-introduced referent, which provides a discourse-based explanation for why adnominal anaphoric pronouns rarely occur in initial position. Full referential devices with anaphoric pronouns as in *ari jirri ‘the/some man’* in (195a) refer to discourse entities that the speaker is treating as identifiable to the addressee on the basis of the preceding discourse. As the translation suggests, this reference does not have to be specific in the sense that the speaker intends the nominal construction to refer to one and only one possible discourse referent whose identity is known to the speaker. As with anaphoric pronouns ambiphoric reference does not include a meaning of specificity. In (195b) the nominal construction *andu orroli ‘a/the dingo’* does not bring a new referent into the discourse, it was introduced as a protagonist at an earlier stage in the story. Example (195b) was preceded, however, by several utterances referring to other discourse entities and at this point in the discourse the dingo has lost prominence. By using the ambiphoric nominal construction the speaker introduces the discourse referent *orroli ‘dingo’* anew, facilitating its identification.

---

3 Examples of anaphoric pronouns in nominal constructions occurring before the nominal are found, however, as shown, e.g., in (195d) and (202).

4 Cf.: ‘Specific reference means that a noun phrase connects to the concept of an individuated, specific person in the speaker’s mind and evokes a ditto concept in an addressee’s mind’ (Kibrik, 2011: 32).

5 This function derives from the general referential function of ambiphoric pronouns, compare the use in example (176b) on page 139.
by the addressee. Ambiphoric nominal constructions in this function often also signal a new stage or scene in the discourse structure, illustrating the interdependency of discourse reference and discourse structure suggested above by Fox (1987) and Stirling (2001). A good alternative translation for (195b) could be a sentence introduced by a discourse connective, such as ‘And (all the while) this dingo just looks at her’. Ambiphoric nominal constructions may also lend prominence to a discourse referent, which is a feature of information structure (see section 5.2.1.2).

Demonstrative pronouns as in (195c) may be used with referents at any stage of the discourse, in constructions introducing, reintroducing or referring back to entities, but one meaning they consistently express is specificity.\(^6\) In (195c) the construction *jinda kundi* ‘the husband’ singles out one specific protagonist from the Family problems picture task story. Demonstratives, with their proximal, medial, remote distinction (see section 2.2.2) also involve a spatial dimension, so *jinda kundi* could alternatively also be translated as ‘this husband here’.\(^7\) Table 5.1 summarises the discourse properties of the pronominal-nominal constructions discussed above (a +/- indicates that the respective pronoun does not specify the column’s feature).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRONOUN TYPE</th>
<th>IDENTIFIABLE</th>
<th>SPECIFIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANAPH</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBIPH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1.: Discourse properties of pronouns in nominal constructions

As (195b) indicates identifiability, the property represented in the first column in table 5.1 is relative to the specific stretch of discourse: by using an ambiphoric (*andu, nyandu* etc.) nominal construction the speaker suggests ‘I assume that within this stretch of discourse D referent \(x\) is not yet identifiable to you’. With an anaphoric nominal construction the speaker suggests that the referent \(x\) is likely identifiable to the addressee and a demonstrative nominal construction is neutral in this respect. Demonstrative nominal constructions carry a meaning of specificity that the two other types of pronominal-nominal constructions do not include. Hence, the three types of pronominal referential devices have (partially) complementary functions.

The complementarity of the anaphoric, ambiphoric and demonstrative nominal constructions explains why pronouns in nominal constructions are often combined in more or less elaborate

\(^6\)Of course, demonstratives may also express an exophoric, situationally determined ‘pointing’ meaning, but in this chapter I will only be concerned with discourse referential functions.\(^7\)For this reason adnominal demonstrative constructions are also often used to introduce new referents (see appendix D, a text in which all new topics are introduced in this way. By using a demonstrative pronoun, signalling specificity rather than, e.g. an ambiphoric pronoun signalling unidentifiability, the narrator indicates that the purpose of introducing the referents is not so much to discuss unknown referents so that the addressee can know about them but to describe specific referents that form part of scene of the narrative.
pronoun complexes. A common combination is that of a pronoun signalling identifiability status and a definite demonstrative pronoun (\textit{andu jina malngarri} ‘this white man’ 148b on page 114 is an example). A slightly less ordinary example is given in (195d), combining an anaphoric and an ambiphoric pronoun. This combination is typical of re-introduced participants: the speaker indicates that she expects the referent \textit{yila} ‘child’ in (195d) to be identifiable to the addressee but not exactly in the way in which it appears in the present scene in the narrative.\footnote{The immediate discourse context for this example is show in (215) on page 192, where the example is discussed further.} Example (195e), finally, illustrates bare nominal reference, a lexical construction neither signalling identifiability status nor specificity.

The referential devices in (195) all represented a type of full referential device, providing a maximum amount of information about the referent. The main types of Ungarinyin reduced referential devices are illustrated in (196) (as before, the relevant elements are underlined).

\begin{center}
(196) \\
\begin{tabular}{lllllllll}
\text{a.} & \text{\underline{\textit{jirri}} jirri} & \underline{\text{\textit{kanda}}} & \underline{\text{\textit{adawula}}} & \underline{\text{\textit{wu-ma-nangka}}} & \underline{\textit{yobi}} & \underline{\text{\textit{kanda}}} \\
\text{b.} & \underline{\textit{ngerr}} & \underline{\textit{ngerr}} & \underline{\textit{ngerr}} & \underline{\textit{amara...}} & \underline{\textit{ama}} & \underline{\textit{andu}} \\
\text{c.} & \underline{\textit{jinda}} & \underline{\textit{ngurr}} & \underline{\textit{nyelan}} & \underline{\textit{ngurr}} & \underline{\textit{nya}} & \underline{\textit{ila-n}} \\
\text{d.} & \underline{\textit{ngurr}} & \underline{\textit{nyelan}} & \underline{\textit{nunngurrrij}} & \underline{\textit{ama}} & \underline{\textit{nunngurrrij}} & \underline{\textit{a}} & \underline{\textit{ma}} & \underline{\textit{ila-n}} & \underline{\textit{nunngurrrij}} & \underline{\textit{take.off}} & \underline{\textit{ama}} & \underline{\textit{3msg-do}} & \underline{\textit{3msg-do}} & \underline{\textit{3msg-do}} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

‘He has one sitting here for him, another one’ [talking about a bottle of beer] (090813AJMJSMPDe, 3:23-3:29)

‘He said... says “ngerr-ngerr-ngerr” ’ (111013-01NGUN, 13:11-13:13)\footnote{The preceding and following utterances contextualising this example are given in example (200b).}

‘He hits her’ (090812JENGPDe, 1:58-2:00)

‘He hits her and leaves’ (090812JENGPDk, 2:08-2:09)

The interpretation of the anaphoric (196a), ambiphoric (196b) and demonstrative (196c) constructions is as in table 5.1, only these examples do not provide any lexical detail about the referent as provided by the nouns in (195). Perhaps the most common reduced referential device in Ungarinyin is the one illustrated twice in (196d): reference through a bound pronoun unaccompanied by any free referential expressions. Like the bare nominal construction in...
(195e) the main difference between (196a-196c) on one hand and (196d) on the other is that the latter does not specify identifiability or specificity status.

I have adopted the distinction between full and reduced referential devices from Kibrik (2011), who couches these terms in a cognitive model of discourse reference. He conceives of discourse reference as a two-stage process, consisting of an 'attention' stage and an 'activation' stage. The attention stage establishes initial reference to a discourse entity by mentioning it, after which it becomes available for activation, renewed adoption into working memory. Activation is a matter of degree: it is possible for a referent to be insufficiently activated in working memory to reach a specific 'activation threshold' (Kibrik, 2011: 54–55) but 'above this threshold, a reduced referential device is used, and below it, a full NP' (Kibrik, 2011: 54).

The process Kibrik (2011) describes for explaining the choice between full and reduced referential devices is schematically represented in figure 5.1.

![Figure 5.1.: Model of referential choice in Kibrik (2011: 64)](image)

The model of referential choice in figure 5.1 states that the ‘aggregate activation’ of a referent, deciding whether activation falls above or below the language-specific threshold, depends on the activation factors ‘discourse context’ and the internal properties of the referent. The discourse context is formed by what was said before the speech moment, associations with introduced events and participants increasing the predictability of a referent and by other perceivable factors in the speech situation. If the scene is set as a drinking party, then a bottle, as in (196a), requires little introduction. The inherent properties of a referent include those in the Silverstein (1976a) referential hierarchy: the speaker-and-hearer-referring first and second person are inherently more easily ‘accessible’ referents than third persons, humans are more salient referents than animals.

---

10The proposal in Kibrik (2011) builds on Chafe (1974ff), who makes a similar point: ‘Each topic amounts to a partially activated cluster of knowledge within which speakers navigate with more limited, fully activated foci of consciousness’ (Chafe, 2002: 258). Where Chafe refers to the broader and more elusive notion of ‘consciousness’, however, Kibrik’s proposal narrows in on working memory, establishing an even more direct connection between referential form and a cognitive capacity.
The relevance of the inherent properties of referents comes out particularly clearly in referential patterns in narrative, as in appendix D and appendix E. In these texts all human protagonists are introduced with bound subject pronouns, signalling that they inherently have a high activation. There is also a distinction between Aboriginal protagonists who take an active role in the story and passive participants/others: the former are exclusively referred to with bound pronouns, the latter with full lexical constructions (almaru ‘white man’ in appendix D, yila child, wungay ‘woman’ and yirrkalngarri ‘police’ in appendix E).

The model in figure 5.1 further involves a ‘referential conflict filter’: if there are multiple equally activated candidates that could be identified as the referent, additional linguistic measures can be taken to avoid ambiguity. The resulting referential form most appropriately reflects the relevant referential choice.

The model of referential choice can be used to predict where to expect pronouns (i.e. reduced referential devices) and where full referential devices. As demonstrated by the comments about episodic structure in the short English text in the introduction of section 5.2.1, other factors may influence the actual form of a referential device, but the existence of marked, meaningful deviations from expected referential forms validates the model in figure 5.1.

The referential conflict filter in figure 5.1 motivates a third type of element interacting with referential devices: referential aids. As the term implies, referential aids are not referential devices per se but can be used to disambiguate reference. They ‘are lexico-grammatical in their nature and sort referents according to a certain feature; hence they can be called referent sortings’ (Kibrik, 2011: 289). Number markers may be such a feature: they ‘sort’ a referent as either singular, dual, paucal or plural, but perhaps the most prototypical referential aids are class/gender markers, which do not directly refer, but do identify a referent as belonging to a particular grammatical gender (see section 2.2.1.2). Kibrik (2011) connects the distinction between referential devices proper and referential aids to a cognitive view of incremental discourse interpretation:

‘If discourse production had only one level of granularity, all referent sortings would be fully equivalent. However [...] processing is incremental [...] and various levels of granularity may be relevant’ (Kibrik, 2011: 338).

All of the pronouns shaded grey in (65) and (66) on pages 46–46 are ambiguous between two or more person forms, meaning that the initial ‘sorting’, the indexing of properties of the

---

11Appendices D and E, respectively, present a narrative and a co-constructed narrative in the form of a dialogue. The transcriptions are annotated for discourse properties (the details of which are explained at the start of appendix D) and the texts are followed by detailed counts and diagrammatic representations of the referents and referential forms in the texts, illustrating the referential devices described in this section and section 5.2.1.2.
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relevant discourse participant, partially fails to identify a referent. In such instances referential aids may guide the addressee in determining who or what is intended.

Ungarinyin has one final referential device that does seem to play a more primary referential role than referential aids, although in contemporary Ungarinyin it is used infrequently. This referential device is a prefix that in the verbal template immediately precedes the root (position -1 in the verbal template in 62 on page 43) and that Coate and Oates (1970) call the ‘long form’ and Rumsey (1982) the ‘definite subject marker’. ‘The long forms,’ Coate and Oates (1970: 54) observe, ‘are far more widely used in narrative than are the short [i.e. forms without the definite subject marker, SS], though both occur together in the text. In conversational speech usually only the shorter forms occur, so the longer forms may be those of the literary or narrative language’. Rumsey (1982) finds that the marker ‘signals that the subject of the verb so marked is an NP which is coreferential to one which has occurred in previous discourse (usually in the immediately preceding clause or sentence) and whose reference has been definitely established’ (Rumsey, 1982: 105). The two utterances in (197), taken from the narrative transcribed in full in appendix H, illustrate a typical discourse sequence involving the definite subject marker.

(197) a. umburungine di yidminjarl ngurrba
  umburu-ngine di yidminjarl ngurr-ba
  what.cha.ma.callit-INSTR n_{w}.ANAPH bushes hit-ASP
  amundan di
  a_{1}-o-minda-n di
  3msg.O-3sg.S-TAKE-PRS n_{w}.ANAPH
  ‘With, what’s it, bushes she hits him then’

b. wurrumarn ay nyumanangka
  wu-irra-ma-rn ay nya_{1}-ma-nangka
  3n_{w}.O:3sg.S-DEFS-take-PRS INTER 3fsg-do-3sg.IO
  ‘With, what’s it, bushes she hits him then. She takes it (the bushes). She says “Ay” to him’ (= lines 45-46 on page 361)

The definite subject marker is shown on the first word in (197b), wurrumarn ‘she takes it (branches)’. Note that the pronominal prefix complex of this verb is potentially ambiguous: it may refer to any third person subject (see the transitive pronoun prefix paradigm in 65) and there are two potential candidates for this third person referent, ‘he’ (the son-in-law) and ‘she’ (the mother-in-law). The definite subject marker indicates that in the present clause the subject pronoun is coreferential with subject of the immediately preceding clause,\(^{12}\) which

\[^{12}\]This use is highly reminiscent of what Stirling (1993: 17–18) describes as a ‘recapitulation clause’ in languages that morphologically mark same subject versus different subject. I have refrained from glossing
identifies the mother-in-law as the subject of *wurrumarn* ‘she takes it’.

5.2.1.2. Information structure

Marked information structuring occurs if initial discourse reference fails because the addressee cannot identify the referent the speaker intended or if the speaker subjectively wants to present discourse referents in a way that is not primarily motivated by their activation in the addressee’s working memory (but, for instance, with the intention of emphasising the referent’s role in the described event).

The choice of the syntactic frame, and hence the availability of bound subject and object pronouns, is a meaningful factor in information structuring (cf. Hopper and Thompson, 1980; Du Bois, 1987). For example, apart from frequently being referenced by bound pronouns, human referents and other protagonists are also often introduced by intransitive constructions, while inanimate, non-protagonist referents are typically introduced as nominal (preverbal) objects being acted upon by (inherently) salient subjects.\(^{13}\) Instances going against this general pattern consequently lend prominence to a referent (or, conversely, take it away).

This principle is clearly demonstrated in the story in appendix D, which revolves around a trip with the purpose of documenting flora and fauna on Ngarinyin country and comes to a climax with the appearance of a *wujingarri* ‘native cat’, an animal the narrator had rarely seen before. This is the only non-human referent that is referenced as a subject in the story.\(^{14}\)

The text in appendix E represents a passage from the Family problems picture task in which the male protagonist, a father who drinks beer and hits his wife, is *exclusively* referred to with pronouns (mostly bound). The wife undergoing the violence and ultimately reporting her husband to the police is referred to with bound pronouns about 60% of the time, but also has a relatively high number of mentions with lexical referential phrases and is even introduced with the oblique (i.e. not cross-referenced) nominal construction *wungaykuyu* ‘to the woman’.\(^{15}\)

This pattern goes against the generalisation about human referents and signals the overall...
lower discourse status of the passive woman protagonist.

While the woman undergoing the violence is mostly cross-referenced as a grammatical object in the story the clear exception to this pattern is when she calls the police in the lines cited below as (198).

(198) NG: kokoj engarri:: kandayu na ngurrba
ko-koj a1-y2-i-ngarri:: kanda-yu na ngurr-ba
REDUP-drink 3msg-BE-SUB nₘ.PROX-LAT now hit-ITRV

nyumindani
nya₂-a-minda-ni
3fsg,O-3sg,S-TAKE-PST

‘And after he was drinking here he hit her’

JE: ngurrba nyumindani
ngurr-ba nya₂-minda-ni
hit-ITRV 3fsg,O:3sg,S-TAKE-PST

‘He assaults her’

NG: nyinda wurla on yirrkalngarri balya bumalu
nyinda wurla a₁-o-u₃-u-n yirrkalngarri balya b₃u=ma=lu
f.PROX talk 3msg-ACT.ON-PRS policeman go IMP-DO=PROX

‘She tells the policeman to come’ (lines 29-32 in appendix E)

In line (198) the woman takes on an active role in the story, and this corresponds to one of the most straightforward parameters for subjecthood distinguished in Hopper and Thompson (1980: 252): ‘agency’. In the co-constructed narrative in the dialogue referents who ‘do things’ are prominent in the discourse and are expressed as subjects. The utterance in which the woman first transforms from a passive to an active participant in the story she is referred to by the subject coreferential pronoun nyinda ‘she’.16

Ungarinyin has a range of nominal strategies for expressing prominence, such as the use of free personal pronouns, as in (199).

(199) darak anya nyiringan darak nyinkayirri
da_rak a₁-o-nya nyiringan darak nyin-w₂a₂-o-yirri
go.in 3msg-GO-DIST 2sg go.in 2sg-IRR-GO-CONT

‘He goes in, but you don’t’ (Coate, 1966: 118, line 285)

Example (199) contains the second person singular free pronoun nyiringan ‘you’ in the second clause, which contrasts with the third person referent in the first clause, referred to with a

16Apart from reinforcing the prominence resulting from the subject-object contrast the gender bearing pronoun also acts as a referential aid, resolving a potential referential ambiguity since the bound subject pronoun in the verb phrase wurla on ‘s/he/it talks’ is only specified for third person.
bound pronoun. First and second person free pronouns in Ungarinyin rarely fulfil a primary discourse referential role, but they express a degree of emphasis, such as for the purpose of highlighting a contrastive relation between referents above. The ambiphoric pronoun set is also often involved in contrastive referential constructions, as the examples in (200) demonstrate. The glosses also include the speaker’s original translation in double quotation marks, to illustrate the way in which she renders the contrastive meaning in (Aboriginal) English.

(200) Discussing the differences in sound of bird calls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>burdu wurla nyumanya</th>
<th>andu</th>
<th>kundi</th>
<th>jongorri wurlan bururu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>burdu wurla nyaa1-ma=nya</td>
<td>andu</td>
<td>kundi</td>
<td>jongorri wurlan bururu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small talk 3sg-DIST</td>
<td>m.AMBIPH husband heavy talk men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| kajin wurla budmangarri |
| kajin wurla burr-ma-ngarri |

SEM talk 3pl-SUB

“She talking light one, him that husband, heavy talking, he talking like a man”

‘She talks light and that husband has a heavy voice, like when men talk’ (111013-01NGUN, 15:12-15:23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b.</th>
<th>belngerr jina</th>
<th>ari</th>
<th>ngerr ngerr ngerr amara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>belngerr jina</td>
<td>ari</td>
<td>ngerr ngerr ngerr a1-ma-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>black cockatoo m.DEM.PROX man ngerr ngerr ngerr 3msg-do-PST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(.06) ama andu</th>
<th>nyandu:: ngarnarn</th>
<th>(.12) ngerr-ngerr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ama andu</td>
<td>nyandu:: ngarnarn</td>
<td>ngerr-ngerr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3msg-do m.AMBIPH</td>
<td>f.AMBIPH white cockatoo</td>
<td>ngerr-ngerr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ngerr-ngerr nyuma nyandu |
| ngerr-ngerr nyuma nyandu |

ngerr-ngerr 3sg-do f.AMBIPH

“Man one, he saying ‘ngerr’, he saying. Her, white cockatoo, she saying ‘ngerr-ngerr’.”

‘This black cockatoo, the man, he said... says ‘ngerr-ngerr-ngerr’, and she, the white cockatoo, says ‘ngerr-ngerr’, ‘ngerr-ngerr’’ (111013-01NGUN, 13:04-13:22)

The first clause in (200a) is comparable to that in (199): its only referential device is a bound pronoun referring to a third person. Following a brief pause the second clause in (200a) is headed by a full referential construction with the anaphoric pronoun andu ‘he’ in first position. Both the prenominal position of the ambiphoric pronoun and the clause initial position of the nominal construction lend the referential construction prominence. Example (200b) shows an additional strategy that is used both as a highlighting strategy and as a strategy for clause combining: the prosodic lengthening of the final syllable in nyandu ‘she’.
In (200b) both referents involved in the contrast, the belngerr ‘black cockatoo’ and the ngarnarn ‘white cockatoo’, are referred to with full referential constructions in preverbal position and a reduced referential construction following the verb. The ambiphoric pronoun, which is found in both clauses, is particularly suitable for the function of (contrastive) highlighting: it signals that the referent so marked is not yet identifiable to the addressee. By using the ambiphoric pronoun the speaker indicates: ‘I know you are perhaps aware of referent $x$ but I intend to introduce $x$ here in a new capacity’.

There are also other types of pronouns that can be used to lend prominence to a referent in nominal constructions. The anaphoric pronoun in Bungguni jirri ‘this/the Bungguni’ in (201) is combined with a person name, a full referential device that does not normally require an adnominal pronoun since named referents are identifiable per definition.

(201) Bungguni jirri amara
    Bungguni jirri a₁-ma-ra
Bungguni m.ANAPH 3msg-do-PST

‘This is what Bungguni said’ (Coate, 1966: 114, line 202)

The addition of the anaphoric pronoun in (201) highlights that the respected elder Bungguni, and no one else, was the author of the reported utterances. With this highlighting, information structuring function anaphoric pronouns may also be found in prenominal position, as in (202).

(202) a. kunya amarerri jirri wadmuna? (.17)
    kunya a₁-ma-ra-yirri jirri warrmuna
where 3msg-do-PST-CONT m.ANAPH opossum

‘What was the opossum doing?’ (= line (20) on 312)

b. arrunangkungu wandi andoningarri birri ngala (.03)
    arrunu-a-ngkugu wandi andaw-ŋi-ŋarri birri ngala
above-GEN create 3pl.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PST-SUB pl.ANAPH animal

‘God created these animals’ (= line (166) on page 332)

Apart from clause initial and prenominal positioning, repetition is another strategy through which the highlighting function of adnominal demonstratives in referential constructions may be signalled. The underlined construction in (203) with the proximal demonstrative pronoun kanda ‘this’ is a case in point.

---

17This description nicely illustrates the difference between ‘activation of $x$’ and ‘identification’. The opposition between full versus reduced referential devices, associated with the non-activated/activated distinction, signals either a completely unintroduced referent in the current stretch of discourse or an episodic break in the discourse. Identification requires neither: a contrast can only be set up if there is some preexisting expectation on behalf of the addressee about the referent, which means that the referent is often (somewhat) activated and necessarily implies continuity in the discourse.
Chapter 5. Cohesion: through the fourth wall

PN introduces the topic of stones (rarrki di ‘rock’) and states there are rocks with different names, prompting JE’s suggestion in the first line.

JE: *manjarn di* (.05)

PN: *aka* (.04) *kanda kanda walngun di* (.44) *wumankarr*

JE: ‘[You mean] *manjarn*, stone’

PN: ‘No, this name here: *wumankarr*, black rock, *dinki*, limestone and *kumbarru*, yellow stone’

JE: ‘Oh, yeah’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 0:47-1:03)

The repetition of *kanda* ‘this’ in the underlined referential construction again calls up a contrast between referents, in this instance the name Jilgi Edwards mentions in her first turn and the specific name Paddy Neowarra (Nyawarra) has in mind.

Apart from bound and free pronominal strategies for signalling prominence, Ungarinyin also has several lexical and morphological devices for highlighting a particular referent. One such device is the marker *arri* ‘about’, as in the underlined construction in (204).

(204) B: *bala wungo amara arri ngawa menyi merr*

B: ‘I spread it out,’ he thought. And when there was rain, it got close to him’
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A: ‘Yeah’ (= lines (38)–(40) on page 314–314)

The function of the construction with *arrirri* ‘about’ underlined in (204) is often to introduce or highlight a referent, but unlike the pronominal strategies without setting up a contrast with another constituent. In (204) *arrirri ngawa* simply signals ‘now I will talk about the rain’. Morphological highlighting devices include *-nga* ‘only’ (e.g. 36 on page 30, 54b on page 39, 61c on page 42, 82 on page 58, 97e on page 64, 113 on page 78, 192a on page 151, 244a on page 218, 248c on page 221, 254b on page 226) and *-yali* ‘indeed’ (e.g. 3 on page 2, 67 on page 46, 95 on page 63, 151 on page 118, 157 on page 123, 244a on page 218, 245 on page 219).

5.2.2. Extra-clausal dependencies

This section discusses two strategies through which an Ungarinyin speaker may signal relations between elements in a discourse, in addition to referential constructions. More particularly, section 5.2.2.1 looks at discourse connectives, linking elements signalling a relation between a clause and other elements in the discourse and section 5.2.2.2 considers the non-local interpretation of formally dependent clauses, insubordination.

5.2.2.1. Connectives

Of the three most prominent discourse connectives in Ungarinyin, only one resembles a classical logical connector, the conjunction *a/ya* ‘and’, which also functions as an infrequent linking device in coordinated nominal and clausal constructions (see section 2.4.2.1). The underlined instances in the dialogue in (205) introduce questions which speaker A adds to previous questions in the discourse (also see 217 below).

(205) A: *ya munda Diliri-RA? ya munda Diliri-RA?*

\[\underline{CONN} n_m {\text{PROX}} \text{Diliri-LOC}\]

B: \textit{wawi munda} (.05)

\textit{wawi munda}

\textit{plain/field} \textit{n_m {\text{AMBIPH}}}

A: *ya anja yidmungkal di wembarr woningarri? ya anja yidmungkal di wembarr wu-a-u ni-ngarri* \[\underline{CONN} \text{what bushes} n_w {\text{ANAPH}} \text{break} n_w {\text{O-3sg.S-ACT.ON-PST-SUB}}\]

A: ‘And is this place at Diliri?’

\[\text{The transcription in Coate (1970) attributes this line to speaker A, interpreting it as a question inquiring about the referent.}\]
Capell and Coate (1984: 52) make the following more general remarks on connectives in Ungarinyin texts:

‘Use of connectives seems to depend to a degree on the length of the narrative as the narrator envisages it. [...] The almost complete absence of connectives in the shorter texts is very striking [...] Each sentence is a kind of cameo, independent of its neighbours. The only connective liable to appear in this situation is [(Ungarinyin)] [beja] and this is really not just a connective but a sequence indicator, bringing in relative, though not absolute, time [...] If the story is prolonged, conjunctions begin to appear more freely; in [Ungarinyin] di (‘this’ but becoming rather ‘then this’, ‘and then’) begins to be found’ Capell and Coate (1984: 52).

The marker beja ‘alright, finished’ is an interjection and completive aspect marker (see section 2.3.1.2) and is often used at the conclusion of a narrative to indicate that the story has ended. The w-neuter anaphoric pronoun di ‘(and) then’, not in its regular referential function but conventionalised as a temporal connective, is, pace Capell and Coate (1984), a relatively common connective in narratives. Example (206), shown in context as (7) below, illustrates this use.19

\[(206)\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{\underline{Di}} & \text{joli} & \text{amindanilungarri} \\
\text{joli} & \text{a1-minda-ni=lu-ngarri} \\
\text{n0,-ANAPH} & \text{return} & \text{3msg-bring-PST=PROX-SUB}
\end{array}
\]

‘Then when he came back...’ (= line 7 on page 294)

The most surprising Ungarinyin discourse-organising connective was already introduced in section 2.2.1.1 and 2.4.2.1: the non-spatial interpretation of the lative case that I have labeled ‘paragraph case’. Rumsey (1987), who discusses the discourse function of the lative case more fully, describes the paragraph marker as a semantic extension of the spatial ‘up to’ meaning of the lative case: the lative case on the clause-initial noun in (207b) marks that the (preceding) clause ‘is the terminus of a certain movement in the flow of discourse’ (Rumsey, 1987: 607).

19 Also see, e.g., (97c) on page 64, (10–13) and (14) on pages 356-357 and (75) on page 320 and elsewhere (also see section 2.4.2.1).
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(207) a. **nyangannga kaduk winyjo amerera**
   nyimgan-nga kaduk winya2-w1 u a1-ma-ra-ra
2sg-EMPH cut 3nsw.sg:2sg-ACT.ON 3msg-say-PST-1sgDAT

b. **nginju kaduk wungoninangka**
   ngin-ju kaduk wng1-w1 u-ni-nangka
1sg-LAT cut 3nsw.O:1sg-S-ACT.ON-PST-3sg.IO

“You cut it [my hair],” he said to me’

‘So I cut it for him’ (Rumsey, 1987: 607)

Rumsey (1987) adds the interesting observation that the lative case in its paragraph marking function is ‘partially complementary’ to the definite subject marker (Rumsey, 1987: 608). As indicated, the definite subject marker signals a continuation of the discourse, whereas the paragraph case appears in the first clause of a new episode.

5.2.2.2. Insubordination

Insubordination, ‘the conventionalized main clause use of what, on *prima facie* grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses’ (Evans, 2007: 367) in Ungarinyin primarily plays a role in discourse organisation. All instances of ‘insubordinate’ morphology appear to be of the type Mithun (2008) analyses as markers of ‘extra-clausal dependency’.

This type of extra-clausal dependency marking insubordination is frequent in Ungarinyin discourse: (208) is a typical example.

(208) **Discussing the sound of the call of a specific bird:**

**NG:** andu amangarringa wurla ama anangka wurlannnga
   andu a1-ma-ngarri-nga wurl a1-ma anangka wurlan-nga
3msg.AMBIPH 3msg-do-SUB-ONLY talk 3msg-do 3msg.POSS language-ONLY

**SS:** hn!

**NG:** ‘sh sh’ amangarri
   sh sh a1-ma-ngarri
   sh sh 3msg-do-SUB

---

20 Example transliterated and morphological gloss added

21 The wide array of functions Evans (2007: 423–427) finds in insubordination in Australian languages and elsewhere, expressing modality (e.g. epistemic), mood (e.g. admonitive) and information structure are absent in Ungarinyin. Evans (2007: 274–276) describes the process of constructionalisation leading to insubordination as a sequence of ‘pragmaticisation’ and subsequent ‘depragmaticisation’ (cf. ‘subjectivisation’/‘objectivisation’ in Langacker, 1990) ‘occurring in situations where a high degree of intersubjective alignment between speaker and hearer can be presupposed’ (Evans, 2009). The type of insubordination found in Ungarinyin appears to have undergone this process only to a limited extent.
SS: *yow*

yeah

NG: *nak anjumindani?* mardu mardu nyindangarri kanda?  
*nak anja2-minda-ni?* mardu mardu nyin-a-ngarri kanda?  

hear 3msg.O:2sg.S-TAKE-PST walk walk 2sg-GO-SUB ngu-PROX

NG: ‘When it speaks, it only speaks its own language, ‘sh sh’ it says. Did you hear it when you were walking this way?’ (111013-01NGUN, 18:01-18:11)

In the first and last turn in (208) Pansy Nulgit (Ngalkad) forms canonical temporal subordinate clauses, expressing an action contemporaneous with a main clause (i.e. ‘talking a language while speaking’ and ‘hearing s.o./s.th. while walking’). The underlined formally subordinate clause in her second turn is slightly different: the imitation of the bird’s call is an elaboration of the first turn in (208), it provides further details about the exact sound of the bird call, but the construction it is also a self-contained utterance.\(^{22}\) As per Mithun (2008), formally subordinated elements in Ungarinyin that are not clearly dependent on a particular main clause do not advance the discourse/narrative but provide background information or describe events that are discursively secondary to what-is-being-talked-about. A second example is shown in (209).

\[(209)\]

\[
\begin{array}{lllllllll}
\text{ngarnki} & \text{nyina} & \text{dubalangarri} & \text{nyinyingarri} & \text{diyali} & \text{yilela} & \text{bunda} \\
\text{snake} & \text{f.PROX} & \text{red} & \text{3sg-be-PST-SUB} & \text{ngu-INDEED} & \text{kid-REDUP} & \text{PL} \\
\text{buk} & \text{biya} & \text{dubalangarri} & \text{kulin} & \text{bingarri} \\
\text{come.out} & \text{3pl-go} & \text{red} & \text{be.born} & \text{3pl-be-SUB} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘That snake was red. Because of that, when the kids are born they come out red as well’ (110925-04NGUN, 1:30-1:39)

Example (209) is taken from a story about red snakes and black snakes, an allegorical tale about the offspring of unions between Aboriginal people and white people. As figure 5.2 shows, the three clauses of the example form distinct intonation units, with a slight rise after the first subordinate clause, which may imply a dependency relation between the two. This interpretation is less likely in (209), however, due to the presence of the temporal connective *diyali* ‘then (emphatic)’, which appears between the formally subordinate clause and the main

---

\(^{22}\)Nick Evans (p.c.) points out that this example could also be interpreted as a regular subordinated clause to *anangka wurlannga* ‘only his language’ in Ngalkad’s previous turn, i.e. ‘which is to say “sh, sh”’. My insubordination analysis here partially relies on the speaker’s translation of the example and on the communicative impression that the utterance was produced as an independent turn, but I have to acknowledge that alternative analyses are possible (as in many other examples of apparent insubordination in Ungarinyin, e.g. see the discussion in appendix D).
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As Stirling (2010) argues, reported speech is relevant for studying information structuring and discourse reference for two main reasons: first, the distribution of expressions of reported speech tends to play an important role in the organisation of a narrative (Stirling, 2010: 9–11) and second, referring expressions within reported speech belong to a different ‘referential space’ than the general discourse (Stirling, 2010: 7–8): if a referent is activated at the speech moment this does not (necessarily) mean it is activated in the reported speech event represented by
the framed clause, which means that the framed and framing clauses can be expected to form partially separate ‘referential spaces’.

In this section I will address each of these two claims in turn. Section 5.3.1 examines the distribution of framing constructions and defenestrated clauses in discourse, particularly addressing their contribution to signalling prominence. In doing so, the section uncovers distinctions between the information structuring properties of framing constructions of reported speech and thought, reported intentionality and defenestration. Section 5.3.2 analyses patterns of discourse reference in framing constructions and defenestrated clauses. It examines to what extent the model in Kibrik (2011) can be applied to expressions of reported speech, thought and intentionality and identifies examples of discourse contexts in which it breaks down.

In this section I will add a complementary claim to that of Stirling (2010): I aim to demonstrate that discourse reference and information structuring (signalling prominence) are essential topics in accounting for the behaviour of expressions of reported speech, thought and intentionality in discourse and for uncovering the essence of their functionality. This is true not only because observing these properties allows us to distinguish between the respective meanings of framing constructions more fully, but especially because it begins to reveal how framing constructions not only express a single perspective but allow for the expression of multiple perspectives in the same utterance.

5.3.1. Framing constructions as a discourse context

Discourse organisation and the frequency and distribution of framing constructions are intimately connected. For example, Aaron (1992: 237) notes that in Obolo, a Niger-Congo language with a four-way distinction between what the author calls direct, semidirect, semi-indirect and indirect speech constructions ‘[t]he more important the information is, the more directly it is put’. In other words, we find direct speech constructions where the reported message significantly contributes to the development of the story and (more) indirect speech constructions where this is not the case.

Ungarinyin does not have a canonical direct-indirect speech opposition but the observation about direct speech distributions in Obolo is mirrored by those of Ungarinyin framing constructions with a reported speech interpretation. This may in part be related to the dramatising effect of (direct) reported speech (Wierzbicka, 1974): subjective elements in framing construction (of reported speech) are allowed to stand out prosodically adding a theatrical touch, and hence prominence, to an utterance. Figures 5.3a and 5.3b, representing the examples in (210), show clear prosodic spikes for the interjections wo! ‘hey’ and aw! ‘oh’. 
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(210) a. nyangki jina ngabunda jina bulawarri joli bi joli
   nyangki jina ngabun-ra jina bulawarri joli bi joli
someone m.PROX water-LOC m.PROX in.the.middle? return IMP-2i return
joli wo: (.02) ngamara
joli wo: nga1-ma-ra
return hey! 1sg-do-PST

"There is something in the water, there in the middle. Come back, come back, hey!" I said’ (111012-NGUN, 1:54-158)

b. buluba nyina jino minjal a aww: jina rimij
   buluba nyin-a jino minjal a1-a aww! jina rimij
look.around 2sg-go oh! m.DIST eat 3msg-go m.PROX steal
andumarnirra merley [they say] (.06) budmara
andu-ma-rni-ra merley [they say] burr-ma-ra
3pl.O:3msg.S-TAKE-PRS?-1sg.IO oh.dear 3pl-do-PST

"You look around you, oh, he eats (them)! He steals them from us, oh dear" they said’ (100903NGUN,1:33-1:39)

Figure 5.3.: Interjections in framing constructions

The text shown in figure 5.4 on page 185 illustrates, however, that the association between (discourse) prominence and framing constructions is not only based on ‘dramatising re-enactment’. The text constitutes the English free translation of the ‘Fishing’ story, the Ungarinyin version of which is shown in appendix G (pages 351–354) and the line numbers refer to the respective example sentences in the appendix. The story is divided into six ‘episodes’ or paragraphs, corresponding to the successive stages of development in the narrative. The labels in the right margin follow those in Verstraete (2011) and Labov (1972).

The opening lines 1-4, ‘going fishing’ set the scene, introducing the protagonist (‘you’) and
the protagonist’s dog walking to the river to catch fish. In lines 5-11, ‘starting to fish’ the
protagonist sits down while the dog sleeps alongside him/her. The line ‘They’re watching you’
in (6) introduces a third participant in the story: the fish that are about to be caught. In
the short paragraph ‘fishing’, line 12, the protagonist continues to catch fish, while the dog is
still asleep. These paragraphs represent the ‘orientation’ of the story in terms of Labov (1972:
363), introducing the ‘time, place, persons, and their activity’ (Labov, 1972: 364). In line 13
the dog has woken up and wants to return home, which the narrator presents in the paragraph
‘dog wants to go’, lines 12-17, as a passage of reported speech with the dog addressing the
protagonist. Impatient with the protagonist’s response, in ‘runs off with fish’, lines 18-21, the
dog snatches a fish from the pile and eats it. With the interjection in the paragraph ‘finish’,
line 22, the narrator signals that the telling of the story is complete. The categories of narrative
structure from Labov (1972: 363) in the right margins divide the paragraphs into four groups:
orientation (going fishing, starting to fish, fishing), complicating action (dog wants to go),
resolution (runs off with fish) and coda (end).

The Fishing story contains three framing constructions, each in a different function: reported
intentionality (1) reported speech (13) and reported thought (17), shown below as (211a),
(211b) and (211c), respectively.

(211) a. wana jalku ngiya nyunmangarri
    wana jalku ngiy-a nyin-ma-ngarri
    if  fishing 1sg.FUT-go 2sg-do-SUB

    ‘When you want to go fishing’ (= line 1 on page 351)

b. anjamangarn barij nyinyi amanu
    anjamangarn barij nyin-i-y_{2i} a_{1}ma-nu
    when   get.up 2sg-FUT-BE 3msg-do-2sg.IO

    “When will you go back?” he asks you’ (= line 13 on page 353)

c. anjamangarn ngunngurli amangarri karnangkurr
    anjamangarn ngun-ngurli a_{1}-ma-ngarri karnangkurr
    when  1sg.O:3sg.S.FUT-give 3msg-do-SUB  dog

    ‘He thinks: “When will he give me something?” ’ (= line 17 on page 354)

What stands out with respect to the way in which the framing clauses in (211) are used in the
Fishing story is how unevenly they are distributed over the narrative. The framing construction
at the beginning of the story occurs in a subordinate clause and places the entire narrative
in some hypothetical story world, but the most striking constructions are the examples of
reported speech and thought that cluster together in the fourth paragraph, ‘dog wants to go’:
in the narrative scheme adopted from Labov (1972) the utterances of reported speech and
thought all occur in the complication episode, the passage in which the entities and events as
5.3. Framing constructions in discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOING</th>
<th>When you want to go fishing (1) You walk and walk (2) Your dog follows you (3) to the water (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FISHING</td>
<td>When you throw in your line, he sleeps (5). They’re watching you (6). Then you’re getting fish from the water (7) and you throw them aside (8) on the ground (9) and this dog just keeps sleeping (10) and sleeping (11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISHING</td>
<td>Then you throw aside more (12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>“When will you go back?” he asks you’ (13). The dog gets up (14) This fire keeps burning a little (15) He looks intently at you (16) ‘He thinks: “When will you give me something?” (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANTS TO GO</td>
<td>He gets up and takes one, he snatches it (18) Then he runs away (19) He goes and eats by himself (20) this dingo, this dog of yours (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUNS OFF</td>
<td>Yes (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4.: A narrative syntax representation of the Fishing story in appendix G
laid out in the orientation episode are given their narrative significance. This pattern is observed in Verstraete (2011), who applies the categories of narrative structure from Labov (1972) to stories of personal experience in the Cape York language Umpithamu:

> ‘From a procedural perspective, we could [...] say that [reported speech and thought] signals what the main issue of the narrative will be: the first instance of [reported speech and thought] in a narrative tells the audience that this will be the main problem it will deal with’ (Verstraete, 2011: 507). ‘[I]f there is a complication episode in a narrative, it will contain at least one instance of [reported speech and thought]’ (Verstraete, 2011: 505).

Verstraete (2011: 505) notes that Labov (1972) makes the observation that ‘evaluative resources (including [reported speech and thought]) tend to peak in-between the complication and the resolution’ and Stirling (2010: 10) similarly finds that reported speech in a Ganalbingu hunting narrative introduces the ‘key events’ of the story. The Fishing story illustrates that the observations in Ungarinyin replicate this pattern. ‘Framing a clause as a quotation’, McGregor (2011: 690) writes, ‘serves to highlight it, drawing attention to it as particularly significant in the unfolding of the story’, for any of ‘three main reasons [...]:

(a) it is exceptional or unusual in a way that contributes to the unfolding of the plot;

(b) it is significant in terms of the way it characterises certain narrative characters, constructing their personas;

(c) it is significant in the context of the narration process itself, the [current speaker].’

(McGregor, 2011: 690–691)

Reported speech in a narrative does not only ‘serve to move a story along chronologically’ (Vincent and Perrin, 1999: 292), or is indiscriminately used to highlight important events in the story but relates to organisational properties at the level of macro-structure. Although the analyses by Verstraete (2011) and McGregor (2011) pertain to narrative texts in particular, they are relevant for the way in which framing constructions function in connected speech across genres and discourse modes.

In her study of reported speech constructions in the Peruvian language Aguaruna, Larson (1978: xiii) states that these may be used for ‘highlighting events and participants’ and representing ‘nonspeech acts such as awareness attribution’, i.e. they show a similar polysemy.

---

23 Labov (1972: 370) writes that ‘only [...] the complicating action [...] is essential if we are to recognize a narrative’.

and discourse function to Ungarinyin framing constructions. The distribution of framing constructions in Ungarinyin discourse also shows, however, that the prominence meaning does not extend to all functions of framing constructions, since the highlighting function does not extend to framing constructions of reported intentionality. Note that the single occurrence of reported intentionality in the Fishing story in (211a) occurs in a subordinate clause, i.e. a construction type presenting backgrounded information.

As (212) demonstrates, framing constructions of reported speech can in fact occur as subordinate constructions, but only when the content of the framed clause is of little importance.

(212) ngadaka wurlan kanda wayu ona birrke (.23)
ngadaka wurlan kanda wa-yu ona birr-w2a2-yi
1pl.INC.POSS language n-wall.PROX NEG-LAT KNOW 3pl-IRR-be

ngadmarndungarri (.13) kuya ngadmarndungarri nyulwankurr
ngarr-ma-rndu-ngarri kuya ngad-ma-rndu-ngarri nyulwankurr
1pl.INC.S-do-3pl.IO-SUB get.out 1pl.INC.S-do-3pl.IO-SUB humbug

kurrke (.07) ngadmarndunga anja birri
kurr-w2a2-2y2i-o (.07) ngad-ma-rndu-nga anja birri
2pl-IRR-be 1pl.INC.S-do-3pl.IO-ONLY what 3pl.ANAPH

budmangarriku
bud-ma-ngarriku
3pl.S-do-1pl.INC.IO

“They don’t know our language ... when we talk to them. When we just say to them: “Go, don’t disturb us,” they ask us what that means” [lit.: ‘What are they?’] (100831-01NGUN, 2:44-2:56)

In (212) the speaker tells about the language proficiency of Ngarinyin children and uses the subordinate clause ngadmarndungarri ‘when we say/talk to them’ to frame the single word kuya ‘get out’ not to talk about a specific saying event but to describe a generic speech situation. Even in this case, though, the slightly longer framed clause nyulwankurr kurrke ‘don’t disturb us’ is framed with a non-subordinate clause construction: expressing a reported speech meaning in a subordinate clause is clearly dispreferred. Subordinated framing constructions of reported intentionality, on the other hand, play a more important role in discourse, providing a motivation for the main clause event, as (213) illustrates.
Chapter 5. Cohesion: through the fourth wall

(213) a. kundayal barrabarra welanyina banmarn
kanda-yl ali barra-barra wa2-yl ila-nyini banmarn
3n-.PROX-INDEED talk-talk 3n-.HOLD-PST magician

bindiningarringarri berruru birri marrkala, banmarn
bunda2-ininga-rrri-n-garrri berruru birri marrkala, banmarn
3pl.O:3pl.S-put-DU-SUB men 3pl.ANAPH novice magician

bunganju budmangarri
bunga2-anju burr-ma-ngarri
3pl.O:1sg.S-make 3pl-do-SUB

‘This is how the story was told about when these novices were to be made magicians,
because they wanted to make them magicians’ (Coate and Oates, 1970: 85)25

b. ngarrun balya badarn
ngarrun balya barr-ra-n liny bungo
1pl.INC go 3pl.O:1pl.EXC.S-GO.TO-PRT see 3pl.O:1sg.S-ACT.ON-FUT

ngadmangarri
ngarr-ma-ngarri
1pl.EXC-DI-SUB

‘We are going to them because we want to see them’ (090812-JENGPDk, 3:12-3:14)

In (213a) the subordinated framing clause of reported intentionality motivates the subject
matter of the story and in (213b) it motivates the action described in the main clause.

The patterns observed above regarding the distribution of reported speech, thought and in-
tentionality over subordinated clauses are confirmed for the long narrative in Coate (1966). For
this text I have coded a wide range of discourse functions using MMAX2 (Müller and Strube,
2006), as detailed in appendix J. Table 5.2 lists the frequencies of utterances of reported
speech, thought, intentionality and naming in Coate (1966), their occurrences with their dis-
tributions in subordinate clauses and the relative frequency of these functions in subordinate
clauses compared to the total number of occurrences in the third column. As expected, the
contrast between the distribution of framing constructions of reported speech (and thought) as
opposed to reported intentionality is particularly stark, with about 78 % of occurrences found
in subordinate clauses, while for reported speech the percentage is about 15 %.

Framing constructions of naming, which can be interpreted as talking about words rather
than using these words in a meaningful way within the discourse, are slightly more frequent in
subordinate clauses than framing constructions of reported speech and thought, but nowhere

25Transliteration, glosses and translation adapted. Original translation: ‘He began to tell a story (about)
when these novices were to be made magicians; ‘I will make them into doctors’, that’s what they say’.

26Note that none of the framing constructions in Coate (1966) are unambiguously interpretable as reported
thought, and therefore the framing constructions of reported speech are classified into two groups, with one
leaving the possibility of being interpretable as reported thought.
Table 5.2.: Functions and occurrences of framing constructions and defenestrated clauses in Coate (1966)\textsuperscript{26}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of the construction</th>
<th>Construction type</th>
<th>Total # of occurrences</th>
<th>Total # in sub. clauses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>naming</td>
<td>framing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported intentionality</td>
<td>framing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported speech</td>
<td>framing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported speech defenestrated</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported speech or thought</td>
<td>framing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

near as frequent as those of reported intentionality.

Table 5.2 also shows that the proportion of defenestrated clauses, i.e. clauses expressing the meaning of a framing construction without a framing clause, occurring in subordinate clause constructions is similar to that of framing constructions of reported speech and thought. This is illustrated particularly clearly in the short passage from the Family problems picture task discussed as (198) above.\textsuperscript{27} The simple clause construction *nyinda wurta on yirrkalngarri* ‘she calls the police’ introduces the only example of (defenestrated) reported speech in the co-constructed narrative and occurs at a stage at which the woman for the first time is represented as a subject and an active participant in the story (as opposed to a passive undergoer of violence). In other words, the only occurrence of reported speech in the text marks a ‘transformational event’ (Verstraete, 2011: 512), highlighting the changed role of the woman.\textsuperscript{28}

Based on these characterisations examples such as in (214) may initially seem puzzling. They are examples of insubordination occurring in the context of defenestrated reported speech.

\begin{verbatim}
(214) a. liny ngayangarri ho:: wularnburr babilij budma
      liny ngay-a-ø-ngarri ho:: wularnburr babilij burr-ma-ø
      see 1pl.INC-GO-PRS-SUB oh! things fill.up 3pl-DO-PRS

      ‘Then we saw: “Oh, it is full of things!” ’ (100903-19NGUN, 2:00-2:04)

b. bulo ngala jiriki (.015) nyonya jina linyju nyidningarri
   bulo ngala jiriki nyonya jina liny-ju nyirr-yi-nyi-ngarri
3pl.DIST animal bird other msg.PROX see-LAT 1pl.EXC-BE-PST-SUB
   awh!
   awh!
   ah
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{26}The relevant construction in this example was also cited as an example of defenestration introduced by a speech event specifying clause in (142) on page 110.

\textsuperscript{27}This effect is only attained by reported speech: contrast (198), which evokes a reported speech situation in the sense of figure 3.1, for example, with the simple clause *descriptions* of talking events in lines (7) and (8) on page 299 in appendix E, which do not mark a similar degree of prominence.
‘This bird [is there] ... and then we suddenly saw another one, oh!’

Example (214a) is a typical example of defenestration with an introductory perspectivising clause (see section 4.2.1). It describes a group of people going up to a bowerbird’s nest and discovering it is full of stolen goods. The example comes from a different telling of the bowerbird story in appendix C and introduces a pivotal moment in the story in which the protagonists finally discover where their stolen belonging have ended up and who took them. Line (214b) introduces the climax of the story in appendix D about the bush trip to document wildlife and plants: the narrator spots a native cat, a great result for the trip! The ‘climatic’ nature of the sentence is highlighted through several linguistic devices that contribute a sense of unexpectedness and prominence: there is a lative case paragraph marker appearing on the coverb, representing a sudden or surprising break with the preceding discourse and exclamative interjection *aw!,* which is prosodically prominent.29

As indicated in section 5.2.2.2 insubordinate clause constructions in Ungarinyin serve to background the events described in them, they describe events supporting the story line, not moving it along further: within the narrative syntax of Labov (1972) they are expected in, e.g., orientation episodes, but not in a complication or climax, which are normally made up of independent clauses (Mithun, 2008: 72). Although the *wujingarri* ‘native cat’ is referred to with independent clauses in the lines following (214b), the moment at which the narrator spots the animal would certainly seem to warrant a higher degree of discourse prominence than a formally subordinate clause could convey, as would the climactic event in (214a).

The crucial difference between the frequencies of subordinated defenestration in table 5.2 (relatively low, as expected) and the defenestrated clauses in (214) is that the (in)subordinated clauses do not occur within the defenestrated construction, but describe a background to the defenestrated speech event. As Mithun (2008: 73) observes in Navajo and elsewhere, a typical discourse context in which (in)subordinate constructions appear are speaking events, utterances of reported speech. Although—for the Ungarinyin data, and perhaps more generally—this would initially appear to lead to a contradiction (reported speech constructions express prominence while at the same time facilitating a strategy that serve to present backgrounded events) this observation provides further evidence of the discourse function of reported speech. Rather than isolated formally subordinate clauses, *liny ngayangarri* ‘we see’ in (214a) and *linyju nyidnyingarri* ‘and then we saw’ in (214b) describe mental states preceding the defenestrated speech event. In this sense, the insubordinate clauses function in a similar way to ‘regular’ subordinate clauses, describing an event that occurred prior to the following main

---

29 For further details see D on page 295, which shows the pitch contours of the example sentences and shows a shift to a historical present in the following line, bringing the spotting event conceptually particularly even closer to the hearer.
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But instead of depicting the background to a typical main clause, the formally subordinate clause forms the background to a defenestrated reported message clause, which itself functions as a highlighting in the discourse.

The observation that both framed and defenestrated clauses have a prominence effect demonstrates it is the function of evoking the message of the reported speech event, not the framing construction _per se_, which accounts for the prominence marking function. This also explains the difference in discourse status between framing constructions of reported speech on the one hand and those of reported intentionality on the other and suggests that at a discourse level Ungarinyin speakers do distinguish the two.

5.3.2. The limits of discourse reference

Having discussed the special significance of framing constructions and defenestrated clauses for the expression of prominence, in this section I will return to discourse reference and the function of referential devices in a narrower sense: for introducing and maintaining activation of referents. The framing analysis of reported speech (McGregor, 1994; 1997), as well as standing traditions within discourse analysis, both suggest that the straightforward connection that exists in regular, non-attributed discourse between working memory and full/reduced referential devices in figure 5.1 is more complex in framing constructions. The function of a framing clause is to set the framed clause ‘off from its environment’ (McGregor, 1997: 254), implying that framing constructions create separate, referential units within the discourse. The framed clause, representing the reported speech event, reflects an internally coherent discourse world, with its own perspectives, participants and referents that the framing clause marks off and presents in a way in so that it can be interpreted by the current addressee.  

31 If we interpret this in a strict sense we would expect first mentions in framed clauses to have a similar form to first mentions in non-attributed discourse since there is no referential connection between them.  

The question whether ‘the boundary between reported speech and surrounding narrative constitutes a barrier to accessibility’ (i.e. whether referents in reported speech constructions are treated more as ‘new referents’ in the discourse), as Stirling (2010: 16) points out, is not only unanswered, it has been systematically ignored in discourse analysis (Stirling, 2010: 6; also see Redeker and Egg, 2006; Verhagen, 2005). For example, Kibrik (2011: 399) explicitly

30 Compare (43) on page 280, a construction similar to (214b) but with a full defenestrated grammatical clause.

31 Note that even though referential patterns in reported speech have not received much attention in discourse analysis, the existence of special pronouns specifically (but not necessarily exclusively) occurring in reported speech constructions, namely logophoric pronouns, is typologically well documented, particularly in African languages (e.g. Hedinger, 1984, also see Evans, 2006: 106; Kibrik, 2011: 315–320; Spronck, 2012a: 97).

32 Note that McGregor (1994; 1997) at no point claims or suggests that this is the case.
omits reported speech constructions from his referential analysis of a Russian text.

A first glance at Ungarinyin discourse suggests that the hypothesis of the framing relation acting as a barrier to referential accessibility may be on the right track. Consider, for example the contrast between the referential devices in the first turn by Alec Jilbidij and the last turn by Scotty Martin in (215).

(215) A passage from the family problems picture task, involving its protagonists ‘father’, ‘mother’ and ‘child’: The father has just been sentenced to jail after having assaulted the mother and mother and child leave the courthouse.

AJ: *wankunjulu* ba *balya ngarrigayirri*
    *wankun-ju* bo2-*a* *balya ngarr-iy-a-ngirri*
    some.time-LAT IMP-go walk 1pl.INC-FUT-GO-DU

SM: *nyumanangka*
    *nyaj1-ma-nangka*
    3fsg-do-3sg.IO

AJ: *nyumanangka*
    *nyaj1-ma-nangka*
    3fsg-do-3sg.IO

SM: *hn!*
    *hn*

AJ: [...]  
    [uninterpretable]

SM: *andu jirri yila nongarrijkarra ama*
    *andu jirri yila nongarrij=karra a1-ma*
    m.AMBIPH m.ANAPH child run.away=MAYBE 3msg-DO

AJ: *nongarrijkarra ama yow*
    nongarrij=karra a1-ma yow
    run.away=MAYBE 3msg-DO yeah

AJ: ‘Go first, we’ll go together,” ’
SM: ‘...she says to him’
AJ: ‘...she says to him’
SM: ‘Hn!’
AJ: [uninterpretable]
SM: ‘This kid, he may run away’
AJ: ‘He might run away, yes’ (090813AJMJSMPD, 10:21-10:28)
In the first turn in (215) Alec Jilbidij produces the initially defenestrated clauses *wankunju ba balya ngarriyanyirri* ‘and now go, we two are going’ in which he now addresses the child. Scotty Martin recognises that the bound pronouns in this utterance refer in a reported speech event, representing a reported message attributed to the mother protagonist and suggests the framing clause *nyumanangka* ‘she says to him’. Alec Jilbidij confirms this interpretation with a resonant framing clause. Scotty Martin subsequently suggests that the child might not want to come along, which he does with the non-attributed construction *andu jirri yila nongarrijkarra ama* ‘this child might run away’ in (215). This final line was introduced above as example (195d), where it was indicated that the ambiphoric and anaphoric adnominal pronouns in this last turn mark *yila* ‘child’ as both identifiable and non-identifiable (a meaning is close to the ‘recognitional use’ of demonstratives in Himmelmann, 1996), leading to the interpretation of the referent being reintroduced.

From the perspective of reference maintenance the full, complex referring expression *andu jirri yila* ‘this child’ seems unmotivated. The referent *yila* ‘child’ is indexed in every single clause of (215) and the difference in gender between the child and the mother acts as a referential aid disambiguating the bound pronoun in the verbal construction *nongarrijkarra ama* ‘maybe he runs away’. If there were still any doubt about the identify of the subject of this verbal construction the *yila* ‘child’ would be sufficient to remove it. So why is the child in the last line presented as a reintroduced topic?

As suggested above, a possible explanation is that that the change in role involves a shift from the reported speech event, in which the child is seen and conceptualised through the eyes of the subject of the framing clause, the mother, to the current speech event in which it is being described from the perspective of the current speaker. By marking the referent as a reintroduced topic it is marked on the one hand as being established and identifiable in the referential world of the framing construction and newly introduced in the referential world of the current speech event.

A second example of a referential shift between referential worlds but in the opposite direction, i.e. from the current speech event to the reported speech event, occurs in (216), taken from the narrative about the Ranger bush trip in appendix D.

(216) *The rangers show the elders videos containing images of animals on Ngarinyin country and ask them to identify these animals*

*idminda* *jinda* *mananarr jinda* *liny*

*irr-minda-ni* *jinda* *mananarr jinda* *liny*

3msg.O:3pl.S-take-PST m.PROX camera m.PROX see
‘They took that picture and wanted to look at it, after they had set it up’ (= line 3 on page 292)

The relevant construction in (216) is *jinda mananarr jinda* ‘this camera/picture here’, which is the object of the initial verbal construction *idmindani* ‘they took it’, where it is indexed with a bound pronoun. Although it can thus be assumed to be activated it is introduced in the framed clause with a full complex referential device. Apart from the observation that the nominal construction contains two demonstrative pronouns, the form of these demonstratives is striking as well: they are the only ones in the story that are not phonetically reduced, i.e. *jinda* rather than *jina*. This complex referring construction also happens to occur in the first framing construction of the story.

Throughout the Ranger story, the narrator uses post-nominal noun demonstrative constructions to introduce a new referent and prenominal demonstratives in noun demonstrative constructions if the entity has been previously mentioned. The double demonstrative noun construction *jinda mananarr jinda* ‘this camera this’ or ‘this camera, it’ appears to be a hybrid referring expression that marks the referent as both ‘old’ and ‘new’. In this sense the construction in (216) mirrors the referent marking as identifiable and non-identifiable in the last line in (215).

The analysis that I propose for (216) is that the complex referring expression, again, connects the referential domain of the general discourse with that of the framed referential event. It serves to ground the referent *mananarr* ‘camera’ both in –in the term of Stirling (2010)– the ‘referential space’ of the narrator, and in that of the reported speakers/cognisants, the rangers, referred to with the third person plural subject pronoun on the framing verb.

Both of these observations are consistent with the accessibility barrier hypothesis in framing constructions and so are observations about the distribution of referential devices over framing constructions and non-framing constructions. Table 5.3 lists the most frequent referential devices in Coate (1966), grouped by their occurrence in non-attributed sentences, framed clauses and framing clauses.33

The frequencies in table 5.3 reveal several properties of discourse referential devices in non-attributed constructions in comparison to framed and framing clauses. The first column demonstrates that roughly half of all referential elements in non-attributed sentences are bound pronouns and the same is true for framed clauses. Nouns make up 16% of the referential devices in both non-attributed discourse and framed clauses and the percentages of anaphoric

---

33For details about how these frequencies were calculated, see appendix J.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENTIAL FORM</th>
<th>NON-ATTRIBUTED CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
<th>FRAMED CLAUSE CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
<th>FRAMING CLAUSE CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bound PN</td>
<td>661/1245 (53 %)</td>
<td>160/296 (54 %)</td>
<td>139/174 (80 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td>205/1245 (16 %)</td>
<td>47/296 (16 %)</td>
<td>4/174 (2 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAPH</td>
<td>116/1245 (9 %)</td>
<td>33/296 (11 %)</td>
<td>5/174 (3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex n</td>
<td>40/1245 (3 %)</td>
<td>4/296 (1 %)</td>
<td>7/174 (4 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBIPH</td>
<td>24/1245 (2 %)</td>
<td>2/296 (1 %)</td>
<td>7/174 (4 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3.: The form and relative frequency of the most common referential devices in Coate (1966)

pronouns compared to the total of referential devices are around 10 % for each. The picture that emerges is that the representations of referential devices in non-attributed discourse and framed clauses are highly comparable.

Framing clauses, on the other hand, show a rather distinct pattern. As for the other two groups, bound pronouns are the most frequent, but no other referential form constitutes more than 4 % of the total of the total of referential devices. Instances such as (217) in which the speaker is presented as a contrastive ambiphoric subject are rare in Ungarinyin.

(217) a nyandu winjangun bay winjora nyumanangka
     a nyandu winjangun bay wu-njo2-w1 u-ra nyoa2-ma-nangka
     CONN 3fsg.AMBIPH fire spin 3n.w.O-2sg.S-act.on-1sg.IO 3fsg.S-do-3sg.IO
     nyinda, umbun walwi
     nyinda umbun walwi
     f.PROX whats-it-called blue.tongue.lizard

‘And she, “twirl the fire for me,” she said to him, eh, the blue tongue lizard’ (= lines (67)–(68) on page 318)

The predominance of bound pronoun-only reference in the framing clause occasionally causes confusion, as the exchange in (218) illustrates.

(218) A: balya bumalu winjangun bay wunjora bunda
     balya bu-ma=lu winjangun bay wu-njo2-w1 u-ra bunda
     go IMP-do=PROX fire turn 3n.w.O-2sg.S-act.on-1sg.IO pl.AMBIPH
     bunguluwannyirri dubala biyirringarri
     bu-njo2-ulwua-n-nyirri dubala bi-yi-o-yirri-ngarri
     3pl.O-1ag.S-be.afraidPRS-DU red 3pl-be-PRS-CONT-SUB
     nyumernangka walamba jinda (.05)
     nyoa2-ma-ra-nangka walamba jinda
     3fsg-do-PST-3sg.IO red.plains.kangaroo m.PROX
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B: *nyinda lirrirri nyumara*

*f.PROX blue.tongue.lizard 3fsg-do-PST*

A: ‘“Come here, twirl the fire for me, I am afraid of them because they are red,” she said to the plains kangaroo’

B: ‘Did the blue tongue lizard say that?’ (= lines 218-218 on page 195)

Such requests for conversational repair are relatively infrequent, however. Speakers will typically only use framing constructions where the reported speaker can be sufficiently established by a bound pronoun. As the analyses in section 5.2 demonstrated, human protagonist referents are often introduced with bound pronouns only and reported speakers naturally fall into this category, which may explain the high representation of bound pronouns in framing clauses in table 5.2.

If framed clauses refer in the reported speech event and framing clauses refer in the current speech event, we could expect the latter to be more similar in its referential profile to non-attributed sentences than framed clauses, which is clearly not the case in Coate (1966). On the other hand, framing constructions are often short and have predominantly human or mythical (subject) referents, which may explain the difference between non-attributed constructions and framing constructions. Also, if it were the case that referents from the ‘main discourse’ have to be reintroduced in framed clauses and vice versa, we might expect the distribution patterns of non-attributed and framed clause constructions to mirror each other as in table 5.2. The findings, therefore, could point both ways.

The picture emerging from table 5.4 is more diverse. It lists the form of referential devices referring to referents that are being introduced into the discourse for the first time in non-attributed sentences, framed clauses and framing clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENTIAL FORM</th>
<th>NON-ATTRIBUTED CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
<th>FRAMED CLAUSE CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
<th>FRAMING CLAUSE CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bound PN</td>
<td>48/194 (25 %)</td>
<td>15/43 (35 %)</td>
<td>7/12 (58 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td>62/194 (32 %)</td>
<td>10/43 (23 %)</td>
<td>0/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAPH</td>
<td>7/194 (4 %)</td>
<td>4/43 (9 %)</td>
<td>0/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex noun</td>
<td>12/194 (6 %)</td>
<td>1/43 (2 %)</td>
<td>1/12 (8 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBIPH</td>
<td>7/194 (4 %)</td>
<td>0/43</td>
<td>1/12 (8 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun ANAPH</td>
<td>15/194 (8 %)</td>
<td>8/43 (19 %)</td>
<td>1/12 (8 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4.: The form and relative frequency of the most common referential devices in initial reference in Coate (1966)

If initial mention in non-attributed discourse and framing clauses served the same function,
we might expect to find the same formal distributions in both, which according to table 5.4 does not appear to be the case. Since most referential devices can have both a reference tracking and an information structuring function (in the definitions suggested in sections 5.2.1.1 and 5.2.1.2) we cannot necessarily assume that differences in the distribution of referential devices in non-attributed sentences and framed clauses suggest differences in their referential status.

However, section 5.2.1 did introduce two strategies that appeared to be reliable indicators of referential discourse status and these are listed in table 5.5: the definite subject marker, signalling a maintained topic, and the postnominal ambiphoric construction, signalling a new topic.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENTIAL FORM</th>
<th>NON-ATTRIBUTED CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
<th>FRAMED CLAUSE CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
<th>FRAMING CLAUSE CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>121/1245 (10 %)</td>
<td>1/296 (0 %)</td>
<td>31/174 (18 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun AMBIPH</td>
<td>12/1245 (1 %)</td>
<td>1/296 (0 %)</td>
<td>0/174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5.: The form and relative frequency of the most common referential devices in Coate (1966)

In comparison to the other grammatical environments, the definite subject marker appears to be surprisingly frequent in framing clauses, an example of which is shown in (219).

(219) *Yobijuyali*  
--- Yobi-ju-y2ali  
--- di  
--- gulangan webun  
--- jinda  
--- di  
--- gulangan wo2-y1ibu-n  
--- jinda  
--- different-LAT-INDEED nwx.ANAPH turn  
--- 3nwx.O:3sg.S-THROW-PRS m.PROX  
--- barmnarn amimbunnyiirringarri.  
--- "Karri, a"  
--- irrumara  
--- barmnarn a1-mimbu-n-nyirri-ngarri  
--- karri, a  
--- irra2-ma-ra  
--- magician  
--- 3msg.O:3sg.S-show-PRS-SUB  
--- oh.yes ah  
--- 3msg.DEFS-do-PST  
--- ‘Then he becomes something different, when this magician shows him. “Oh yes, ah,” he said’ (Coate, 1966: 115, lines 218-219)

With respect to the hypothesis that the non-attributed, and the framing clauses on the one hand and framed clauses on the other, form relatively independent planes of reference, the comparatively frequent occurrence of definite subject markers in framing clauses is a first indication that some parts of the Ungarinyin referential system do treat them as such. In (219) the definite subject form *irrumara* ‘he said’ is coreferential with the subject of the main clause (in historical present tense) immediately preceding the framing construction. Taking into account that definite subject markers often occur in immediately consecutive clauses, the

--- 34 Again, see appendix J for details about these counts.
--- 35 Here and in the following the orthography of examples from Coate (1966) has been adjusted to the one used here but punctuation is preserved (or added) for readability in the transcription line.
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Intrusion of the subordinate clause and the framed clause (consisting of the interjections *karri* and *a*) between the framing clause and the preceding main clause motivate the functional need to signal coreferentiality. This explains the relative frequency of definite subject markers in framing clauses: they referentially connect the framing clause to the general discourse and hence separate them from the referential world of the framed clause.

The same reasoning suggests that framed clauses do not mark coreferential participants with a definite subject marker, even though they have been mentioned in an immediately preceding clause. This prediction is borne out as well. As 5.5 illustrates, both maintaining reference with a definite subject marker and introducing one, using an adnominal ambiphoric construction are exceedingly rare. In fact, in the only occurrence of a definite subject marker in a framed clause the referentiality is internal to a long, framed clause sequence shown with its immediately preceding clause and framing clause in (220).

(220) *Di* irrumarndu. "Wulari be banjali di irra2-ma-rndu wulari be banjali
n=.ANAPH 3sg.DEFS-do-3pl.IO things already leave
ngando:njirri kajingka wararkarr kundara
nganda2-w1-u-n-yirri kajinka warrarrkarr ¿kundara?
1sg.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-PRS-CONT CANNOT look.back ?
kudmuluyirri murlnbu burrayngarri mardu kurrmerri.
kurr-mulu-yirri murlnbu burray-ngarri mardu kurr-ma-yirri
2pl-take.care.of.oneself-CONT trouble nothing-NMLZR walk 2pl-do-CONT
Nyangki darr amaruruku? Ngin ngiyonolin be nguruba
nyangki darr ¿amaruruku? ngin ngiy-onolin be nguru-ba
who stand.up 3msg-do-? 1sg 1sg-well.known already depart-ITRV
ngirrayirri. Wangkun di bura mara ngarriwi,"
ngirra2-a-yirri wangkun di bura mara ngarra2-iy-iwo2-y2i
1sg.DEFS-GO-CONT later n=.ANAPH SHALL see 1pl.INC-FUT-DEFS-BE
irrumarndu
irra2-ma-rndu
3msg.DEFS-do-3pl.IO

‘Then he says to them: “All these things are leaving me. I shall not look back to you again. Take care of yourselves. Go along without trouble. Who will stand for you? I am well-known. Now I am departing (from you). Later we shall see each other,” he says to them‘ (Coate, 1966: 120, lines 322-325)

Example (220) illustrates the linking function of framing clauses, already shown in (219), in an even more emphatic way: the subject of the construction-final definite-subject marked framing clause *irrumarndu* ‘he says to them’ is coreferential with that of *di irrumarndu* ‘then
he says/speaks to them’ in initial position in (220). The definite subject marker in ngirrayirri ‘I am departing’ is coreferential with the subject of the previous non-verbal clause, ngirri ngiyonolin ‘I am well-known’ and this coreferential relation does not cross a boundary between non-framed and framed clause constructions. There is, however, one striking aspect to this particular occurrence of the definite subject marker: it appears on a first person form. First person forms are perhaps the most prototypical definite subjects in any language. Referring to the speaker, its referent is human, identifiable, activated and salient per definition, which explains that it rarely receives any additional markers of definiteness such as with a definite subject marker: the form is all but excluded from occurring with first person referents. However, as (221) demonstrates, first person definite subject markers are found more widely in discourse.

(221) di marda ayirri ngamara ngurr ngurrumernangka
    di marda a1-a-yirri nga1-ma-ra ngurr nga1-ira2-ma-ra-nangka
    nw.ANAPH walk msg-go-CONT 1sg-do-PST kill 1sg-DEFS-do-PST-3sg.IO

‘Then he was walking, I did it, I killed it’ (= line (147) on page 329)

The definite subject markers in these examples, however, do not occur with referents that are present in the regular referential plane of the speech situation. The reason the definite subject marker can occur on a first person subject in (220) and (221) is because the first person in this framed clause is not coreferential with the current speaker, but indexes the reported speaker. A reported speaker that is repeatedly referred to with a definite subject third person form in the immediately surrounding discourse. This indicates that although the distribution of the definite subject marker provides evidence for the (relative) referential independence of the framed and framing clauses, an additional factor is at play, and this factor is perspective: the inclusion of the definite subject marker may not be expected in the reported speech event, i.e. from the perspective of the reported speaker, but is guiding the interpretation in the current speech event, i.e. from the perspective of the current speaker. This collusion of referential, representing aspects of both the perspective of the reported speaker and the current speaker is a phenomenon Evans (2012) calls ‘bi-perspectival speech’.

The factor of perspective is also necessary to explain the near absence of adnominal ambiphoric constructions in table 5.5. Since framing constructions typically introduce prominent events into the discourse, it seems a reasonable expectation to hypothesise that they would

---

Footnote: The verb ngirrayirri ‘I am going’ in (220) is also coreferential with the subject of the framing-introducing verb irrumarndu ‘he says to them’ and ngarrriwi ‘we will’ is coreferential with the subject of irrumarndu ‘he says to them’, but in both instances the definite subject forms follow coreferential non-definite subject forms in the framed clause. On this basis I am calling the definite subject forms ngirrayirri ‘I am going’ and ngarrriwi ‘we will’ not coreferential across framed clause boundaries: this would have been the case if the definite subject form occurred as the first referential element in the framed clause, i.e. without first being introduced in the framed clause.
include a high frequency of as ‘not yet identifiable referent’ marking adnominal ambiphoric constructions. Table 5.5 shows that this is not the case. The only example in Coate (1966) is (222).

(222) anja bunda budma aw yilakarrayali bunda ngowannga wulaba
anja bunda burr-ma aw yila=karra-yi ali bunda ngawan-nga wulaba
what 3pl.PROX 3pl-do oh child=maybe-INDEED 3pl.PROX water-ONLY taste
wandu budma
w-andu burr-ma
nw=AMBIPH 3pl-do
‘“What are these,” they say. “Oh, children maybe, those only taste of water,” they say’ (Coate, 1966: 105, lines 11–12)

In (222) the nominal construction wulaba wandu ‘this taste’ exceptionally contains the ambiphoric pronoun wandu, marking it as unidentifiable. The referent wulaba ‘taste’ itself is not unidentifiable within the main discourse: an eating event is described in the preceding discourse, metonymically prompting the concept of taste, so the construction is appropriately interpreted as ‘unidentifiable in the reported speech event’, but this is the only time in Coate (1966) this meaning is marked with an adnominal ambiphoric construction. In the example sentence the reported speakers discover that a fish they have been eating has no taste and speculate that this might be because it is in fact the soul of an unborn child: unborn children are known to live in waterholes before they are incarnated as people. Underlining this meaning of unidentifiability to the reported speakers, in (222) the current speaker employs the overly explicit adnominal ambiphoric construction, firmly grounding the assessment in the reported speaker’s perspective.

5.4. Discussion and conclusion: reported speech as stance and cohesion

The importance of taking perspective into account in the interpretation of discourse reference is nowhere seen as unequivocally as in attempts in computational linguistics to automatise the process of coreference recognition. For example, while designing a model to mechanically predict the formal properties and referential interpretation of referential devices, Hovy et al. (2013) encounter the problem of ‘inconsistent reporting’, which ‘occurs when a [discourse element] stated in reported text contains significant differences from the author’s description of the same [discourse element] (Hovy et al., 2013: 25).\(^{37}\)

\(^{37}\)The importance of perspective is also illustrated by a separate problem Chafe (1974: 130) signals for the analysis of reported speech, as he discovers that reporting speakers often treat aspects of the reported speech situation as ‘known’ to the addressee, even though this cannot be assumed on the basis of cooperative principles applied elsewhere in language. The mild egocentrism involved is apparently institutionalized in language,
5.4. Conclusion

Often speakers simply do not use referential expressions in the same way as they were used in the actual reported speech event, in which case standard models of discourse reference fail. This is a problem for the cognitive model in Kibrik (2011) as well: the working of short term memory cannot account for the interpretation of discourse reference in reported speech constructions as in (219) and (222). Referential elements in reported speech acquire a meaning that differs from that in non-attributed speech: they do not just express aspects of cohesion, but also of perspective, belonging to the category of stance.\(^{38}\)

These two functions are reflected in the way in which, as McGregor (2004) notes, reported speech may be used in narratives: ‘situations represented by quotes can be significant in the development of the characters’ (McGregor, 2004: 291), but also, reported speech ‘is occasionally used in Gooniyandi to authorise what the speaker says, to attest to its veracity by appealing to an acknowledged authority’ (McGregor, 2004: 291). The first function was discussed in section 5.3.1 and the distribution of framing construction with a reported speech interpretation in table 5.2. For the second function McGregor (2004) cites the Gooniyandi example in (223).\(^{39}\)

\[(223)\]  
\[
\text{goowaj-jin+ø+a ngirrangi-ngga maja/ war gard-boo-wirr+arni liya/ tell-1EXCl.O+3sg.S+A our-ERG boss war hit-IT-PRS/3pl.S+ARNI west jimai::: yinglish/ miga-ø+mi-ngirrangi/ German English tell-3sg.S+MI-3pl.OBL}
\]

‘Our boss told us. “The Germans and English are fighting a war together,” he told us’ (McGregor, 2004: 291)

In (223) the framing construction is introduced to allow for the expression of a specific source, lending credibility to the assertion made in the framed clause. This is a function that has little to do with a discourse referential or discourse structuring use of reported speech.

For this reason, reported speech constructions do not form a referentially homogenous construction type.\(^{40}\) With respect to the hypothesis that framed clauses form a referential barrier and seems to cause no discomfort to anyone’ (Chafe, 1974: 130). This appears to be another area where ‘regular’ expectations about discourse reference break down, and where referential elements serve to support an interpretation of perspective shift, not a meaning of cohesion.

\(^{38}\)Stance interacts with the model in Kibrik (2011) in several interesting ways. For example, Hanks (2005: 211) points out that evaluative constructions ‘can help resolve the reference’ to a discourse object because a qualified reference simplifies the identification of this object. In terms of Kibrik (2011), then, evaluative stance can act as a referential aid: it does not specifically draw attention to a referent but by describing this referent more fully the qualifications narrow down the number of available referents based on the spatial and cognitive relation a discourse entity has with the discourse object. The observations about stance in the expression of reported speech in chapter 4 added a further dimension to this analysis: an evaluation can help identify the perspective involved in this evaluation itself. In this sense, stance constructions can act as a referential aid in identifying perspective.

\(^{39}\)Glosses adapted. The capitalised Gooniyandi elements A, ARNI and MI are verb roots. The slashes / in the transcription line indicate the end of an intonation unit and in the glossed line that the categories to the left and right of the sign are conflated.

\(^{40}\)The empirical question Stirling (2010) poses concerning the referential accessibility of reported speech
the observation about the Ungarinyin data so far do not provide a full answer: some observations support the hypothesis, others violate it, and this is exactly what we may expect from a phenomenon that combines two functions that are as diverse as stance and cohesion.

As Holt (2000) states it:

‘[R]eported speech contains a speech activity that the utterer claims to be merely reproducing from a previous occasion. Yet, it can be used to perform a range of actions in the current conversation, including informing the recipient about the previous interaction and contributing toward the overall action of the current sequence’ (Holt, 2000: 434).

Presenting logico-semantic and referential elements from the reported speech event as they are relevant in the current speech event may be related to discourse reference and discourse structuring and hence of establishing cohesion. Using reported speech to evoke an argument of authority or to present a complex perspective is a stance act. In each case the role of referential devices in framing constructions differ in a meaningful way.
Chapter 6. Complex stance

The obsessive question at the heart of Bakhtin’s thought is always “Who is talking?” — Holquist (1983), p. 307

6.1. Introduction

Chapters 3 and 4 introduced framing constructions and defenestrated expressions of reported speech and thought as strategies for shifting the perspective away entirely from the current speaker to the reported speaker or cognisant. In these instances, the reported speaker simply demonstrates, or ‘enacts’, the reported speech event without expressing any qualification of what was (allegedly) said or thought and how. That this is not the only way to represent speech and thought in Ungarinyin was shown in chapter 5, where the ‘fourth wall’ standing between the enacting speaker and the current speech situation was partially torn down. Section 5.3.2 illustrated cases in which the perspectives of the current speaker and the reported speaker were both reflected in the framing construction. The existence of these types of constructions demonstrated the property of reported speech that Vološinov ([1929] 1973) alludes to: the interpretation of reported speech in a way which allows multiple discourse participants to express disparate views at the same time, in other words, framing constructions as dialogue condensed to a grammatical construction.

In the final section of this chapter I will introduce a last type of framing construction that demonstrates this quality in an even more striking fashion than through referential elements in discourse. It expresses both the thought, or more specifically a belief, of a reported cognisant and a qualification of this belief by the current speaker as untrue. Such meanings have been found elsewhere in Australian languages. For example, it is reminiscent of the way in which Evans (2006) describes the particle maraka in the Non-Pama-Nyungan (Tangkic) language Kayardild:

’ve when placed directly before a NP or modifier [...] means that [s]omeone held a false belief about the identity or characteristic of the relevant entity, or acted as if

1 A condensed version of this chapter appears a Spronck (2015).
they had such a belief [...] [whereas] the speaker, at least at the moment of speech, holds a more realistic view of the relevant entity’ (Evans, 2006: 107).

A typical example of this particle being used is shown in (224).

(224) A fisherman has been seized by the monster Kajurku, who appropriates his bark torch, which the victim’s companions see from the shore:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{kurru-ja} & \text{manharr-iy} & \text{maraka} & \text{dangka-karran-ji} & \text{birra} \\
&\text{see-ACTUAL} & \text{torch-ACTUAL.OBJECT} & \text{PRT} & \text{man-GEN-ACTUAL.OBJECT} & \text{too} \\
&\text{niwan-ji} & \text{his-ACTUAL.OBJECT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘(They) saw a bark torch, and wrongly thought it was the man’s, that it too was his’ (Evans, 2006: 108)

By using the ‘false belief’ marker maraka in (224), the speaker expresses both ‘they thought it was his torch’ and the evaluation ‘I/we know it was not’ (or: ‘I do not necessarily believe that it was’) in the same utterance. In the Central Australian language Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda) Wilkins (1986) discusses the particle kathene that in a specific grammatical context, as illustrated in (225), appears to have a very similar meaning to Kayardild maraka (also see Breen, 1984).

(225) \[
\begin{align*}
&\text{arlenge-nge} & \text{aherre-kathene} & \text{ayenge} & \text{itirre-ke}, & \text{arleye-rle!} \\
&\text{far-ABL} & \text{kangaroo-KATHENE} & \text{1.sgS} & \text{think-pc}, & \text{emu-TOP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Hey! From afar I thought it was a kangaroo, but it turns out that it’s an emu’ (Wilkins, 1986: 589)

In (225) the propositions ‘I thought it was a kangaroo’ and ‘I was wrong’ are co-expressed in the first clause, with the second non-verbal clause arleye-rle ‘emu’ specifying the nature of the false belief (the ‘kangaroo’ turned out to be an emu). The particle kathene attaches to the object of the false belief aherre ‘kangaroo’, and this clause also contains the reported thought verb itirre-ke ‘(I) thought (past completive)’, representing the false belief event in an even more straightforward way than (224): it consists of some discourse entity thinking p and the speaker evaluating p as wrong.3

Example (226), from the Mexican language Western Tarahumara (Uto-Aztecan, Taracahitic), has a clause simultaneously representing the reported message ‘someonej said hej

\footnotesize{\text{2}}\text{Also see Evans (1995). In a more recent analysis, Nick Evans (p.c.) indicates that the particle maraka in Kayardild is perhaps better analysed as signalling that the speaker does not vouch for the truth of the belief attributed to a discourse entity in the utterance but allows for the possibility that it may nonetheless be true.}

\footnotesize{\text{3}}\text{In the Kimberley region McGregor (2011: 382) cites Gooniyandi, Wangkajunga and Jaru as examples of languages having a particle or enclitic marker expressing mistaken belief.}
went’ and the evaluation ‘I know he did not’ represents a slightly more complex case, but the basic meaning ‘x said/thought p but I, the current speaker say not-p’ is similar to the particle construction examples in (224-225).  

\[(226)\quad \text{simi-le-ga-ra-e} \]
\[\text{go-PAST-STAT-QUOT-DUB} \]
\[\quad \text{‘Someone said he went but he did not’ (Burgess, 1984: 104)} \]

In (226) there is again some discourse entity to whom a reported message/thought is attributed, here marked by the quotative suffix -ra and an evaluation of this reported message as untrue by the speaker, signalled by the modal suffix -e, glossed as ‘dubitative’. The combination of these elements Burgess (1984) translates as the expression of complex multiple perspective (see Evans, 2006: 104.) in (226) above.

The Ungarinyin construction of mistaken belief shares important characteristics with examples (224)-(226) and in this chapter I will explore the components of the construction in detail. I will first introduce the deceptively simple modal marker that is central to the Ungarinyin mistaken belief construction, but by itself does not encode a multiple perspective meaning. This is the modal clitic =karra ‘maybe’, which was briefly mentioned in section 4.3.5 and is by far the most frequent and versatile modal marker in (contemporary) Ungarinyin. I discuss this modal marker in section 6.2, introducing its meaning and use in section 6.2.1 and its syntactic properties in section 6.2.2. Section 6.3 then takes a look at the semantics of =karra ‘maybe’ in ‘regular’ framing constructions and identifies an interesting distinction between framing constructions of reported speech and thought on the one hand and of reported intentionality on the other. Up until that point the examples with =karra ‘maybe’ exclusively index the perspective of either the speaker or the reported speaker. The mistaken belief construction in which the perspectives of the speaker and the reported speaker become entangled is introduced in section 6.4 and section 6.5 summarises the chapter and adds a theoretical context, discussing the significance of the mistaken belief constructions for understanding the semantics of framing constructions. It embeds them in the stance model proposed in Du Bois (2007).

This complication is caused by the observation that (226) more explicitly seems to represent reported speech instead of reported thought, and the case of an untrue locution is different from untrue thought in that an example such as (226), at least from an outside perspective, may involve deliberate deceit, whereas in (224) and (225) the mistaken belief was not intended by the cognisant. Consequently, questions are introduced about the interpretation of the concept of lying and the relation between thought and words in Ungarinyin models of mind. The most authoritative study on this topic is Rumsey (1990), who states that Ungarinyin does not conceptualise words, thoughts and actions as distinct, which would imply that wrongly thinking and wrongly saying are two sides of the same coin for an Ungarinyin speaker. Anecdotally, this conclusion is supported by the fact that I have been completely unable to elicit or otherwise record examples in which speakers make such a distinction, e.g. x thinks/knows p but says not-p. Fortunately, however, the Ungarinyin construction, like the Kayardild and Aranda ones, primarily seems to involve a meaning where the reported speaker/cognisant actually holds/held the wrong belief, so for these constructions this particular problem does not arise. But for the cross-linguistic comparison of such constructions deliberate wrong-saying presents a challenging case.
6.2. The epistemic modal marker -karra ‘maybe’

Ungarinyin has three basic strategies for expressing doubt, an aspect of epistemic modality. First there is irrealis inflection, which indicates that the proposition of the utterance, in Rumsyey’s (1982: 89) formulation, ‘in the speaker’s estimation, may not be true’ and is presented at the time of utterance as an event that exclusively exists in the mind of the speaker (illustrated in example 178a on page 141). A second epistemic modal strategy introduced in section 4.3.5 also involves the irrealis, but this time in combination with the particle biyarra ‘can’ (or the negative modal particle kajinka ‘cannot’) forming a ‘mood phrase’ as, e.g. in (183a) on page 144. A third and very productive strategy involves the modal clitic =karra ‘maybe’, which I will describe in this section. Section 6.2.1 illustrates the various meanings of =karra and section 6.2.2 examines its scope and sentential position. This section also proposes a way in which these syntactic properties may be used as criteria for defining clausehood in Ungarinyin, which will prove an interesting instrument for investigating the syntactic status of framing constructions later on in the chapter.

6.2.1. The meaning of =karra ‘maybe’: subjective epistemic evaluation

The most common use of the Ungarinyin epistemic modal clitic =karra ‘maybe’ is illustrated in (227).

(227)  
\[\text{wungaykarra nyawal nyangkandirri} \]
\[\text{wungay}=\text{karra nyawal nyawal-}=\text{angka-}=\text{ndu-rri} \]
\[\text{woman}=\text{maybe stick.to 3fsg-go-PST-3pl.IO-DUAL} \]

‘Maybe that woman stuck to them both’ (i.e. ‘maybe she’s adulterous’) (090813AJMJSMPDh, 4:08-4:09)

Example (227) was spoken in the context of the Family Problems picture task and represents a contribution by Scotty Martin speculating about the behaviour of one of the protagonists. As shown, =karra ‘maybe’ represents a fairly familiar type of epistemic modification: in general terms, in (227) the speaker expresses the proposition ‘she sticks to them both’ and the qualification of this proposition ‘I am uncertain about this’. Coate and Oates (1970: 59) label the marker ‘potential’ and most Ungarinyin speakers translate it into Aboriginal English as maitbe ‘maybe’. For convenience, I gloss =karra as MAYBE, written, as per the convention introduced in section 1.2.3, with small capitals to indicate that as a morphological element.

---

5The Family Problems picture task was especially successful eliciting examples of =karra ‘maybe’ (San Roque et al., 2012: 157–158), predominantly during the phase where the participants speculate about the pictures on each card and particularly in the session from which (227) has been taken. All interpretations of =karra discussed in this section occur.
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its semantic status lies somewhere between that of a grammatical and a lexical construction.\(^6\)

Examples similar to (227) are also found in (149b) on page 115, (183b) on page 144, (191c) on page 150, (235b) on page 214, (250) on page 222, (254a) on page 226, among others.

Although the epistemic uncertainty meaning of =karra is prevalent in Ungarinyin, the clitic has a second epistemic meaning exemplified in (228). Example (228) represents the moment in the Bowerbird story (see section 4.4), when the protagonists finally realise that the ‘thief’ who has been taking their belongings was in fact a bowerbird all along.

\begin{equation}
(228) \text{yow!} \ jirrikarra \ \text{rimij} \ \text{inyinyarrukana} \ \text{juwibarn} \ \text{beja} \ \\
\text{yow!} \ \text{rirri=karra} \ \text{rimij} \ a_{1}-y_{2i}-nji-nyarruku-na \ \text{juwibarn} \ \text{beja} \ \\
\text{yes} \ \text{m.ANAPH=\textit{may be}} \ \text{steal} \ \text{3msg-BE-PST-1pl.EXC-PAUC} \ \text{bowerbird} \ \text{CMPLV} \ \\
\text{layburru} \ \text{nyadi} \ \\
\text{layburru} \ \text{nyarr-y_{2i}-ð} \ \\
\text{know} \ \text{1pl.EXC-BE-PRS}
\end{equation}

“yow! we know that that one bin robim us mob”\(^7\)

‘Yeah, he was robbing us, the bowerbird, we know now’ (= example 30 on page 278)

Example (228) consists of two clauses preceded by an interjection, in both cases indexing the perspective of the discourse participants referred to as ‘we (exclusive)’ in the both clauses, which is the morphological secondary object in \textit{jirrikarra rimij inyinyarrukana juwibarn} ‘the bowerbird=karra has been stealing from us’ and the morphological subject in \textit{beja layburru nyadi} ‘we know already’. How to interpret =karra in this example? From the second clause in (228) it becomes clear that unlike in (227), where the speaker expresses doubt, in (228) she is quite certain about her accusation: she has finally identified the bowerbird as the thief. The two clauses in (228) are produced without any prosodic break and the Bowerbird story contains an almost identical example later on in line (74) of appendix C, there introduced by the Aboriginal English phrase \textit{next time they bin know na} ‘next time they knew’. The epistemic meaning expressed in (228) and (74) is what van der Auwera and Plungian (1998: 85) call ‘epistemic necessity: [...] the certainty of a judgment relative to other judgments. [...] Certainty and a relatively high degree of probability [...] amount to epistemic necessity’ (van der Auwera and Plungian, 1998: 82). The closest translation of =karra ‘maybe’ in (228) under this interpretation is ‘he must have been the one robbing us’, as in the translation of (229) below (the examples in 244 on page 218 are further examples).

\(^6\)I have not adopted the gloss ‘potential’ from Coate and Oates (1970) because it only partially covers the meaning range of =karra, so it has no advantage in this respect over \textit{may be} (see below), and because I prefer to limit the use of grammatical glosses to inflectional morphemes. Other alternatives, such as ‘dubitative’ or ‘epistemic modal’ have similar disadvantages of being either too narrow or too broad. That said, the glosses here should in no way be taken to imply that =karra is in all or most of its uses equivalent to English ‘maybe’.

\(^7\)Note that the speaker chooses to translate this example as a single complex clause construction and \textit{without} a translation for =karra ‘maybe’.
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(229) A man tells the narrator about having found some meat, but narrator discovers this is untrue and confronts him:

*jirrkalkarra nyininyi*  
*jirrkal=karra nyin-y2i-nyi*  
lie=MAYBE 2sg-BE-PST

“You bin liar”  
“You must have lied’ (100722-04NGUS, 7:48-7:50/100722-05NGUS, 0:36-0:40)

In its epistemic necessity, or ‘inferred necessity’ reading =karra is formally indistinguishable from the epistemic possibility/uncertainty reading, for which reason I will continue to gloss =karra with the same label under both interpretations in the interlinear gloss and specify the relevant meaning in the idiomatic translation.

A third function of =karra that appears to be even further removed from the modal meaning of doubt in (227), and which unlike the epistemic necessity interpretation does have a slightly different distribution, is =karra as a way of deriving indefinite pronouns. In this function the marker most frequently appears in combination with interrogative pronouns and occasionally with nominals, as illustrated in example (230).

(230) Talking about a bowerbird:

*anjakarra rimijba inyi jinda*  
*anja=karra rimij-wa a1-y2i-nyi jinda*  
what=INDEF steal-ITRV 3msg-BE-PST m.PROX

“That one (he) has been robbing something’ (100903-21NGUN, 1:07-1:09)

As (230) shows, in its indefinite-pronoun deriving function I will differentiate the interlinear gloss of =karra from that of ‘modal =karra’, based on semantic properties and distribution (see section 6.2.2; also see Mushin, 1995 on the connection between indefiniteness and epistemic modality in Australian languages).

Finally, example (231) illustrates a possible fourth function of =karra:

(231) marakarra bondo ngala di joli bilu joli  
*mara=karra ba2-anda2-w1u ngala di joli ba2-y2i-lu joli*  
see=MAYBE IMP-3pl.O-ACT.ON animal nPro.Anaph return IMP-BE=PROX return

*bandumindalu*  
ba2-anda2-minda=lu  
IMP-3pl.O-TAKE=PROX

‘Find some meat (animals) and then come back and bring it (them)’ (100722-12NGUS, 7:05-7:16)
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In (231) \textit{\textit{karra}} appears with an imperative verb, denoting the nonvolitional act of ‘finding animals’. In this example, \textit{\textit{karra}} does not so much appear to express uncertainty (none of the discourse participants can be certain of the hunt becoming a success), as mitigate the command expressed by the imperative, presenting it as a suggestion, a meaning that may perhaps best be translated with a conditional clause, i.e. ‘if you find meat...’ or as ‘try to find meat’ (cf. Brown and Levinson, 1987; Bublitz, 1992).

On the face of it, the meanings of uncertainty, epistemic necessity (i.e. relative/inferred certainty), indefiniteness and mitigation of commands may appear quite diverse, but they share a very important feature: in all instances \textit{\textit{karra}} expresses a subjective epistemic evaluation. In other words, \textit{\textit{karra}} always indexes some aspect of the knowledge of the speaker (i.e. ‘subjective’ in the sense of Traugott, 2010). This overarching meaning of \textit{\textit{karra}} ‘maybe’ may be illustrated by the following two excerpts from the Family Problems picture task in (232) and (233), which demonstrate how the marker is put to use in face to face interaction.

In the exchange in (232), taken from an early stage of the picture task, both speakers use \textit{\textit{karra}} ‘maybe’ in their utterance. In fact, both utterances are identical: in the first turn Alec Jilbidij suggests that the husband character in the story, who is sitting with his head down, may be ashamed. In response, Scotty Martin signals agreement with Jilbidij’s assessment by repeating his utterance as an alignment strategy (see section 4.3.1)

\begin{verbatim}
(232) AJ jiyen\textit{\textit{karra}} wumarn
     jiyen=\textit{\textit{karra}} wu-ma-rn
     shame=\text{\textit{maybe} 3n.O:3.sg.S-TAKE-PRS}

SM jiyen\textit{\textit{karra}} wumarn
     jiyen=\textit{\textit{karra}} wu-ma-rn
     shame=\text{\textit{maybe} 3n.O:3.sg.S-TAKE-PRS}

‘AJ: He might become ashamed’
‘SM: Yes, he might become ashamed’ (090813AJMJSMPDc, 3:19-3:22)
\end{verbatim}

Even though the two turns in (232) are superficially the same, they differ in one important aspect: their indexical properties. In both instances \textit{jiyen\textit{\textit{karra}} wumarn} ‘maybe he becomes ashamed’ expresses the proposition ‘he becomes ashamed’ and the modal evaluation ‘it is uncertain/possible according to me’, but the indexical value of this ‘according to me’, i.e. the subjective meaning of \textit{\textit{karra}}, indexes distinct perspectives, simply by being spoken by two different speakers. As a consequence, Scotty Martin’s turn expressing agreement with Alec Jilbidij’s suggestion does not simply reiterate the assessment that the ‘man becoming ashamed’ is a possible interpretation of the picture under discussion, it adds the communicative intention ‘I think so too’.

209
When Alec Jibidij makes the same suggestion about the man later on in the picture task, shown in (233), Scotty Martin’s response is different from (232). Again, he agrees with Jilbidij’s interpretation, but he crucially leaves out =karra ‘maybe’.

(233) AJ: jiyenbakarra e
jiyen-ba=karra a₁-y₂i-ø
shame-ITRV=maybe 3msg-be-PRS

SM: jiyenba e yow
jiyen-ba a₁-y₂i-ø yow
shame-ITRV 3msg-be-PRS yeah

‘Maybe he’s ashamed?’
‘Yes, he’s ashamed’ (090813AJMJSMPDm, 1:25-1:27)

Although Alec Jilbidij signals uncertainty about his interpretation of the picture in (233), his utterance is not primarily about his doubt vis-à-vis the proposition ‘he is ashamed’ but about a subjective epistemic evaluation of that proposition: he suggests that the proposition is ‘possibly true’ in his estimation. Scotty Martin, having agreed with Alec Jilbidij’s suggestion earlier on in the picture task responds by echoing his utterance without the epistemic modal marker =karra ‘maybe’ followed by the alignment interjection yow ‘yes’, now committing to the proposition ‘he is ashamed’ in a less subjective evaluation. At this stage in the conversation both speakers know that they agree on the interpretation of the picture, and it is established as a ‘discourse fact’. In this context, Scotty Martin leaves out =karra ‘maybe’, which would place the assessment ‘he is ashamed’ exclusively in his perspective, and now expresses the proposition as a non-modal declarative clause.

The meaning of ‘epistemic subjectivity’ connects all functions of =karra, as is loosely represented in figure 6.1. In all its functions, =karra ‘maybe, must, INDEF’ indexes the presumed knowledge of the speaker in some form. Most often, its function is to express uncertainty on behalf of the speaker, but in utterances such as (228) it may also express relative certainty, if, all possibilities considered, the proposition p is the most probable. The indefiniteness-deriving function is also clearly connected with the meaning of subjective epistemic representation: in examples such as (230) the speaker presents the referent as non-identifiable and non-specific (cf. table 5.1 on page 167; cf. Mushin, 1995). Finally, the ‘command mitigating’ function

---

8 The iterative marker -ba often attaches to the coverb jiyen ‘shame’ when it combines with the stative inflecting verb -y₂i- ‘be’ to underline the ongoing, continuous quality of the shame event.

9 Incidentally, the subjective nature of =karra is also evidenced by what appears to be a predictable connection between illocution and the expression of =karra: in a random sample of 100 occurrences of =karra from my fieldwork data the marker is not once attested in an interrogative sentence. This is expected (except for the attenuating, politeness function of =karra) since interrogative constructions represent an utterance type that primarily indexes the knowledge of the addressee, not that of the speaker (see section 4.3.2).
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Subjective epistemic representation

Epistemic evaluation  Epistemic evaluation  Non-specific reference

Uncertainty

=karra ‘maybe’ (e.g. in 227)

‘Most likely among possible alternatives’

=karra ‘maybe’/‘must’ (e.g. in 228)

Indefinite-deriving

INDEF (e.g. in 230)

Figure 6.1.: A general representation of the functions of =karra of =karra in (231) is not included in figure 6.1, but it could be interpreted as a particular instance of a cross-linguistically common strategy of lowered certainty to reduce imposition on the addressee in making a request, comparable to e.g. English ‘Could you maybe take out the garbage?’.

The semantic discussion above has only given a brief outline of the functions of =karra and that there are many controversies in studies of epistemic modality, such as the status of epistemic necessity, that the preceding discussion has minimally engaged with. Some of these issues were touched on in footnote 10, but the main focus in this study inevitably lies on the

There exists a vast literature on epistemic modality and related notions that I will not address here, but I would like to note that Ungarinyin =karra ‘maybe’ is a counterexample to the English-based universalist claim in von Fintel and Gillies (2010) that languages do not encode epistemic uncertainty and epistemic necessity (relative certainty) with the same markers. On the other hand, the polysemy between relative certainty and epistemic uncertainty fits with the semantic map approach in Boye (2010; 2012) and Boye (2012: 144) in fact identifies several languages that share a similar polysemy. The semantic map below represents an adapted version of the one in Boye (2010). I have added the dimension of definiteness, which Boye (2010; 2012), focussing on verbal categories, does not discuss, but which has a clear link with epistemicity. In my interpretation the meaning of Ungarinyin covers the contiguous areas shaded grey below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>evidentiality:</th>
<th>direct</th>
<th>indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>epistemic modality:</td>
<td>certainty</td>
<td>partial (un)certainty/probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definiteness:</td>
<td>definite/specific</td>
<td>indefinite/nonspecific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have copied the dimension of evidentiality from Boye (2010; 2012) above, but I do not believe it relevant for the interpretation of =karra in Ungarinyin. Many authors following van der Auwera and Plungian (1998) have assumed that the meanings Boye (2010) labels ‘indirect’ and ‘partial uncertainty’ (epistemic necessity) are expressed by the same form (compare the polysemy of English ‘must’, e.g. ‘John must be home, I see that the lights are on’ vs. ‘John must be home, he already left us an hour ago’). However, an important distinction, as Cornillie (2009: 57–59) points out, building on Nuyts (2001), between evidential and epistemic modal meanings is that evidential meanings (i.e. expressing a knowledge state deriving from some observation prior to the speech moment) may be intersubjective in the sense that the addressee may have shared in the observation lying at the basis of the evidential statement, whereas modals of epistemic necessity only index an evaluation of knowledge by the speaker. I consider subjectivity to be an integral part of the semantics of =karra, which on a theoretical level rules out an evidential meaning, but I will not further comment on this distinction here.
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way in which =karra is used in framing constructions, not on the clitic itself. A final word
may be due, however, on the etymological origins of the marker: An initially appealing analysis
may be to interpret it as an adaptation of the the informal English modal form gotta ‘have
to’, which would mean that =karra ‘maybe’ is a post-European settlement innovation. This is
indeed found in Light Warlpiri, a mixed variant of Warlpiri for which O’Shannessy (2013) cites
the form -garra, a different spelling of the same phonological form as Ungarinyin =karra, with
the modal meaning ‘will, should’.11 For Ungarinyin I find this interpretation highly unlikely
given that, for example, the now lost Guwij dialect of Ungarinyin, which has only had a very
short history of exposure to English, had the form as well, as the excerpt from a typescript in
figure 6.2 shows.

*Lambara balja njuŋuyandalu? Jau, waŋa gara njuŋon: Shall I bring the axe? Yes,
I wu may want it.*

Figure 6.2.: From A. P. Elkin’s notes on Guwij (AIATSIS MS4577/9, page 29)

The form is also frequent as a modal clitic in even the early Ungarinyin recordings made
by the missionary linguist Howard Coate (1910-2001) from before the 1960s, which shows that
its use was clearly established at a time when English was considerably less dominant among
Aboriginal people in the Kimberley region. None of the modal functions of =karra ‘maybe’
introduced in this section seem to overlap with (Aboriginal) English modal ‘gotta’ in the way
the form does e.g. in Light Warlpiri.12

An alternative diachronic interpretation may be that =karra derives from a compound form
of the question marker =ka, which is occasionally used in an epistemic modal function (e.g. in
line 42 on page 280) and an ‘indefinite’ suffix -rra, which is found, for example in some igno-
ratives such as wirrigarra ‘some’. Such an analysis would explain the connection between two
of the main contemporary uses of =karra, epistemic uncertainty and indefiniteness.13 But in
the absence of substantial diachronic and comparative evidence for the development of =karra
‘maybe’ in Ungarinyin, both the suggested English origin, and my alternative explanation
of =karra as an indefinite/epistemic =ka-complex remain speculative. Given that =karra is
found in the oldest documentation of Ungarinyin available with the distinctive properties de-

11 There are other Australian languages with a similar form in a modal/evidential function, for example
in Nginyabaa Donaldson (1980) finds the marker -gara ‘sensory evidence’, but this formal resemblance with
Ungarinyin =karra is almost certainly coincidental.

12 It needs to be acknowledged that examples of =karra are nonetheless sometimes translated as ‘gata’, such
as example (250) on page 222, which the speaker Pany Nulgit subsequently translated as ‘like he just thinking,
meaning what he gata say’. However, I have not come across examples in which ‘gata’/’got to’ was used as a
translation when =karra has a ‘wide scope’ interpretation as introduced in section 6.2.2.

13 This functional combination is not completely unattested elsewhere. For example, Pearce (2010) discusses
a very similar homonymy between a wide-scope and narrow-scope interpretation of an irrealis construction in
the Oceanic language Unua.
scribed here, however, I will assume that the marker does not constitute a borrowing from English. The distinctive semantic properties of =karra were introduced above, but =karra also has several formal features that make it stand out with respect to other modal markers in the language. To these syntactic features I will turn now.

6.2.2. The syntax of =karra ‘maybe’: wide and narrow scope

All examples of =karra ‘maybe/must’ in the previous section share a common syntactic feature: the marker always occurs in clause second, ‘Wackernagel’ position (cf. Mushin, 2006). More precisely, the epistemic modal =karra ‘maybe’ is, in general, a second position clitic that attaches to the first lexical constituent in the clause often preceding other elements that appear to be part of the same construction, as in (234), where =karra follows the first noun but precedes its nominal classifier di, and follows inflectional markers such as case forms (235) and suffixes (236).

(234) kalumunkarra di bandumera kalumun=karra di bandag-a2-ma-gi-ra long.ago=maybe n.w..ANAPH 3pl.O:3pl.S-IRR-take-PST-1sg.IO

‘Maybe they took them off me a long time ago’ (101012-02NGUN, 2:28-2:30)

(235) a. damburakukarra marduwa biyarrri dambura-ku=karra mardu-wa hirr-a-a-rri home-DAT=maybe walk-ITRV 3pl-GO-PRS-DU

‘Maybe they two are walking home’ (090813AJMJSMPDe, 2:25-2:27)

14In most instances, =karra ‘maybe’ is word-final, except for when it combines with the emphatic clitic -y2ali ‘indeed’, as in (95) on page 63, (244a) on page 218 and (245) on page 219 (also see the two examples in Coate and Oates, 1970: 39). In all of these examples the combination =karra=y2ali translates as ‘it may be/must be x’.
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b. ngalakurdekarra joli ngilu (1.8) ngalakurde joli
ngala-kurde=karra joli nga1-yi-lu ngala-kurde joli
meat-COM=maybe return 1sg-FUT-BE-PROX meat-COM return

ngilu
gga1-iy-y2i=lu
1sg-FUT-BE=PROX

'Maybe I’ll come back with meat, come back with meat' (100722-12NGUS, 1:16-1:22)

(236) nyinganngakarra kayukun jongarri winjumarn
nyingan-nga=karra kayukun jongarri winja2-ma-rn
2sg-ONLY=maybe money big 3n.0:2sg.S-take-PRS

'Maybe only you are taking big money' (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 2:41-2:45)

Although the clause-second position of =karra as in (235) and (236) represents the great majority of its occurrences, in a random corpus sample of 100 spontaneous occurrences of =karra is also found in a different position 17 times, as examples (237) and (238) illustrate. In these instances the scope properties of =karra are different, however.

(237) jinda kunyakarra amerri
jinda kunya=karra a1-ma-ø-yirri
m.PROX where=INDEF 3msg-do-PRS-CONT

'He is doing something' (090813AJMJSMPDC, 0:59-1:00)

(238) andu jirri yila nongarrikarra ama
andu jirri yila nongarrij=karra a1-ma-ø
m.AMBIPH m.ANAPH child run.off=maybe 3msg-do-PRS

'This kid there, it might be that he runs off' (090813AJMJSMPDH, 10:25-10:27)

The example in (237) is an instance of =karra in its function of expressing indefiniteness, as reflected by the interlinear gloss. Of the 17 attested exceptions to clause second positionality, seven involve indefinite pronouns of this type. Example (238) illustrates the second most frequent exception: in the sample there are six examples of =karra are different, however.

Where =karra does not appear in second position it normally directly modifies the element it attaches to, rather than the whole clause. For example in (238) the act of running away is specifically under question, as the translation attempts to reflect. However, instances of =karra in clause-second position may still be ambiguous between wide and narrow scope readings. For

\[15\] The exception to this is where =karra attaches to other sentence particles, exemplified in (242) below.
example, the sentence in (239) is potentially ambiguous between the two interpretations shown in the translation below.

(239)  

\begin{verbatim}
ondolankarra linyba on
ondolan=karra liny-ba a1-w1 u-n
cloud=maybe see-ITRV 3msg.O:3sg.S-act.on-PRS
\end{verbatim}

‘Maybe he is looking at the clouds/It may be clouds he is looking at’ (090813AJMJSMPDe, 7:48-7:50)

The interpretation ‘maybe he is looking at the clouds’ represents a reading of (239) in which the modal uncertainty expressed by the speaker applies to the entire proposition ‘he is looking at the clouds’. Under the reading ‘it may be clouds he is looking at’ =karra is taken to specifically modify the word ondolan ‘clouds’. I will label these two readings ‘wide’ or ‘clausal scope’ and ‘narrow scope’, respectively.

With this description of scope I follow the definition of the term in Boye (2012: 183) as ‘the meaning to which the meaning at hand applies’. This notion reflects the common approach to modification that assumes that a construction/utterance has a central core meaning (commonly labelled proposition or at-issue meaning) that may be modified by elements that say something about this meaning. In its wide-scope use the clitic =karra ‘maybe’ cliticises to the first construction of the clause in its scope, modifying the entire proposition expressed by the clause.

Appearing in clause-second position, wide-scope =karra is one of the very few grammatical elements that shed light on Ungarinyin clause structure. Since the construction fully under the scope of wide-scope =karra is a clause (or in the case of a complex clause construction, a sentence) the interpretation of =karra ‘maybe’ can be used for defining clausehood in Ungarinyin. This will become very relevant for analysing the syntactic behaviour of framing constructions in the final sections of this chapter. I formulate the syntactic test =karra provides as in (240).

(240)  

\begin{verbatim}
Iff the marker -karra ‘maybe’ has scope over a constituent C that
  - is a verbal construction, or
  - a non-verbal predicate, or
  - consists of a verbal or non-verbal predicate construction and one or more nominal constructions
  and =karra has the widest possible scope, not partially or fully overlapping with the scope of another instance of =karra
  then C is a clause.
\end{verbatim}

Applying this test is simple: for any utterance U for which it is unclear if constituent C in U is a clause, attach =karra ‘maybe’ to every construction in U and determine the construction
for which it has the widest possible scope, this is the clause. Because of its status as a second position clitic, the occurrence of =karra ‘maybe’ with the widest scope will almost always be the one in Wackernagel position, attached to the construction at the clause boundary. Based on the =karra test (235b), repeated as (241) below, clearly consists of two clauses, since the underlined occurrences of =karra ‘maybe’ have the widest possible, non-overlapping scope.

\[(241)\] ngalakurde=karra \ joli \ nga1-iy-y2i=lu \ ngala-kurde=karra
meat-COM=maybe return 1sg-FUT-be=PROX meat-COM=maybe

\[joli \ nga1-y1i=lu\]

return 1sg-FUT-be=PROX

‘Maybe I’ll come back with meat, come back with meat’ (100722-12NGUS, 1:16-1:22, modified)

The suggested alternative occurrences of =karra, struck out in (241) may be grammatical but would not have a wider scope than the underlined instances of =karra ‘maybe’. The two underlined instances of =karra ‘maybe’ in (241) are the two maximally non-overlapping wide-scope occurrences of the marker, which means that on the basis of the =karra ‘maybe’ test in (240), (241) consists of two clauses.

Although wide-scope =karra ‘maybe’ almost always cliticises to the first element at the clause boundary, there is one class of occurrences of =karra ‘maybe’ in which it is found in third position. In instances where the clause initial element is followed by a sentence particle, such as a temporal connective or another grammatical particle this second element may ‘attract’ the clitic =karra ‘maybe’, as illustrated in (242).

\[(242)\] a. debarr dikarra \ inyi \ alyi
debarr di=karra \ a1-y2i-nyi \ alyi
die \ n\_w\_ANAPH=maybe 3msg-be-PST inside

‘Maybe he has died inside’ (100903-31NGUN, 3:29-3:31)

b. bunda waykarra \ warda burrko
bunda way=karra \ warda burr-w2\_w2\_u-\_0
3pl.PROX NEG=maybe like 3pl-IRR-ACT.ON-PRS

‘Maybe they don’t like it’ (090813AJMJSMPDc, 1:31-1:32)

c. barnarr bijakarra \ yorro \ nyuwani
barnarr bija=karra \ yorro \ nga2-w1\_a-ni
bush.turkey CMPLV=maybe group.sit 3sg-FALL-PST

‘Maybe the bush turkey has already gone’ [‘It may be the case that the bush turkey has sat there’] (100903-17NGUN, 2:39-2:41)
The element $\text{di}=\text{karra}$ 'maybe then' in (242a) consists of the w-neuter form of the anaphoric pronoun, which is often used as a temporal connective translated as 'then' and the modal clitic $=\text{karra}$ 'maybe'. The connective-modal combination interpolates the complex verb construction between the coverb $\text{deber}$r ‘die’ and $\text{in}$gi ‘he was’. In (242b) $=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe’ cliticises to the negative particle way ‘no’, which is in its regular preverbal position but follows the clause initial element. This is also the position of the aspectual-modal complex $\text{bija}=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe already’ in (242c). I have not recorded any instances in which $=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe’ is directly followed by a grammatical particle such as those illustrated in (242). These observations seem to suggest an analysis in which $=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe’ ‘gravitates towards’ a grammatical particle whenever the two are adjacent. A generalisation that easily accounts for the exceptions in (242), then, is that clausal-scope $=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe’ cliticises to the first word of a clause, except where this first word is immediately followed by a grammatical particle, in which case $=\text{karra}$ may appear in clause third (‘Wackernagel-plus-one’) position.

The only observation that matters for the discussion here, however, is that in all instances in (242) $=\text{karra}$ does not modify the grammatical element it attaches to but the entire clause: semantically, the interpretation of $=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe’ is exactly the same as would the grammatical particle it attaches to have not been present and $=\text{karra}$ would have cliticised to the first word in (242) as per normal.

6.3. The scope and meaning of the clitic $=\text{karra}$ in framing constructions

When occurring in framing constructions, two features of the modal clitic $=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe’ become particularly relevant: First, the subjective nature of $=\text{karra}$, i.e. its speaker-indexing function, means that it may interact with the meaning of perspective shift away from the speaker that is intrinsic to expressions of reported speech, thought and intentionality. Second, observing the scope semantics of $=\text{karra}$ in framing constructions of reported speech, reported thought and reported intentionality by applying the $=\text{karra}$ test in (240) to framing constructions allows us to address their problematic syntactic status: the degree to which the framed and framing clauses are integrated into one constructional unit and the uniformity of framing constructions of different types in this respect. These are the topics I will examine in the present section.

The epistemic marker $=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe’ may appear at several places in framing constructions, either in the framed clause, the framing clause, and even occasionally in both. All functions of $=\text{karra}$ described in section 6.2 are available in framing constructions as well and (243) shows a typical example of a framing construction of reported speech in which $=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe’ occurs in wide-scope, second position in the framed clause.

---

16This combination does occur with narrow-scope $=\text{karra}$ ‘maybe’, as e.g. in (247a) on page 220.
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(243) A travel party near Mt. Barnett sees smoke in the distance and speculates about whether some fellow travellers who have travelled ahead (‘they’) have caught up with the fire (‘it’):

bejakarra norl wudmanga budmerndu
beja=karra norl wurr-ma-nga burr-ma-a-rndu
CMPLV=maybe get.close 3n.O:3pl.S-TAKE-PST 3pl.S-do-PRS-3pl.IO

‘They say about them: “They may have already caught up with it” ’ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 11:38-11:40)

In (243) =karra ‘maybe’ is part of the reported message: appearing in wide-scope position in the framed clause, the subjective meaning of =karra indexes the attitude of the reported speaker, i.e. the subject of the framing clause (‘they’), rather than that of the current speaker. Such a shift in the subject-attributing meaning of =karra in framed clauses of reported speech also occurs under the epistemic necessity interpretation of the clitic (i.e. as in examples 228 and 229 above). This point is illustrated by the two examples in (244), taken from Coate (1966), a long narrative called ‘The Rai and the third eye’ (see section 5.3). The examples have been transliterated and glosses have been added as well as square brackets marking the framed and framing clauses for clarity.

(244) a. [[ anja bunda ] budma ] [[ aw yilakarrayali bunda
[[ anja bunda ] burr-ma-ø ] [[ aw yila=karra=y2ali bunda
[[ what 3pl.PROX ] 3pl-do-PRS ] [[ oh child=mAYBE=indeED 3pl.PROX

ngowannga wulaba wandu ] budma ]
ngowan-nga wulaba w-andu ] burr-ma-ø ]
water-only taste nu-AMBIPH ] 3pl-do-PRS ]

‘What are these,” they say. “Oh, children maybe, those only taste of water,” they say’ (Coate, 1966: 105, lines 11–12)

b. [[ barnmarnkarrayali jinda ] birrima bandu
[[ barnmarn=karra=y2ali jinda ] birray-ma-ø bandu
[[ magician=mAYBE=indeED m.PROX ] 3pl.DEFS-do-PRS 3pl.AMBIPH

bunda burrardangarri ] warrngun
bunda burrardangarri ] warrngun
3pl.PROX people ] never

arrwarrawarrarverri wiji ngandi wiji
arr-w1a-rrawarrara-yi-yirri wiji ngandi wiji
3msg.O:1pl.EXC.S-IRR-realise-PST-CONT Q it.is Q

‘He must be a magician,” they said, “we all never realised that he was the one” ’

(Coate, 1966: 108, line 81–84)

The example in (244)a\(^{17}\) describes the response of a group of Ngarinyin people after eating

\(^{17}\)This example was also cited in chapter 5 as (222) on page 200.
During the dry season, some people hear a frog croaking and conclude there may/must be water:

ngabun dikarra wi budmara jino jedmern wurla
ngabun di=karra wa₂-y₂i-∅ burr-ra-ra jino jedmern wurla
water n₃w.ANAPH=maybe 3nᵡ-be-PRS 3pl-do-PST n.DIST frog talk
wirriyangarri ngabunkarrayali di budmara
wirriyangarri ngabun=karra=y₂ali di bwr-ra-ra
where water=maybe=indeed n.w.ANAPH 3pl-do-PST

“it must be water that is there,” they said. “This frog over there [is making] some noise, there must be water,” they said’ (120920-11PNNGUD, 0:08-0:15)

Under both the narrow-scope and clausal-scope reading the epistemic modal meaning expressed within the framed clause indexes the perspective of the subject referents of the framing clause, the reported speaker. This is the case for all functions of =karra appearing in the framed clause of framing constructions of reported speech with either wide or narrow scope, also in the command mitigating function of =karra as shown in (246).

18Note that di in this example represents the w-neither anaphoric pronoun, not a temporal connective, in which case it not normally ‘attracts’ the clitic =karra.
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(246)  *balya bumakarra: amanangka*
   *balya boq-ma=karra: a₁-ma-ø-nangka*
   *go IMP-do=MAYBE 3msg-do-PRS-3sg.IO*

  "Maybe you should go," he says to her" (090812JENGPDc, 4:51-4:55)

Not only the epistemic marker *=karra* ‘hedging’ the command in (246) but also the command itself is grounded in the perspective of the reported speaker and this indicates that *=karra*’s subjective indexical shift to the reported speaker fits with a general pattern of modal and related elements appearing in the framed clause. For example, the epistemic modal irrealis in the first framed clause in (247a), epistemic modal *=karra* ‘maybe’ in (247a), the negative suffix -*ka* and the irrealis expressing negation in (247b) are all grounded in the perspective of the reported speaker.

(247)  a.  *Discussing the customary law which prevented women and uninitiated boys from touching a type of large boomerang, cf. the discussion of (181c) on page 144*
   *kulinbi birrke (.05) wana kulin bundanyirrikarra*
   *kulinbi birr-干部队伍-yi-ø wana kulin bundaq-w₁ u-nyirri=karra*
   *crooked.leg 3pl-IRR-be-PRES if born 3pl.O:3pl.S-ACT.ON-DU=MAYBE*
   *di bдумara*
   *di burr-ma-ra*
   *n₁w.АNAPH 3pl-do-PST*

   ‘They children might have crooked legs, if they (two)parents would give birth to them,’”
   *they elders thought*¹⁹ (111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, 14:45-14:48)

b.  *nginingkaka birrkingarri bunda yila amara yirranangka nginingka=ka birr-干部队伍-yi-ngarri bunda yila a₁-ma-ra yirranangka*
   *1sg.POSS=Q 3pl-IRR-be-SUB 3pl.PROX child 3sg-do-PST father*

   ‘Those are not my kids,” the father said’ (110925-06NGUN, 3:31-3:36)

If *=karra* is not used to modify the reported message in a framing construction, but rather expresses an epistemic modal evaluation of the reported speech event, it has to appear in the framing clause. When *=karra* ‘maybe’ cliticises on an element in the framing construction, as in (248a) and (248c) it is interpreted as indexing the knowledge base of the current, reporting speaker:

(248)  a.  *wow amakarra*
   *wow a₁-ma-ø=karra*
   *wow 3msg-do-PRS=MAYBE*

   ‘He might/must say: “Wow!” ’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 6:50-6:51)

¹⁹Coate and Elkin (1974: 253, entry: *gulimbi*) cite the medical term ‘*saba tibia*’ for this condition.
b. layburrri birrke amarakarra
   layburrri birr-wjy2-jy2 a1-ma-ra=karra
   know 3pl-IRR-BE 3msg-do-PST=MAYBE
   ‘Maybe he says: “They don’t know” ’
   (100903-22NGUN, 00:09-00:13)

c. wardennga kanda ngumanu bidinganyirrikarra
   warden-nga kanda nga1-ma-o-nu birr-nga-yi-nyirri=karra
   true-only nw.PROX 1sg.S-do-PRS-2sg.IO 3pl-put-REFL-DU=MAYBE
   ‘ “I am only telling you the truth now,” they (two) might say to each other’
   (090813AJMJSMPDh, 13:07-13:11)

The three examples in (248) both represent utterances by Pansy Nulgit and Alec Jilbidij in which they suggest an imaginary conversations in a narrative or within the context of the Family Problems picture task. In order to express an epistemic modal evaluation of the imagined reported message he uses =karra ‘maybe’ in second position in the framing clause. In (248a) the framing clause amarakarra ‘maybe he says’ frames a minimal reported message consisting of the interjection wow ‘wow’. In examples (248b) and (248c) the modalised framing clauses amarakarra ‘maybe he says’ bidinganyirrikarra ‘maybe they two say to each other’ frames a full clause expressing a reported message. As with the examples of =karra and other modal elements appearing in the framed clause, the modal epistemic meaning of =karra in the framing clause does not extend beyond the clause in which it appears: in the framed clause it expresses the perspective of the reported speaker, in the framing clause that of the current, reporting speaker. This is evidenced clearly in (248c) by the juxtaposition of the evaluative lexeme wardennga ‘really true/only truth’ in the framed clause, forming an assertion that presumes certainty on behalf of the speaker and =karra ‘maybe’ in the framing clause’. The epistemic uncertainty expressed by =karra ‘maybe’ in (248c) indexes the speaker and does not qualify any part of the proposition represented in the framed clause but the saying event described by the framing clause.

The observations about the meaning of =karra ‘maybe’ in framed and framing clauses lead to an unequivocal conclusion for the =karra test for clausehood in (240) applied to framing constructions of reported speech: what I have so far for convenience have termed the framed and framing ‘clauses’ of framing construction indeed do behave as separate clauses under the =karra test. Consider the constructed example in (249).

(249) bejakarra norkarru wudmangkarra
   beja=karra norl wurr-ma-nga burr-ma-o-rndu=karra
   CMPLV=MAYBE get.close 3n=O:3pl.S-TAKE-PST 3pl.S-do-PRS-3pl.IO=MAYBE
   ‘They may say about them: “They may have already caught up with it” ’ (a revised
version of 243 on page 218)

The underlined clause second occurrences of \(=\text{karra}\) in (249) take the two widest possible non-overlapping scope positions for the clitic in this framing construction: the scope of \(=\text{karra}\) in the framed clause does not extend to the framing clause, nor does the meaning of \(=\text{karra}\) in the framing clause apply to the framed clause, and the two markers attach to the first elements at the clause boundaries. Under the definition in (240) this demonstrates that both \(\text{beja}(\text{karra})\) \(\text{norl wudmanga}\) ‘(maybe) they have caught up with it’ and \(\text{budmerndu}\) ‘they say to them’ represent clausal units.

All examples of \(=\text{karra}\) appearing in framing constructions in this section so far have shown the clitic in framing constructions of reported speech or reported thought. Example (250) is slightly more complicated: it is ambiguous between a reported thought and a reported intentionality interpretation and includes \(=\text{karra}\) ‘maybe’ in a narrow-scope position.

\[(250)\]
\[
\text{wangkun di} \quad \text{wurlakarra ngima \ ama}
\]
\[
\text{wangkun di} \quad \text{wurla}=\text{karra nga}_1\text{-yi-}\text{ma} \quad a_1\text{-ma-}ø
\]
\[
\text{later} \quad n_{\text{ANAPH}} \text{talk}=\text{MAYBE 1sg-FUT-DO 3msg-do-PRS}
\]

‘He is thinking, what can I say later/He wants to maybe say something later’ (100903-25NGUN, 0:36-0:39)

Ngalkad utters (250) in response to a recording of Alec Jilbidij saying \(\text{nini e}\) ‘he is thinking’, from the example transcribed as (2) on page 1. In (250) \(=\text{karra}\) ‘maybe’ follows the coverb in the framed clause in non-second position and the inflecting verb in the framed clause has a first person singular future tense form complying with a reported intentionality interpretation. This interpretation is reflected in the second translation provided above, but a more idiomatically appropriate rendition is the reported thought interpretation in the first translation.\(^20\) As with all previous examples, this example of \(=\text{karra}\) in narrow scope in a framed clause indexes the perspective of the reported speaker.

In (251) \(=\text{karra}\) ‘maybe’ again appears with a wide-scope interpretation in sentence second position. This example is potentially ambiguous between reported thought and and reported intentionality as well and Ngalkad chooses the first reading in her translation of (251). Both in this reported thought translation and the reported intentionality translation, however, there is an important difference from (250): the scope of \(=\text{karra}\) ‘maybe’ is not restricted to the ‘reported message’ but includes the framing clause. Framing constructions with a reported intentionality meaning with \(=\text{karra}\) in the framed clause allow for an interpretation in which it has the entire framing construction in its scope, a phenomenon we could refer to in syntactic

\(^20\) As, e.g., the dialogue fragment in (157) on page 123 illustrates, distinguishing between reported speech, reported thought and reported intentionality interpretations on the basis of isolated sentences is often problematic. Ngalkad’s translation of this example was ‘He is thinking what he gotta say’.
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terms as =karra-lowering (i.e. although the clitic appears in the framed clause it is interpreted as in the framing clause).

(251) Discussing a picture from the Family Problems picture task in which one of the protagonists harvests a pumpkin.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wokkarra} & \quad \text{ongo} & \quad \text{nyumerri} \\
\text{wok=karra} & \quad \text{wonga_1-w_1-u-ø} & \quad \text{nyo_2-ma-ø-yirri} \\
\text{cook=maybe} & \quad 3n_{o,sg.O:1sg.O-act.on-FUT} & \quad 3fsg-do-PRS-CONT
\end{align*}
\]

“She might be thinking want to burn it up”

‘Maybe she wants to cook it’ (090813AJMJSMPDe, 4:35-4:37)

Example (251) contains the framed clause \(\text{wo(karra) ongo}\) ‘I will cook him/it (maybe)’ and the framing clause \(\text{nyumerri} ‘she is saying’, with a pronominal subject that is coreferential with the subject of the framed clause. As with all examples with a future tense, first person subject in the framed clause, (251) is ambiguous between reported speech, thought and intentionality out of context, but Ngalkad interprets the example as reported intentionality. What is the scope of =karra in this case? Following the pattern of =karra in framed clauses observed so far this would be expected to be the framed clause, i.e. with =karra ‘maybe’ marking an epistemic evaluation of the clause \(\text{wo ongo}\) ‘I will cook it with’ on behalf of the subject referent of the framing clause. As Ngalkad’s idiomatic gloss shows this is not how she interprets the example: in her translation represented between double quotes she explains the meaning of the epistemic modal as an evaluation of the ‘thinking event’ described in the framing construction, i.e. as modifying the framing clause. This same interpretation is reflected in the idiomatic translation of (251) between the single quotes above.

The two framing constructions in (252) both contain an instance of =karra, one that is translated as ‘maybe’ and one in the indefinite pronoun forming function following an interrogative pronoun. In both instances the marker =karra ‘maybe’ appears in the framed clause.

(252) \(\text{ngalakukarra buluk ngiya amerri: kunyakarra}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ngala-ku=karra} & \quad \text{buluk nga_1-ig-a a_1-ma-ø-yirri: kunyal=karra} \\
\text{meat-DAT=maybe look 1sg-FUT-go 3msg-do-PRS-CONT where=INDEF} \\
\text{amerri} & \quad a_1-ma-ø-yirri \\
\text{3msg-do-PRS-CONT}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Maybe he wants to look for meat. “[It is] somewhere,” he says’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 7:44-7:47)

As in (251) the translation of (252) shows the epistemic modal =karra ‘maybe’ as indexing the perspective of the current speaker. This contrasts with the translation of kunyakarra
'somewhere' in the second framing clause: the indefinite meaning is not (primarily) a reflection of the current speaker's knowledge background but mostly (or at least just as much) that of the reported speaker represented of the framing clause. This second framing construction is an instance of reported speech. In the first framing construction the framed clause *ngalakukarra buluk ngiya* should not be translated as ‘maybe I will look for meat’, for there is no reason to assume that the reported speaker has any uncertainty about his own actions (i.e. ‘looking for meat’). Rather, it is the reporting speaker who expresses reservations about his interpretation of the events depicted on the image he is describing as part of the Family Problems picture task. In both (252) and (251) *=karra* ‘maybe’ in second position has scope over the entire framing construction, not just the framed clause and indexes the perspective of the current, reporting speaker.

These examples of *=karra*-lowering, i.e. of *=karra* appearing in the framed clause but taking the framing clause in its scope in framing constructions of reported intentionality are no rare exceptions, many similar examples can be found, compare (253).

(253)  

a. *wobakarra ngay ama*  
   wok-ba=karra ngay-a a1-ma-ø  
   cook-ITRV=maybe 1sg-FUT-go 3msg-do-PRS

   ‘Maybe he wants to cook’ (090813AJMJSMPDh, 2:18-2:20)

b. *kundikarra warndij nguwi ama*  
   kundi=karra warndij nguwi-a1-u-yi a1-ma-ø  
   husband=maybe make 1sg-FUT-ACT.ON-REFL 3sg-do-PRS

   ‘Maybe he wants to become [her] husband’ (090813AJMJSMPDc, 1:21-1:22)

c. *ngurrkarra ngimanangka ama*  
   ngurr=karra ngimanangka-a1-ma-nangka a1-ma-ø  
   hit=maybe 1sg-FUT-do-3sg.IO 3msg-do-PRS

   ‘Maybe he wants to hit her’ (090813AJMJSMPDe, 0:16-0:17)

In (253a) it is the current speaker doubting whether the subject of the framed clause expressing the attributed intention *woba ngay* ‘I want to cook’ intends to perform this action, not the reported speaker himself. Similarly in (253b), wide-scope *=karra* ‘maybe’ receives a current speaker perspective-indexing interpretation: within the context of the Family problems picture task Alec Jilbidij again speculates (i.e. expresses uncertainty) about his interpretation of a picture and the meaning of *=karra* ‘maybe’ does not apply to the framed clause *kundi warndij nguwi* ‘I want to/will become a/her husband’ but to the entire framing construction,

---

21 The transcription *ngay* reflects the idiosyncratic pronunciation in the recording, the expected form would have been *ngiya*.  
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i.e. including the framing clause. Perhaps the most unambiguous example of this framing construction wide =karra ‘maybe’ is (253c), which is a description by Scotty Martin of a picture of the male protagonist of the Family problems raising his fist to hit his wife. At this stage, the intentions from the perspective of the man about to hit his wife are clear, but the uncertainty expressed by =karra ‘maybe’ concerns the representation of the mind of the male protagonist by the narrator, the current speaker in (253c). The clitic =karra, although appearing in second position in the framed clause in these expressions of reported intentionality in all instances has a scope extending beyond the framed clause, encompassing the entire framing construction.

Under the definition of an Ungarinyin clause, framing constructions of reported speech and thought behave as two separate clauses, whereas reported intentionality displays the properties of a single clause. This observation adds an additional argument to the description of framing constructions of reported intentionality in section 3.3.2 as slightly exceptional framing constructions: in addition to the forced tense and person choice in the framed ‘clause’, the scope properties of clause second =karra ‘maybe’ also reveal a ‘tighter’ syntactic integration between the framed and framing ‘clauses’ of constructions of reported intentionality. The distinction between framing constructions of reported speech and thought on the other is not as categorical as with the ‘desiderative construction’ in Warrawa (McGregor, 2007), but in Ungarinyin the framing constructions with the ‘want’ interpretation is similarly characterised by tighter constructional integration as the =karra test shows. From a typological perspective, these findings also fit with the characterisation of ‘want’ (complement) constructions cross-linguistically, which Guerrero (2008) describes as being more inflexible, and thus syntactically more ‘tight’ than other constructions expressing mind attribution: ‘whenever there are available structures in a language, the tightest linkage would encode pure intention, whereas the less tight may express a particular mental stance’ (Guerrero, 2008: 335).

For convenience, I will continue to refer to the two elements of framing constructions of reported intentionality that – necessarily – both contain inflected verbs as the ‘framed’ and ‘framing clauses’, with the proviso that these do not need to correspond to what I am calling clauses outside of framing constructions following the definition in (240). What the comparison of reported speech/thought and reported intentionality has demonstrated, however, is that the scope of the modal element =karra ‘maybe’ behaves differently in different types of framing constructions and that this scope interpretation corresponds to shifts in perspective, the way in which elements in the framing construction are understood to express a perspective attributed to the subject referent of the framing clause or that of the current speaker. This property is also fundamental to a specific type of Ungarinyin framing construction that serves to express complex or mixed perspective.
6.4. Complex perspective in Ungarinyin

The framed clause of framing constructions of reported speech and reported thought often represents a reported message that the current speaker cannot vouch for. In a typical reported speech situation (as sketched in figure 3.1 on page 73) she was not involved in the events described by the reported speaker so she is often uncertain about the veracity of these events. However, explicit evaluations of the truth of a reported message are most commonly grounded in the perspective of the reported speaker, as in the examples in (254), which express certainty about the truthfulness of the reported message.

(254) a. mara wungo jadarn di budmanyirra
   mara wungoa₁⁻a₂⁻w₁u jadarn di burr-ma-a-nyirri-ra
   see 3nwa₁-O:1sg.S-FUT-2ACT.on true nwa₁-ANAPH 3plS-do-PRS-DU-1sg.IO
   amarakarra jirri jirri milimilikurde
   a₁⁻ma-ra=karra jirri jirri milimi-kurde
   3msg-do-PST=MAYBE m.ANAPH m.ANAPH paper-COM

   ‘I will find out about it. They two told me the truth (a true word),’ he may/must have said with the paper’ (AJMJSMMPDh, 14:50-14:54)

b. karri warrndernnga nyindinyindi nyinbowara
   karri warrndern-nga nyindi-nyindi nyin-bowa-ra
   oh.yes true-only 3fsg.ANAPH-REDUP 2sg-not.know-PST
   birrimanangka
   birra₂-ma-a-nangka
   3pl.S.DEFS-do-PRS-3sg.IO

   ‘Yes truly, she is the one, you did not know, they said to him’ (Coate and Oates, 1970: 84)

The evaluative expressions in (254a) follow the scope patterns described for framed clauses of reported speech and thought in section 6.3: the qualifications jadarn di ‘true word’ in (254a) and warrndernnga ‘(really) truly’ in (254b) express the perspective of the reported speaker.

Although the content of a reported message construction often describes events that the current speaker was not directly involved in (she was told about them), this does not mean she does not assess these, what Jakobson (1957) calls, ‘narrated events’. The current speaker introduces a framed proposition into the current discourse situation through a framing construction, which may implicate that she considers it unqualifiedly relevant, but there may also be many reasons which lead her to doubt that the reported message is true or, for example, she may want to express hope that the state of affairs does not hold. These evaluations of the reported message are found in utterances that express what Evans (2006: 104) labels ‘complex
perspective’, utterances that present some elements from the perspective of a reported speaker (such as a reported message in a framed clause) and some others from the perspective of the current speaker.

A fairly simple strategy for doing this in Ungarinyin (and other languages) is by using a modifier that has scope over an entire framing construction. Rumsey (1982: 171) cites the example in (255) (glosses and spelling adapted), which employs a modal particle in apposition with a framing construction to signal an affective evaluation of the reported message by the current speaker.

(255)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{menya} & \quad [\text{ ada ngima } \quad \text{ nyumerri}] \\
\text{menya} & \quad [\text{ ada nga1-yi-ma } \quad \text{ nya2-ma-o-yirri}] \\
\text{UNFORTUNATELY} & \quad [\text{ sit 1sg-FUT-DO } \quad \text{ 3fsg-do-PRS-CONT}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Too bad she intends to stay’ (Rumsey, 1982: 171)

The modal particle *menya* in (255), which in this context roughly translates as ‘unfortunately’ (see section 4.3.5) indicates that the current speaker evaluates the intention of the reported speaker/cognisant as something she regrets, thereby implicating that this is indeed an intention that the subject referent of the framing clause had. As observed by Field (1997: 807, also see references therein), expressing an affective evaluation of a reported event commonly leads to the implicature that this event is evaluated by the current speaker as one that occurred in the real world. In other words, with a current-speaker evaluative meaning (Spronck, 2012a) signalling an event as e.g. undesirable, the speaker simultaneously indicates that this event is factive (cf. Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970: 169–171).

There are no examples to contextualise the modifier - framing construction strategy in (255) in contemporary Ungarinyin. Given the observations in section 6.3 it is significant that (255) represents a framing construction of reported intentionality, rather than reported speech or thought, since we may presume that it is more acceptable for a modifier to have scope over a complex sentence construction if this is a relatively tighter integrated construction such as with reported intentionality. All speakers I have discussed example (255) with, however, while acknowledging that it was grammatical, suggested that this type of construction was more common in the neighbouring Worroran languages Wororra or Wunambal than in contemporary Ungarinyin. And in fact, (255) is the only attested instance of this strategy.

But Ungarinyin does have a more productive and even more remarkable complex perspective strategy using the epistemic marker =karra ‘maybe’, an example of which is shown in (256).

---

*22This a somewhat looser reformulation of the claim in Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970), which is intended to apply to specific (English) predicates such as ‘regret’, ‘ignore’ etc. in factive complementation constructions, although these do not necessarily express facts in the strict sense that they reflect propositions the current speaker holds true (Davidse, 2003).*
Chapter 6. Complex stance

(256) Talking about birds who mistake little stones for food:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bidniyangarrikarra} & \quad \text{budma} \quad \text{mangarri} \quad \text{rarrki} \quad \text{kanda} \quad \text{mara} \\
\text{birr-niyangarri}=\text{karra} & \quad \text{burr-ma}=\text{ma} \quad \text{mangarri} \quad \text{rarrki} \quad \text{kanda} \quad \text{mara} \\
3\text{pl-good}=\text{MAYBE} & \quad 3\text{pl-do-PRS} \quad \text{food} \quad \text{stone} \quad \text{m.PROX} \quad \text{see} \\
\text{wurrengarri} & \quad \text{wurr-y}_2=\text{-o}-\text{ngarri} \\
3\text{n}_w.O:3\text{pl-S-be-PRS-SUB} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘When they see these stones, they think they are good food [but they are not]’ (100903-18NGUN, 3:10-3:12)

Two aspects stand out in (256) that distinguish the example from ‘regular’ framing constructions. The first one can be clearly demonstrated by adding the bracket notation for the framed and framing clauses, as in (256’).

(256’) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{bidniyangarrikarra} & \quad \text{budma} \quad \text{mangarri} \quad \text{rarrki} \quad \text{kanda} \quad \text{mara} \\
\text{birr-niyangarri}=\text{karra} & \quad \text{burr-ma}=\text{ma} \quad \text{mangarri} \quad \text{rarrki} \quad \text{kanda} \quad \text{mara} \\
3\text{pl-good}=\text{MAYBE} & \quad 3\text{pl-do-PRS} \quad \text{food} \quad \text{stone} \quad \text{m.PROX} \quad \text{see} \\
\text{wurrengarri} & \quad \text{wurr-y}_2=\text{-o}-\text{ngarri} \\
3\text{n}_w.O:3\text{pl-S-be-PRS-SUB} (= 256) \\
\end{align*}
\]

As (256’) shows, the verbless framed clause bidniyangarri mangarri ‘it is good food’ in (256) is discontinuous and is interrupted by the framing verb budma ‘they say/think’. This contradicts the generalisation discussed in chapter 3 that the framing clause follows the framed clause: the feature that the framing clause follows the framed clause. An assumption that precedes the claim that the framed and framing clauses have a particular order is that the two are clearly differentiable, indivisible units. In (256) the framed clause is not.

The second aspect that is striking about (256) is the position and meaning of =karra ‘maybe’.

23 What is the scope of =karra ‘maybe’ in (256)? The clitic is in wide-scope clause second position and occurs in the framed clause so would seem to index the perspective of the reported cognisant. But how to delimit the scope of =karra ‘maybe’ in a discontinuous framed clause? If the modal clitic has scope over mangarri ‘food’, how to account for the preceding framing clause budma ‘they say’? Is it possible that =karra ‘maybe’ in the framing construction of reported thought (256) has scope over the entire framing construction, as with reported intentionality? In other words, assuming a regular epistemic modal interpretation,

\[23\text{I will rule out a local indefinite (INDEF) interpretation ‘they think it is some food’, since it does not explain the current speaker evaluative meaning ‘but they are not’ and this INDEF interpretation is not available for the otherwise similar examples to be introduced below.}\]
are any of the four possible readings (an epistemic possibility and an epistemic necessity one for each) likely or acceptable candidates for (256): ‘they think: “maybe it is/it must be good food” ’ or ‘maybe they think/they must think it is good food’? And on what grounds?

Example (256) has been taken from a narrative about a bush turkey (*ardeotis australis*), a particulary dimwitted bird in many Ungarinyin stories. Ngalkad tells how after eating and dissecting the bird people would often find large amounts of small stones in their intestines. The exchange in (257) is a short English conversation immediately preceding (256).

(257) NG: ‘They think it’s food for them, you know, that rock. They eatim, swallowim full’

   SS: ‘Can you say that one ‘they think it’s food for them but it’s *rarrki*’?’

As (257) shows, (256) reflects a narrative discourse situation that the narrator has carefully constructed herself in the previous narration and conversation. This situation involves the perspective of the bush turkeys, gobbling up stones because they mistake them for food and the narrator commenting that they are wrong in thinking this. An important observation about this situation is that none of the discourse entities in (256) are in doubt about their interpretation: the bush turkeys assume the stones are food, the narrator knows they are not. This rules out an epistemic possibility reading for both a framed clause wide-scope and a hypothetical framing construction wide-scope of *karra ‘maybe’.*

Also an epistemic necessity interpretation, i.e. ‘they think it must be good food’/‘they must think it’s good food’, cannot satisfactorily account for (256). Although section 6.2.1 demonstrated that *karra ‘must’* can be used to express modal evaluations over propositions that the speaker is certain of, this crucially involves, following the definition of epistemic necessity in van der Auwera and Plungian (1998), relative certainty, an evaluation of a possibility as the most likely among other rejected possibilities (e.g. in 228 the identification of the Bowerbird as the suspect as opposed to all suspects considered earlier). In (256) such a range of possibilities does not exist: from neither the perspective of the narrator nor from that of the bush turkey is there any epistemic assessment other than that the discourse objects referred to as *bidniyangarri mangarri ‘good food’* are food (for the bowerbird) or that they are stones (for the narrator) and neither discourse entity considers the alternative perspective’s interpretation as a possibility. More problematically, interpreting *karra* as a regular epistemic marker does not account for the interpretation of ‘mistaken belief’ nor does analysing (256) as a normal modal framing construction explain the exceptional pattern with the discontinuous framed clause.

In light of these considerations the question of whether *karra ‘maybe/must’* has scope over either the framed clause, the framing clause or both seems tangential: the specific meaning of (256) does not arise from any single element in the utterance but from the syntagmatic combination of the discontinuous framed clause and construction second *karra*. The meaning
of this particular construction is similar to that of the Kayardild example (224) or Mparntwe Arrernte (225), one of mixed perspective, but unlike in these languages this mixed perspective meaning is not tied to a particular particle. In Ungarinyin it is expressed through a multi-word construction that may be schematically represented as in (258). As before, the square brackets indicate the framed and framing clauses, the elements ‘$x_1 \ldots x_n$’ symbolise the word(s) in the framed clause and ‘$x_{n+1}$’ the final element of the discontinuous framed clause.

$$(258) \quad [\, [ \ x_{1} = karra \ldots x_{n} \ ] \ -ma- \ ‘do’ \ [ x_{n+1} \ ] \ ]$$

An example of this construction is shown in example (259) taken from a story recorded by missionary linguist Howard Coate a bit less than half a century before the story told by Pansy Nulgit. It demonstrates all features of the representation in (258), including the pattern of discontinuity: the subject of the framed clause, barnmarn jirri ‘witch doctor, magician’ follows the framing verb ngadmerri ‘we are saying/thinking’.

$$(259) \quad \left[ \left[ \left[ \left[ wulinakarra \quad linyba \ a-yirri \quad ngadmerri \right] \left[ wulina=karra \quad linyba \ a_1-a-o-yirri \quad ngarr-ma-o-yirri \right] \left[ \text{ordinary.eye=}\text{MAYBE look} \quad 3\text{msg-GO-PRS-CONT} \right] 1\text{pl.INC-do-PRS-CONT} \right] \left[ barnmarn \ jirri \mbox{ m.ANAPH} \right] \right] \right] \right] \right.$$

‘We think the magician is looking with his ordinary eyes’ (Coate, 1966: 122, lines 359-360)

The context for (259) is a story about a barnmarn ‘witch doctor’ or ‘magician’, who according to the narrator is capable of looking with his magic third eye, allowing him to see more than any ordinary person. With this authorial omniscient perspective the narrator tells of a previous encounter with the witch doctor, before it was known that the subject of the framed clause in (259) was in fact a magician. Using the complex perspective construction the narrator indicates that he and others thought that the protagonist witch doctor was seeing with his ‘ordinary eyes’, whereas in fact witch doctors do not.

A third example of the complex perspective construction is (260). Here, the narrator recounts a story in which she saw a reptile’s head and assumed it was a goanna’s but as she now knows it was in fact the head of the deadly poisonous King Brown snake.

$$(260) \quad \text{goannakarra \ ngamara \ nyalangkun \ kuno}$$

‘I thought it was a goanna’s head over there’ (100903-30NGUN, 0:47-0:49)
With respect to the meaning of \textit{=karra} ‘maybe’, even more clearly than (256) the self-reports in (260) and (259) demonstrate that it is unlikely that the clitic in the complex perspective construction carries a common epistemic meaning: quite the contrary, it would seem that certainty about both the fact \textit{that} the belief was held at the earlier time and that it was incorrect is central to the information value of a mistaken belief utterances, since there would be very little use in stating that a certain thought was incorrect if it is unclear whether anyone subscribed to it at some point in time. In each of the instances of mistaken belief above there is also no reason why the subject referent would doubt his or her interpretation of the events: in (260) the protagonist supposes that there is nothing extraordinary about the reptile’s head and that it is just a goanna and in (259) the group of people does not question that the protagonist (whom they do not know to be a magician) is looking with anything else than his ordinary eyes. Within the grammatical context of the complex perspective construction \textit{=karra} contributes to a modal meaning within which one interpretation of events presented in the construction is evaluated as untrue. A speculative suggestion about the origins of this modal meaning may be that the epistemic necessity interpretation of \textit{=karra} constitutes a link between the epistemic and the ‘mistaken belief’ interpretation, within which the meaning ‘most certain of all possibilities’ is re-interpreted as ‘p according to participant A and alternative true \textit{p} according to the speaker’. This second part of the mistaken belief interpretation ‘evaluation according to the speaker’ derives from the central function of \textit{=karra} labelled ‘subjective epistemic representation’ in figure 6.1: it indexes the knowledge of the speaker. There is a typological precedent in the grammatical literature for the ‘mistaken belief’ interpretation of the Ungarinyin epistemic modal in a complex perspective construction: the Western Tarahumara example in (226), which Burgess (1984) glosses as ‘dubitative’. As in Ungarinyin, the Western Tarahumara construction consists of an element signalling (speech) attribution and an epistemic modal marker. If the suggestion about epistemic necessity acting as a semantic link between the epistemic and mistaken belief interpretations of \textit{=karra} is correct it would be interesting to see if the dubitative in Western Tarahumara covers a similarly wide range of epistemic meanings. Also, the attestation of seemingly similar patterns in two unrelated languages calls for a broader typological survey of the use of epistemic markers in expressions reported speech and thought. Both of these tasks, however, fall beyond the objectives of the present study.

While the clitic \textit{=karra} is fundamental to establishing the evaluative meaning of the complex perspective construction, it only gains significance in the grammatical context it occurs in: the anomaly of a framing construction with a discontinuous framed clause. As in framing constructions of reported intentionality, where the boundaries between finite verbal constructions and their arguments do not neatly line up with the scope properties of \textit{=karra} ‘maybe’, in complex perspective constructions the instances of \textit{=karra} in the widest possible scope position apply
to do not correspond to the framed and framing clauses. But the reason why the =karra test in (240) becomes unavailable in the complex perspective construction is because in this construction =karra does not have a regular epistemic meaning.

For each of the examples of the complex perspective construction, however, it can be easily demonstrated that the element following the framing clause belongs to the framed clause preceding the framing clause on both morphological and semantic grounds. In (256) the adjective bidniyangarri ‘good (plural/mass)’ has a plural/mass prefix that agrees with mangarri ‘food’ and also semantically the postposed element mangarri ‘food’ belongs to the framed clause: the current speaker knows the discourse object referred to as ‘food’ to be rarrki ‘stones’, so the designation mangarri ‘food’ is grounded in the perspective expressed by the framed clause. In (259) the element following the framing clause barnmarn jirri ‘the magician’ is the nominal subject referent of the verbal construction linyba ayirri ‘he is looking’ in the framed clause. Interestingly, although as the subject of the framed clause it has to be understood as part of this framed clause the designation barnmarn jirri ‘the magician’ is one only the current speaker with his current knowledge state would choose (at the moment when he thought the subject referent looked with his ‘ordinary eyes’ he did not know this man to be a magician), so the wording of the framed clause indicates a mixed perspective. In (260) the construction-final element nyalangkun kuno ‘this head (feminine)’ is again firmly grounded in the perspective of the reported cognisant: while the demonstrative kuno has a w-neuter form because of the bodypart noun -alangkun ‘head’, the prefix is coreferential with the word ‘goanna’ in the framed clause (yadara nyindi in Ungarinyin). The interpretation that the head belonged to a goanna is that of the reported cognisant, not that of the current speaker, who knows the head to be of a aru jirri ‘snake’ or larnkurr jirri ‘King Brown’, both masculine nouns.

The postposed element in a discontinuous framed clause need not be a subject nominal construction, as demonstrated by (261)

\[
\begin{align*}
(256") & \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
.bidniyangarri \text{karra} \\
.burr-niyangarri=\text{karra} \\
.3\text{pl-good}=\text{MAYBE}
\end{array} \right] \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
.budmakarra \\
.burr-ma-\varnothing=\text{karra} \\
.3\text{pl-do-PRS}=\text{MAYBE}
\end{array} \right] \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
mangarri \\
mangarri \\
.\text{food}
\end{array} \right] \\
\end{align*}
\]

*They may think it’s food [but it is not] ( = A revised version of 256)

Also, (256") does not resolve the status of the ‘discontinuous element’ mangarri ‘food’. (I have been unable to elicit reliable speaker intuitions about the acceptability of this constructed example.)
Two protagonists of the story, a woman and a man, go out hunting for kangaroos di jali li bando:! nyumanangka andu []

In (261) the positional nominal wardulu ‘close’ forms a framed clause with the proximal demonstrative kanda ‘here’, indexing the perspective of the reported cognisant, as the subordinate clause following the complex perspective construction demonstrates. The right-dislocated element of a discontinuous framed clause is a single lexical element with or without a discourse status marking pronoun or demonstrative. The existence of discontinuous framed clauses within a complex perspective construction may help to explain why framing clauses in Ungarinyin are abundant to the point that they often seem superfluous. The widespread attestation of defenestrated clauses in chapter 4 indicated that there are many contexts in which reported speech and thought are unproblematically expressed without full-fledged framing constructions, which raised the question why these are still so often used. One answer may be that defenestrated clauses following a framing construction may be misinterpreted as discontinuous framed clauses, especially when they only consist of a single lexical expression. For example, in (252) on page 223, kunyakarra ‘somewhere’, following a framing construction with =karra in framed clause second position could have easily been mistaken for a discontinuous framed clause in the absence of the final framing clause, leading to an incorrect interpretation of ‘mistaken belief’.  

25In the original transcription Coate (1966: 109) renders these sentences as “Di jali li: bando:!” nyumenangka. “Andu ganda-gara” ama, “wadulu.” Bowara, briyi yuri ninge ada burwanngarri, translated as: ‘[S]he says, “Look at that kangaroo over there!” He thinks it might be quite close to here, but they are a long way off, sitting in a different place’ (Coate, 1966: 99). The crucial difference with the re-analysis presented here is that andu ‘he’ in the original version is interpreted as part of the framed clause, which puts =karra in third, rather than construction second position. This, however, is a mistranslation: andu ‘he’ is coreferential with the object suffix -nangka representing the addressee of the framing clause preceding the complex perspective construction, as can be concluded from the transitive imperative li bando ‘look at them’ and the subject prefix of the subordinate clause ada burwanngarri ‘when they sit’ showing that the referent jali ‘kangaroo(s)’ is plural and could not be referred to with the singular form andu ‘he’.
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A semantic property all discontinuous framed clauses share is that they primarily express a belief or reported thought, which the current speaker presents as a proposition that may or may not have been expressed verbally, with or without the particular wording of the framed clause. This analysis corresponds to the finding in Rumsey (1982: 163–164) that framing constructions of reported intentionality and causation, unlike regular framing constructions of reported speech or thought, allow for discontinuous framed clauses. While Ungarinyin framing constructions are typically ambiguous with respect to the distinction between speech and thought, it is uncommon that a reported speech interpretation is dispreferred on the basis of anything other than contextual factors. Discontinuous framed clauses in complex perspective constructions stand out by explicitly not directly reflecting a real-world reported speech situation, instead expressing reported thought. As such, they are consistent with the prediction in McGregor (1997) that a cross-linguistic motivation for explicitly expressing reported thought predominantly arises in contexts of mistaken belief:

‘My investigation of Gooniyandi discourse reveals that represented thoughts are generally mistaken and are normally indicated as such by the propositional modifier tharrri ‘mistakenly believe’ [...] I believe that the same observation is likely to hold for other languages as well, and that it has a (perhaps universal) pragmatic motivation in terms of the Gricean maxim of quantity’ (McGregor, 1997: 260).

By not presenting a reported speech event as a real world event, the distinction between uninterrupted and discontinuous framed clauses resembles the opposition between ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ speech. As per the characterisation of this opposition in Wierzbicka (1974), introduced in section 3.2.2, summarised as: ‘Direct discourse is “show” as well as speech, indirect discourse is speech only’ (Wierzbicka, 1974: 300), with ‘speech’ referring to the utterance from the perspective of the current reporting speaker and the perspective ‘shown’ is that of the reported speaker. An immediate consequence of this distinction is, in the formulation of Holt (2000: 428), that ‘indirect reported speech [...] facilitates infiltration by the author to comment on or interpret the meaning of the quotation.’

Ungarinyin, like many languages of the world, does not distinguish between direct and indirect speech in the classical sense (cf. Coulmas, 1986c): all deictic terms in a framed clause refer as in the reported speech situation. However, the complex perspective construction may be related to a much more fundamental semantic, and perhaps also formal, property of non-direct speech: a partial perspective shift. McGregor (1997) discusses this case as follows:

---

26 I am using the non-committal notion non-direct speech rather than indirect speech to cover the range of reported speech constructions that have been identified in the literature as neither completely ‘direct’, i.e. purely reported speaker indexical, nor ‘completely indirect’, i.e. with all deictic terms indexing the perspective of the current speaker (e.g. Bally, 1912; Lips, 1926; Volosinov, 1973; Wierzbicka, 1974; Coulmas, 1986b; De Roeck, 1994; Redeker, 1996; Aikhenvald, 2008; Evans, 2012; Nikitina, 2012).
‘[A] speaker might decide [...] to represent certain categories from the perspective of the frame constituted by the representing clause (the [reported speech situation]), and certain from outside of it (from the perspective of the [current speech situation]). There is nothing anomalous about such mixing of perspectives [...] The ‘intermediate’ categories [i.e. between canonical direct and canonical indirect speech, SS] thus emerge not as grammatically intermediate, but as statistically intermediate: they show some number between the minimum (zero) and the maximum of reference points within the frame constituted by the clause of speech’ (McGregor, 1997: 256).

The analysis in Wierzbicka (1974) would imply that ‘intermediate’ constructions on the cline between fully direct and indirect speech, a subtype Evans (2012) calls ‘biperspectival speech’, are a combination of ‘show’ and ‘tell’. The Ungarinyin complex perspective construction is such an intermediate type and, like the main features of the direct-indirect speech opposition, it is characterised by a degree of ‘syntactic integration’ between the matrix (framing) and embedded (framed) clauses. Within the traditional European opposition between ‘John said: “I will go there”’ and ‘John said that he would come here’ the framed and framing clauses in the latter, indirect speech construction share more grammatical relations through the dependency of pronominal/demonstrative referential values and tense forms. In Ungarinyin, increased syntactic integration between clauses, while not affecting the deictic expressions in the framed clause, is manifested by the embedding of the framing clause within the framed clause.

As per the characterisation in Holt (2000) of non-direct speech constructions facilitating evaluation of the reported message by the current speaker, the perspective of the current speaker can be reflected in Ungarinyin framing constructions with discontinuous framed clauses. Verhagen (2005) suggests the following connection between wording and indirect speech constructions:

‘The responsibility of the speaker/writer for the wording allows her to identify the source of the content of certain ideas as another mental space than her own, and at the same time present them in a way that suits her communicative purposes optimally. Notice, for example, that ‘indirect speech’ often involves leaving things

---

27 This label should not be taken to imply that the construction represented in (258) on page 230 is a fully separate construction from the framing construction and its variants described in chapter 3: I consider it a special type of framing construction, i.e. a subtype of the construction represented in (4) on page 2.

28 Note however that analyses of the English direct-indirect speech opposition in terms of coordination/subordination with direct speech consisting of paratactic clauses and indirect speech of hypotactic ones (as, e.g., in Halliday, 1985), while highlighting the importance of the notion of integration in the expression of the direct-indirect distinction, insufficiently acknowledge, as McGregor (1994) convincingly argues, the syntactic exceptionality of framing constructions and also overlook the granularity of the distinction.
out from someone else’s discourse and summarizing it, such that its size and content best fit the present discourse’ (Verhagen, 2005: 114).

With Evans (2012) I interpret the label ‘indirect speech’ here as a scalar phenomenon and the above citation as also applying to biperspectival speech: the reported speaker has a choice as to the exact wording of the reported message, and in the framing clause that is not understood as an unmediated representation of a reported speech event through, as an Ungarinyin discontinuous framed clause, she has a greater degree of freedom in representing the reported message. This is a freedom she does not have – or, at least, has to a lesser extent – if she is purporting to ‘show’ the reported message as in a regular direct speech construction.

If this analysis applies cross-linguistically, it may be expected to have even more relevance for Aboriginal languages like Ungarinyin since, as Rumsey (1990: 354) asserts:

‘Aboriginal linguistic ideology does not valorize wording as something distinct from meaning, since the choice among lexico-grammatical alternatives is usually or always a meaningful choice, even where the alternative wordings express what appears to be the same propositional “meaning.”’

An extreme example of the importance of wording can be found in the framing constructions in lines (112-114) on page 325 in which an utterance attributed to an Unggumi speaker is reported in the original language, with an Ungarinyin framing clause: in a regular framing construction the framed clause is not understood as a ‘reworded’ version of the reported message (although of course due to limitations of memory and the limits of imitation it often is). The complex perspective construction, on the other hand, provides a grammatical context within which the current speaker is allowed to comment on and rephrase the ‘message’ of the reported cognisant, as was clear from the use of barnmarn ‘magician’ and nyalangkun ‘head (feminine)’ in (259) and (260) above.

Even though complex perspective is not expressed in Ungarinyin through particle constructions, as in Kayardild or Mparntwe Arrernte, the clitic =karra and the discontinuous framed clauses form an elegant and transparent way of encoding a very similar meaning. In framing clauses of complex perspective, the clausal ‘syntactic integrity’ that is typical of the sequence of framed and framing clauses elsewhere, is disrupted: the framed clause is discontinuous. In combination with the construction-second subjective evaluative modal marker =karra this results in an interpretation in which some aspects of the utterance are presented from the perspective of the reported speaker/cognisant, viz. the ‘belief that p’, and some others from that of the current speaker, viz. the qualification that ‘p is untrue’. Ungarinyin achieves this complex meaning through minimal structural means: a generic modal marker and a syntactic pattern.
6.5. Discussion: the modal-evidential model of reported speech

In this chapter I have explored several interactions between modal meanings and framing constructions. I began by illustrating the meaning and function of the speaker indexical modal marker =karra and presented framing constructions of reported speech and thought in which the boundaries between the elements expressing the perspective of the reported speaker and that of the current speaker neatly coincided with the framed and framing clauses. Sections 6.3 and 6.4 then introduced two alternative patterns: first it was shown that framing constructions of reported intentionality allowed complex modal meanings expressed in the framed clause to have scope over the entire framing construction, suggesting that they behave as a tighter constructional unit than framing constructions of reported speech and thought. This phenomenon of syntactic integration was evidenced in an even more striking way in complex perspective constructions in which the framing clause interrupts a discontinuous framed clause.

The complex perspective construction is vital for answering one final question about the internal structure of the domain of stance constructions: how exactly do framing constructions relate to the other stance categories introduced in chapter 4? What are the position and role of the Ungarinyin framing construction in the stance domain? In this section I propose that the construction is most closely linked to the notion of positioning in the stance triangle in figure 4.9 on page 159 and that this property is illustrated particularly well by the complex perspective construction.

Section 4.5 introduced stance, following Du Bois (2007), as a interaction between the functions of evaluating, positioning and aligning. I defined and illustrated alignment and evaluation, but the notion of positioning has so far remained underdeveloped. Du Bois (2007) derives positioning from the sociologically oriented work of Davies and Harré (1990) and Harré and van Langenhove (1991), who define it as follows:

‘[Any interpretation of an] anecdote becomes a fragment of autobiography. People will therefore be taken to organise conversations so that they display two modes of organisation: the ‘logic’ of the ostensible topic and the story lines which are embedded in fragments of the participants’ autobiographies. Positions are identified in part by extracting the autobiographical aspects of a conversation in which it becomes possible to find out how each conversant conceives of themselves and of the other participants by seeing what position they take up and in what story, and how they are then positioned (Davies and Harré, 1990: 48). ‘A “position” can be specified by reference to how a speaker’s contributions are hearable with respect to these and other polarities of character, and sometimes even of role’ (Harré and van Langenhove, 1991: 395–396).
Chapter 6. Complex stance

The formulation of positioning as a meaning that is separate from the logical meaning of speech and expresses how the speaker participated in the discourse event being talked about (‘autobiography’), signalling her position and role to the addressee (‘hearable’) may initially seem far removed from any grammatical account. But there is one particular grammatical category specifying exactly this type of meaning, namely the morphological category of evidentiality, as found, for example, in the Papuan language Oksapmin, cf. (262).

(262) \[ jxe \ jw-an \ modop \ ku \ tit \ it \ əphi-n-gwel \]
then DIST-across FROM woman INDEF again come-PFV-VIS/SENS.YESTP

‘Then, another woman came from over that way {I saw}’ (San Roque and Loughnane, 2012: 117, some glosses adapted)

The evidential marker \textit{gwel} in (262) signals that the speaker bases the information ‘another woman came from over that way’ on participation in the described event as someone who \textit{saw} this event (with the curly brackets San Roque and Loughnane (2012) indicate that ‘{I saw}’ is encoded with a grammatical morpheme). The verbal morphology of Oksapmin, like more well-known evidential systems in languages of North- and South-America, the Caucasus and the Himalayas, distinguishes between different types of ‘positioning relations’ specifying a source of information (Aikhenvald, 2004: 3), more particularly ‘visual’ and ‘otherwise sensory’. San Roque and Loughnane (2012: 117) point out that an evidential meaning as in (262) is expressed through a ‘main predicate event’, indicated by the main clause (in example 262 the woman coming over) and a ‘perception event’, expressed by the evidential morpheme (in example 262 the grammatical expression ‘I saw p’). The juxtaposition of these two events is what accounts for the positioning relation: the main clause represents some event (which corresponds to the notion of ‘anecdote’ in Davies and Harré, 1990 and ‘object’ in Du Bois, 2007) and the evidential marker signals how the speaker positions herself with respect to this event (also see Haßler, 2010: 238).

Example (263) from Ngiyambaa, a language of New South Wales also illustrates morphological evidentiality.

(263) \[ ɲindu-dhan \ girambi-yi \]
2sg.NOM-LING.EVID sick.PST

‘You are said to have been sick’ (Donaldson, 1980: 276)

The suffix \textit{-dhan}, glossed as ‘linguistic evidence’ in Donaldson (1980), signals that the claim ‘you are sick’ in (263) is attributed to someone other than the current speaker, a meaning of ‘hearsay’. A similar morphological strategy is also found, e.g., in Pitjantjatjara (Bowe, 1990: 63). Whereas in (262) the speaker presents her involvement in the event talked about
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as someone who saw it occur, in (263) she presents herself as someone who overheard, or was told, that the event talked about had occurred.29

The Ngiyambaa example in (263) represents a morphologically encoded type of reported speech. While languages such as Oksapmin demonstrate that the range of evidential meanings is much wider than speech attribution, there is a basic correspondence between the two events involved in an evidential meaning and the two events involved in the reported speech situation as in figure 3.1 on page 73: the reported speech event in square B (similar to the perception event) and the current speech event in square A in which the current speaker introduces the reported speech event to the current addressee. Jakobson (1957) is perhaps the earliest explicit formulation of the idea that ‘reportative evidentials’, parallel the meaning of a reported speech construction (also cf. Chafe, 1986; Bergler, 1992; Besnier, 1993; de Haan, 1999; Haßler, 2002; Clift, 2006; Cornillie, 2009; Wiemer, 2010; Shaffer, 2012).30

There are many different ways in which the current speaker may present herself as having been involved in the reported speech event. For example, a speaker may both have witnessed the event described in the reported message and been told about it (and perhaps even in a different way from how she remembers the narrated event herself) or have only partially grasped the reported utterance and second guess the intention of the reported speaker, which all reflect on how the narrated event is being represented.31 Each of these alternative ways of representing her involvement in the reported speech event are alternative examples of positioning. Direct speech, bi-perspectival speech and indirect speech are different constructionalised expressions through which the current speaker positions herself with respect to the reported speech event.

This analysis is contained in Besnier (1993), who sorts elements within utterances of Nuku-laelae reported speech according to their ‘referential’ and ‘affective’ function (see table 4.1 on page 104). The specific choice of framing devices affects the evidential meaning of a reported speech construction.32

29As this description suggests there is a basic distinction between evidential meanings in which the speaker was directly involved herself (direct evidential meaning, such as visual evidentials) and ‘indirect’ evidentials, representing perception events in which the speaker did not directly witness what is being said, viz. the narrated event (de Haan, 2001; Boye, 2010; Padúćeva, 2013: 10). However, the general semantic structure of a perception event and a current speech event, a proposition that is separate from the ‘logical’ meaning that is being talked about and a qualification of the involvement of the current speaker, is the same for all evidential categories.

30Aikhenvald (2004: 132–140) argues that in languages that have both morphological and multi-word strategies for expressing reported speech, these strategies often perform different functions, as can be expected based on the distinction between paradigmatic and obligatory morphological marking and (more flexible and variable) multi-word constructions (also cf. Spronck, 2009: 4–8).

31In languages with a morphological evidential this type of circumstance has clear-cut grammatical consequences. For example, de Haan (2001: 202) finds that in the Californian language Kashaya the reportative evidential marker ‘cannot be used if the speaker has evidence for the action in the sentence. If there is any evidence, the Inferential category suffix (either -qa or -bi) must be used’.

32Besnier (1993) adopts the definition of evidentiality by Anderson (1986: 273), as ‘the expression of the kinds of evidence a person has for making factual claims’, but I will adhere to the description of evidentiality introduced above and interpret the analysis in Besnier (1993) within this approach.
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Contrast, for example, the quotative verb or expression (shown to function in most circumstances as a reported-speech key devoid of affective meaning) with prosodies, whose primary function is to communicate affect. Reported-speech keys thus vary in the extent to which they allow leakage of the quoting voice onto the quoted voice [...] Nukulaelae speakers betray an intense awareness (whether conscious or unconscious) of the relative evidential load of various [representation devices] in reporting discourse’ (Besnier, 1993: 176–177).

The present chapter has laid bare some of the subtleties involved in the syntactic composition of framing constructions in Ungarinyin. Although unlike in Nukulaelae reported speech Ungarinyin does not vary its framing verb in the framing clause or display different degree of integration of the framed clause into the framing construction through direct/indirect speech patterning, structural diversity does exist. Under the =karra test for clausehood ‘regular’ framed clauses of reported speech and thought behave as tight units and position the speaker as someone merely reflecting a real-world reported speech or thought event. For framing constructions of reported intentionality and complex perspective constructions the evidential meaning is more diversified: reported intentionality may represent either a real-world speech event or an interpretation of an unexpressed intention attributed to the reported speaker. The framed clause less unambiguously indexes a reported speech event and is more closely associated with the perspective of the reported speaker in the current speech event, which under the =karra test is reflected by a fuller integration of the framed and framing clauses. The suggestion that the framed clause of framing constructions of reported intentionality may not index an autonomously reported speech event and that this property is related to a lesser degree of ‘clausehood’ and syntactic integrity is also supported by the observation it may be realised as a discontinuous clause (see section 3.3). Both the discontinuous framed clause and the less direct representation of the reported speech event are demonstrated even more strikingly in framing constructions of complex perspective.

Apart from as an expression of evidentiality, many authors have also expressed the view that reported speech signals a type of ‘evaluation’ or modality (e.g. Romaine and Lange, 1991; Hill,

33Instead of ‘representation divices Besnier (1993) uses the notion of ‘keys’, which Goffman (1974) introduces (as in the musical sense) as a term for different ways of ‘copying’ events or social actions in communication and other types/events of social action. In Goffman (1974), ‘keying’ is an active, transitive verb: e.g. ‘a play keys life, a ceremony keys an event’ (Goffman, 1974: 58), and Goffman (1974: 48ff) mentions ‘make-believe, contests, ceremonials, technical redoings, and regroundings’ as the main examples. Any instance in which a social situation is recast in another social situation (reported speech is a prototypical form of ‘keying’) the social actor (the speaker) makes interpretable choices about how to introduce the ‘keyed’ situation/event in the current (speech) situation. Besnier (1993: 164) writes ‘the choice of “keys” [...] that speakers of a language make in communicating affective meaning is a loaded factor in and of itself’. I have not adopted the notion ‘keys’ above in order to avoid calling on yet another theoretical construct, but the analysis that variation in the reporting construction, i.e. form of the framing construction, results in different representation of the speaker of how she was/is involved in the reported speech event is entirely similar (also see Spronck, 2012a).
1995b; Suzuki, 1998; Vandelanotte, 2004; Olson, 2007; Johansen, 2011). The modal view of reported speech is normally based on a similar notion of the semantic opposition between direct and indirect speech constructions that motivates the evidential view. For example, Romaine and Lange (1991) discuss the English ‘new quotative’ construction (e.g. ‘She was/went like...’) cf. Buchstaller and Alphen, 2012) as a strategy for expressing current-speaker attitude towards a reported message and Vandelanotte (2004) introduces the notion ‘distancing reported speech’ for a type of reported speech that evaluates a message as e.g. unreliable (a meaning made explicit in English phrases such as ‘...or so x said’ or ‘x maintained that p’). Wilkins (1986: 585) introduces an example of this type in Mparntwe Arrernte, containing the particle kwele that he explicates as follows:

X kwele
I want you to know that someone else has said this about X. (If I’m reporting them correctly.)
I wouldn’t say it if they hadn’t said it, because I have no direct experience of it myself.

When used in a situation where the speaker has or should have had direct experience of the narrated event described in the reported message, kwele takes a modal meaning, as in (264).

(264) the kwele re-nhe twe-ke
1sg.A KWELE 3sg-O hit/kill-pc
‘I’m supposed to have killed him.’ [But I should know if I did, and I didn’t.] (Wilkins, 1986: 586)

As with the semantic explication of kwele above, the modal meaning of the particle in (264) is a pragmatic inference deriving from the evidential meaning of kwele: as a reported evidential marker kwele signifies indirect evidentiality, which indicates that the speaker has ‘no direct experience’ of the narrated event, an interpretation that is pragmatically marked in the case of a narrated event in which the current reporting speaker is said to have been involved. The ‘modal’ interpretation of (264), then, derives from its unusual evidential marking. The more general principle that can be derived from these observations Evans (2006) phrases as follows:

‘Any time a speaker chooses a modal value imputing the belief to someone else – as with an independent subjunctive or a hearsay evidential – they will, by Q-implicature, implicate that they do not hold the belief strongly themselves, so that the direct connection from speaker to state of affairs will contain an implicated doubt’ (Evans, 2006: 104)
Speech attribution strategies, as more or less constructionalised expressions of indirect evidentiality, thus implicate (in the absence of relevant information that would by Q-implicature indicate otherwise) that the current speaker does not vouch for the truth of what is being talked about.

In terms of the ‘evaluating’ and ‘positioning’ relations in the stance triangle, it is exactly the absence of a modal evaluation in examples such as (264) that leads to the ‘modal’ implicature. By positioning herself as a discourse entity who only has an indirect relation to the narrated event, i.e. the content of the reported message, the speaker implicates that she cannot vouch for the narrated event, which receives a clear modal interpretation if it becomes clear contextually that she should be able to vouch for it (or if the reporting construction is given unusual prominence as in ‘distancing speech’ in Vandelanotte, 2009). As Du Bois (2007: 141) states, ‘[t]he act of taking a stance necessarily invokes an evaluation at one level or another, whether by assertion or inference’, and expressions involving framing constructions are no different in this respect. In complex perspective constructions the inherent modal meaning of reported speech, that implied in ‘non-modal’ framing constructions, is given an explicit semantic value, revealing the semantic components of reported speech constructions that are often less clearly on display. But fundamentally, as Buchstaller (2011) notes, the evidential and modal meanings in reported speech constructions are always available:

‘whereas the modal meaning of these constructions evaluates the content of the message and thereby hedges on the basis of subjectivity [...] the evidential meaning marks the access of the reporting speaker to the reported material’ (Buchstaller, 2011: 63–64).

I refer to this analysis as the modal-evidential model of reported speech.\(^{34}\)

A strong argument for why it is useful to acknowledge the modal and evidential meanings in reported speech as separate contributors to the full meaning of reported speech constructions, Haßler (2002) illustrates with the French example (265).\(^{35}\)

(265) Sans doute, hélas (malheureusement), n’a-t-il pas eu le temps, une fois de plus

‘Without doubt, unfortunately, he has no time, one time more’ (Haßler, 2002: 164)

In (265) the combination of sans doute ‘undoubtedly’ and hélas ‘unfortunately’ can only be interpreted if the second modal adverb is attributed to a reported speaker, viz. the third person il, and the excuse il n’a pas eu le temps ‘he has not had the time’ is an indirect report.

\(^{34}\)Note that ‘access’ in this description is a different formulation of the same insight I have labelled ‘positioning’: representing the way in which the current speaker is involved in the reported speech event.

\(^{35}\)The (near) word-by-word translation in (265) is as in the source, a more idiomatic English translation may be something like ‘Alas/Regrettably, he “hasn’t had the time.” Yet again...’
None of the markers in (265) by themselves signal that the utterance is to be understood as reported speech, but the clash of the modal attitude markers, can only be resolved if one of them is interpreted as belonging to some other speaker (also cf. Rossari, 2012). Haßler (2002: 164) concludes that examples such as (265) show a semantic interaction between ‘evidentiality and modality’. It also illustrates the commensurability of positioning and evaluating: were the reported speech event is explicitly evaluated (as in 265), positioning is implied and, in the case of the implicature pointed out in Evans (2006), where positioning is (overly) explicitly marked (as in 264), evaluation can be inferred. This is a direct consequence of the modal-evidential model of reported speech and its embedding within the stance triangle.
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Nous sommes toujours enclins à cette imagination naïve d’une période originelle où un homme complet se découvrirait un semblable, également complet, et entre eux, peu à peu, le langage s’élaborerait. C’est là pure fiction.
— Benveniste, 1966

7.1. Ungarinyin reported speech, thought and intentionality in context

In this study I have presented the Ungarinyin framing construction as a construction whose interpretation relies on a dynamic, rather than a fully conventionalised process of understanding. As the subtypes of the framing construction introduced in chapter 3 and repeated below as (266) illustrate, even though elements within the construction may hint at a meaning of either reported speech, reported thought, reported intentionality, causation-intention or naming, none of these structural or semantic features are exclusive to the respective interpretation.

(266) a. [ [ ... ] framed clause [-ma- + O_{RepAddr}] framing clause → SPEECH
b. [ [ ... ] framed clause [-ma-] framing clause → THOUGHT
c. [ [ ... S_i + FUT ] framed clause S_i [-ma-] ] framing clause → INTENTION
d. [ [ ... S_j + FUT ] framed clause S_i [-ma- + O_{j}] ] framing clause → CAUSATION
e. [ [ ... ] framed clause [-ma- + O_{Named}] ] framing clause → NAMING

This situation raises questions about how speakers can successfully understand a linguistic structure whose meanings are seemingly so diverse. Questions that become even more pertinent if it is realised that the Ungarinyin patterns of constructional polysemy are far from unique in the languages of the world.

The preceding chapters presented other puzzles for linguistic cognition, with respect to the role of stance constructions in defenestrated clauses, the overlap between linguistic elements expressing cohesion and stance, and the complex perspective meaning, which Ungarinyin achieves with minimal structural means. What properties does human cognition need to possess in order
to successfully use a construction like the Ungarinyin framing construction and the grammatical domains with which it interacts?

In this brief concluding chapter I attempt to place the description of Ungarinyin reported speech in a socio-cognitive context, addressing the questions posed above in section 7.2. In section 7.3 I propose an approach to grammar that takes into account a feature of reported speech that is central to the interpretation of framing constructions: understanding the role of participants in the double-event structure that framing constructions encode. This proposal is inevitably programmatic, but I suggest that the participant meaning in framing constructions sheds light on the contribution of perspective in grammatical categories more generally, pointing towards a framework that allows us to comprehensively examine the tight connection between social cognition and grammar.

7.2. Social cognition and Ungarinyin reported speech

7.2.1. Three connections between (social) cognition and framing constructions

In order to use the Ungarinyin expressions of reported speech, thought and intentionality described in this study, several minimal assumptions have to be made about what a language-using mind is able to do. First, it has to have an understanding of objects, properties and events in a shared experienced world and understand that these are sufficiently recognisable to other speakers of the language in order to refer to these objects and events. This is an area in which framing constructions/defenestrated clauses do not differ from other expressions and that cognitive-functional linguistics has sought to model for decades, addressing the question of how to interpret the relation between the speaker and perceived conceptual categories. Second, the language-using mind has be able to reason about other minds, understanding that and how they are different from that of the speaker. This, again, is an aspect that is inherent to using language (e.g. Verhagen, 2005), but it has particular significance both for stance constructions (evaluating, positioning and aligning) and cohesive devices/strategies (reference tracking, information structuring): while an intersubjective assessment of the extent of common ground between the mind of the speaker and the addressee is essential for successfully using most referential elements, stance and cohesion require that the speaker understands the addressee can not only distinguish, but also juxtapose and compare several types of knowledge background, expectations and attitudes.

This ability demands a complexity of social cognition, that Kaminski et al. (2008), Tomasello and Herrmann (2010), Callaghan et al. (2011) and Moll et al. (2014); Tomasello (2014a) demonstrate, is uniquely human.\footnote{In fact, Tomasello (2014a: 54ff) cites the necessity of being able to co-ordinate opposing views as an} While our closest primate relatives, chimpanzees, are well able to

\footnote{In fact, Tomasello (2014a: 54ff) cites the necessity of being able to co-ordinate opposing views as an}
predict the actions of other chimpanzees based on what they think the others know about a situation, they cannot contrast their own knowledge with that of others: for example, Kaminiski et al. (2008) find that when two chimpanzees are shown the same information they can predict each other’s actions, but not when the subject chimpanzee knows more than the other; in which case it acts as if the other chimpanzees knows this information as well. The authors conclude that chimpanzees can interpret ‘mental states’ but not ‘beliefs’:

‘[T]he understanding of beliefs requires a fully representational theory of mind in a way that the understanding of other mental states does not, and chimpanzees simply do not have this representational theory of mind. Humans have evolved this capacity and it emerges in human ontogeny’ (Kaminski et al., 2008: 233)

What is unique about human social cognition is that humans are able to interpret beliefs that are different from their own beliefs.

A third minimal assumption about the language-using mind that is prompted by framing constructions and defenestrated clauses is that it has to have the ability to not just contrast beliefs of people who are present in the current speech situation, but, importantly, also of those who are not. In terms of Sperber (1997), beliefs that a speaker holds may be divided into two types: ‘intuitive’ and ‘reflective’ ones. The first type concerns beliefs that she derives from direct experience and perception, the second type involves some form of cultural transmission, typically communication (Sperber, 1997: 72). Sperber (1997) suggests that speakers judge their reflective beliefs by comparing them with intuitive beliefs in order to test whether what is learned as a reflective belief is in accordance with her perception of the world.

Judging the reliability of reflective beliefs is an ability that has to be learned. Aydin and Ceci (2009) observe that younger children are more ‘suggestible’ than older children: presented with a reflective believe/assertion which they can know to be false through direct experience (intuitive belief), younger children are more likely to accept it, provided it it comes from a sufficiently authoritative source. False memories of other children are less influential than those of adults and, children even ‘distinguish between credible and noncredible adults’ (Aydin and Ceci, 2009: 84). Sperber et al. (2010: 371) write: ‘[g]iven the choice, three-year-olds seem to prefer informants who are both benevolent [...] and competent [...] By the age of four, they not
only have appropriate preferences for reliable informants, but also show some grasp of what this reliability involves.’

Sperber et al. (2010) explore this subject further using the term ‘epistemic vigilance’, ‘a suite of cognitive mechanisms [...] targeted at the risk of being misinformed by others’ (Sperber et al., 2010: 359). ‘Vigilance (unlike distrust) is not the opposite of trust; it is the opposite of blind trust’ (Sperber et al., 2010: 363; also see Tomasello, 2014a: 72).

According to Sperber et al. (2010), epistemic vigilance can be observed towards a source and towards the content of an utterance. Otherwise reliable sources may communicate a logically implausible story or a notoriously unreliable source may tell a story that is above suspicion. Aydin and Ceci (2009) observe that children develop the capacity to make these judgements at a relatively early age even though, as Sperber et al. (2010: 372) point out, it depends on intricate calibrations of the status of a source and evaluations of the content of a message: ‘Children’s epistemic vigilance [...] draws on – and provides evidence for – distinct aspects of their naïve epistemology: their understanding that people’s access to information, strength of belief, knowledgeable, and commitment to assertions come in degrees’.

Just like acquiring the understanding of such degrees of belief, knowledge and commitment, learning how to use the linguistic structures with which to talk about them, i.e. mastering different varieties of framing constructions, takes time. In a developmental study of the use of (in)direct speech and defenestrated clauses in English, Hickman (1993) finds clear distinctions within and between young age groups and adults:

‘The 4-year-old children had two clearly identifiable prototypical modes: the re-enacting and the descriptive modes. Although some framed quotations could be found at this age, they were interspersed among other utterance types and rarely constituted a prototypical mode. The 7- and 10-year-old children, as well as the adults, mostly relied on the reporting modes. However, the 7- and 10-year-olds clearly preferred the direct reporting mode, whereas the adults relied as frequently on the direct and the indirect reporting modes. Unframed quotations were rare in these age groups and they were systematically used in specific contexts (e.g., an unframed reply to an immediately preceding framed question)’ (Hickman, 1993: 72).

At four, language learning speakers either emulate the reported speaker or describe the reported message as if it were a non-attributed locution (Hickman, 1993). Perhaps they maintain epistemic vigilance towards the source or even towards the content of the reported utterance, and this may correlate with their decision to either plainly state the content of the reported message or to imitate the reported speaker. In terms of the modal-evidential model of reported speech, however, these children do not show a fully conventionalised way of positioning them-
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selves with respect to a reported message through the use of a framing construction. Slightly older children do acquire the ability to linguistically position themselves as a reported speaker, but only seem proficient in a minimal range of positioning types, simply demonstrating a reported message through the use of a direct speech construction. Only in the oldest group of test subjects does Hickman find the capacity to vary linguistic types of positioning and a command of motivated defenestration (note that Gültemann, 2008 lists turns in dialogue as a typical context in which framing clauses, his ‘quotative indexes’, are not used; see page 149). The details of age and skill may differ between subjects and language groups, but the observations described above show that despite the apparent ontogenetic basis for source recognition and authority evaluation the specific linguistic structures with which to talk about these properties require considerable and extensive ‘fine-tuning’. The developmental account suggests that the acquisition of the full range of framing constructions follows (or, stronger, is predicated on) the cognitive development of the socio-cognitive category necessary to interpret it (cf. Tomasello, 2003). However, arguing in the other causal direction, Aydın and Ceci (2009) also propose that evidential meanings (as expressed by framing constructions) contribute to the cognitive development of source recognition:

‘Children’s ability to evaluate and track the sources of beliefs has been associated with reductions in suggestibility levels. [...] The findings revealed that some warning or training on the existence of source information helps even three to to four year olds to resist suggestibility. Then it is reasonable to assume that grammatically salient source cues would act similarly as the explicit source cues. Evidentiality markers, as linguistic cues that tag source distinctions, might help children be alert to sources during a misinformation paradigm, causing reductions in suggestibility levels’ (Aydın and Ceci, 2009: 84–85).3

If this is a reasonable assumption to make, we can also assume that mistaken belief particles and complex perspective constructions as introduced in chapter 6 can play a similar role in facilitating the development of epistemic vigilance.

7.2.2. Complex perspective

The three types of cognitive skill set introduced above are directly relevant for framing constructions in any language and should be central to an account of the relation between (social) cognition and reported speech. In addition, this study has also highlighted three more specific phenomena that shed light on the connection between grammar and social cognition: (1)

3Also cf. Matsui et al. (2009), who argue that false beliefs are recognised at an earlier age by Japanese children than German children, because Japanese employs more grammatical markers signalling knowledge status.
the interaction of meanings within the stance triangle as evidenced in framing constructions and defenestration, (2) forms in discourse as resulting from an interplay between stance and cohesion, and (3) the polysemy of the framing construction itself.

Chapters 4 and 6 illustrated two specific types of interaction between the interpretation of positioning and evaluating in Ungarinyin framing constructions and defenestration: on the one hand, it was shown that in utterances where the speaker positions herself as a reporting speaker (either through the use of a framing construction or a defenestrated clause), she also makes more use of evaluative stance markers (indexing the perspective of the reported speaker). On the other hand, the interpretation of the clitic =$karra$ in various types of framing construction demonstrated a grammatical interaction between structures expressing positioning (framing constructions) and modal marking.

One way of explaining the interdependency of positioning and evaluating is to appeal to the role the two play in (the conceptualisation of) joint activities, as laid out in Tomasello (2014b):

‘Humans, but not chimpanzees, [...] seem to comprehend joint activities and their different roles from a “bird’s eye view” in which all roles are interchangeable in a single representational format. [...] And cognitively, they seem to understand the collaborative activity as a dual-level structure of jointness (joint goal and attention) and individuality (individual roles and perspectives) in ways that pre-figure the organization of many complex human institutional structures’ (Tomasello, 2014b: 189). Although many animals monitor and evaluate their own actions with respect to instrumental success, only humans self-monitor and evaluate their own thinking with respect to the normative perspectives and standards (“reasons”) of others or the group (Tomasello, 2014b: 192). ‘[T]he collaborative nature of human communication means that the communicator can perceive and comprehend his own communicative acts as if he were the recipient [...] With modern humans and conventional linguistic communication, some new types of thoughts could now be expressed. Moreover, now the self-monitoring process came not just from the perspective of the recipient, but from the normative perspective of all users of the conventions’ (Tomasello, 2014a: 104)

According to Tomasello (2014a;b), humans understand the relationships between discourse participants and discourse objects, in the sense of Du Bois (2007), within ‘a single representational format’ of interchangeable roles. This ‘bird’s eye view’ representation of shared perspectives, individual perspectives and cultural norms of co-operativity implies that each

---

4The understanding of social institutional structures, according to Tomasello (2014a: 90ff), accounts for the development of contextual interpretation.
interpretation of a perspective relation is relative to that of another: if a speaker has an understanding of e.g. a particular positioning value (and the perspective in which it is grounded) she simultaneously has an understanding of other positioning and evaluating meanings and perspectives involved in her representation of the speech event, which means that she necessarily has an overview of their relative constellation. I believe that this bird’s eye representation is what motivates Du Bois (2007) to describe the stance act as, fundamentally, a holistic unit. The interactions between evaluating, positioning and assuming perspective in framing constructions and defenestration are linguistic reflections of the conceptual unity of stance.

7.2.3. Stance and cohesion

The stance triangle represents a system of related and interacting meanings that can be motivated on the basis of human socio-cognitive properties. A further form of interaction stance engages, not within the stance triangle (i.e. between stance meanings) but with another system of linguistic meaning making, namely cohesion. As was shown in chapter 5, within the context of reported speech and thought, referential elements (i.e. elements of cohesion) can express perspective meanings, which are not normally a function of cohesion but of stance. What cognitive explanation may be adduced for the interaction between stance and cohesion?

Of all complex grammatical phenomena cohesion (i.e. the expression of discourse reference and information structuring) has been most successfully linked to specific aspects of cognition. The research programme set out in Chafe (1974; 1994) and further elaborated in Du Bois (1987) and Kibrik (1999; 2003; 2011) was conceived broadly in Chafe (1974):

‘My suggestion will be that [the distinction between ‘new and old information’] is based precisely on a speaker’s assumptions as to what is in his addressee’s consciousness at the time of speech. Such well-known linguistic phenomena as intonation, pronominalization, and to a lesser extent word order, are governed in a crucial way by these assumptions’ (Chafe, 1974: 111)

Kibrik (2011) develops a narrower, more empirical focus by on the one hand limiting the range of grammatical phenomena considered, (definite, third person) pronouns, and on the other hand further specifying the cognitive element of ‘consciousness’ involved: (short term) memory (see section 5.2.1).

Tomasello (2003: 3–4) states that in order to understand the genetic foundation of language proficiency, we need to minimally assume that human ontology includes a propensity for intention reading (in order to understand that human vocalisations mean something, and what they mean)\(^5\) and pattern recognition (in order to recognise and interpret grammatical constructions). In addition, constructing discourse and sustaining a conversation crucially depends on

\(^{5}\)This meaning includes complex perspective meanings but, as Tomasello (2003) shows, is indispensable for
memory. My claim, which in this section I will merely discuss in general terms as a direction for further research, is that while stance is mostly associated with social cognition and cohesion with memory, the interdependence between the cognitive systems underlying stance and cohesion accounts for the observed interaction between the two grammatical systems. The aspects of cohesion that are not motivated by memory, are grounded in social cognition (e.g. assessing whether a referent can be assumed activated in the short term memory of the addressee) and a full cognitive account of reported speech has to consider the role of memory.

Perhaps the most explicit formulation of the relation between evidential meanings and memory is Dahl (2013). Dahl (2013) distinguishes the memory types in figure 7.1, which provides a useful contextualisation of his approach in relation to Kibrik (2011). Kibrik (2011) addresses short term memory, which, according to figure 7.1, is one of three types of memory, along with sensory memory and long term memory. Sensory memory is the memory of immediate experiences as perceived through the senses, but Dahl (2013) is mostly concerned with how these experiences are treated in explicit (declarative) long term memory, particularly in episodic memory:

6 Episodic memory refers to memory for personal experiences and their temporal relations, while semantic memory is a system for receiving, retaining, and transmitting information about meaning of words, concepts, and classification of concepts’ (Tulving, 1972: 401–402). ‘[Episodic memory] makes possible mental time

\[\text{Figure 7.1.: Human memory (Dahl, 2013: 25)}\]
In slightly simplified terms, semantic memory consists of all meaningful generalised and conventionalised elements of language (types), such as world knowledge and the mental lexicon, and episodic memory contains specific events (tokens) of lived experience. ‘One possible explanation for the speed and ease by which [tense, aspect, mood and evidentiality] categories are handled’, Dahl (2013: 24) suggests, ‘is that they reflect how or from where information is retrieved rather than what is retrieved.’ Indirect evidentials signal that the event talked about is ‘something not [...] taken from long-term episodic memory [...]’ because they are used when something is not remembered in Tulving’s sense’ (Dahl, 2013: 49).

By using a construction that expresses a direct evidential meaning, the speaker indicates that the described event was retrieved from episodic memory, whereas an indirect evidential meaning, according to Dahl (2013), signals that the speaker has no specific memory of the event. The interpretation of evidential meanings as an indicator of episodic memory is a more precise and more restricted formulation of what I have called the ‘degree of mental contact the current speaker has with the reported speech situation’ (Spronck, 2012a: 109) and Buchstaller (2014: 64) calls ‘the access of the reporting speaker to the reported material’ (see section 6.5).

While I think that the account in Dahl (2013) takes an important step forward in discussing connections between evidentiality and cognition in more specific terms, the notion of episodic memory may not yet be specific enough. For example, Ely and Ryan (2008) examine the frequency with which a group of American English speakers uses reported speech constructions (as opposed to non-attributed speech, not as opposed to defenestration), while scoring their test subjects for a range of character features. The correlation that stands out most clearly is gender, with women using reported speech constructions more often than men (Ely and Ryan, 2008: 402–403). Ely and Ryan (2008: 397) relate this finding to women generally displaying a better developed verbal episodic memory, remembering wording and other features of the reported speech situation with greater accuracy than men. Irrespective of how to interpret this data, the differences in frequency between men and women with respect to the use of reported speech constructions cannot be attributed to memory alone.

As Olson (2007) summarises, (episodic) memory is only one of several cognitive skills involved in deploying evidential meaning:

'The attitudes children can entertain are just those that they can recognize in

---

7 The idea of grammatical meaning as a signal for information retrieval resembles the notion of ‘procedural meaning’ current in relevance theoretic accounts (cf. Escandell-Vidal et al., 2011).
themselves and ascribe to others. [...] The ability to both ascribe and avow beliefs and intentions in explaining action is the result of coordinating a remembered verbal form, the content of a speech act, with a discrepant currently true situation’ (Olson, 2007: 312)

Evidential meanings have an indispensable memory component, simply because the current, reporting speaker has to remember relevant features of the reported message (where it reflects a real-world speech situation), but just like with discourse reference and perspective, the contribution of memory to the interpretation of evidentiality interacts with a host of socio-cognitive properties. Unlike for discourse referential devices, whose default function is to express a function with respect to memory, the most fundamental meaning of evidential constructions involves stance, and hence socio-cognitive skills of perspective taking and intersubjective positioning. But the interaction between a memory-related meaning and a perspective meaning, i.e. between aspects of cohesion and stance, is evident in both cases.

Crucially, social cognition and episodic memory represent independent sets of cognitive capacities (Rosenbaum et al., 2007), which I associate with the linguistic systems of stance and cohesion, respectively. As the discussion above has shown, the connection between direct/indirect evidentiality and episodic memory is less straightforward than that between full/reduced discourse reference and short term memory and there are several aspects of the proposal that need to be refined. But the hypothesis Dahl (2013) posits, that evidential constructions signal the memory type involved, can serve as a heuristic instrument for analysing where the formation of framing constructions does, and does not rely on (episodic) memory. Similar to the cognitive discourse analysis of discourse reference in Kibrik (2011), which (partially) fails in contexts where referential elements signal a perspective shift, any memory-based analysis of evidentiality will inevitably break down in certain contexts. The view of language as stance and cohesion suggests that these cases represent instances in which stance and cohesive meanings interact and that the failure of the memory-oriented analysis is motivated by socio-cognitive functions, such as perspective taking. This way, a systematic grammatical cognitive discourse analysis as propagated in Kibrik (2011) for referential devices and, more tentatively, for evidentiality in Dahl (2013) serves as a heuristic tool for uncovering effects of social cognition in grammar.8

7.2.4. The polysemy of the framing construction: dialogism

Our final question about the relation between cognition and the grammatical structures examined in this study is perhaps the most fundamental one: what aspects of (social) cognition

---

8A notion that ultimately may serve to unify stance and cohesion (and their cognitive correlates social cognition and memory) into a single model is attention: in cognitive discourse analysis, Kibrik (2011) models establishing and retaining attention to a referent, which social cognition crucially depends on monitoring and establishing joint attention (Tomasello, 2014a; also see Graziano and Kastner, 2011; Graziano, 2013).
can help explain the polysemy of the Ungarinyin framing construction?

As indicated, Ungarinyin speakers have a number of constructional cues supporting an interpretation of reported speech, reported thought or reported intentionality, but the specific, situated meaning of a framing construction has to be constructed dynamically; it is not unambiguously identified by the construction. Nevertheless, despite the (potential) ambiguity of individual examples, Ungarinyin speakers do not appear to have trouble interpreting a framed or defenestrated clause as an (internal) thought or an (external) locution. Marking the distinction between the two is apparently of no concern in most contexts in Ungarinyin, nor in the many other languages that display polysemy between reported speech and reported thought (see section 3.2.2).

One interpretation of this cross-linguistic pattern of polysemy is that, fundamentally, in these languages ‘internal speech’ (i.e. thought) and external speech are perceived as sharing fundamental similarities: there is no marked opposition between the internal subjectiveness of thought and the external intersubjectiveness of a locution. This suggestion corresponds to the thesis of Vološinov ([1929] 1973) and Mikhail Bakhtin (e.g. Bakhtin, 1986a;b; 1993) that language use, whether formulating an utterance or considering a thought, resembles a dialogue: every linguistic act is a response and makes use of linguistic elements and utterances from earlier or imagined conversations (cf. Irvine, 1996).

Recently, Mercier and Sperber (2011) have suggested an intriguing and plausible trajectory through which the dialogic nature of language use could have become part of human ontogeny. According to their proposal, dialogue, the ability to understand contrasting beliefs in a specific speech situation has allowed humans to evaluate opposing views more generally, thereby giving rise to the capacity of reasoning:

‘Reasoning contributes to the effectiveness and reliability of communication by enabling communicators to argue for their claim and by enabling addressees to assess these arguments. It thus increases both in quantity and in epistemic quality the information humans are able to share. We view the evolution of reasoning as linked to that of human communication’ (Mercier and Sperber, 2011: 71)

In this view, the capacity to acknowledge and interpret the beliefs of others in dialogue has also shaped one of the most individual of human cognitive capacities, that of reasoning: external and internal speech are intimately connected. The interdependence of thought/reasoning and

---

9 For a comprehensive discussion of the linguistic ideas of Bakhtin and his collaborators, as well as the (contested) authorship of Vološinov (1973), see Lähde (2001) and Holquist (1983).

10 In discussing mirror neurons, the (controversial) activation patterns of neurons in a person P perceiving an action, as if P performed the action (cf. Hickok, 2010), Brandt (2013: 38) draws a similar parallel between the subjective and the interpersonal level, suggesting that ‘mirror neuron research may even point to a notion of the Other as more primary than the Self’. 255
dialogue can explain a paradox at the heart of reported speech in language: on the one hand it requires the coordination of a complex set of socio-cognitive skills, which takes time to develop, but on the other hand even early language users engage in ‘self-dissociated talk’ (Goffman, 1981: 150) and no languages have been found without reported speech constructions.

Mercier and Sperber (2011) testify to a (re)new(ed) appreciation of the dialogic approach to language and human cognition (White, 2009; Shepherd, 2010), which has yielded new directions in psychology and cognitive science (e.g. Fernyhough, 1996; Linell, 2007; Salgado and Clegg, 2011; Steffensen, 2012). The advent of construction grammar, the recognition of the importance of (inter)subjectivity for grammar, and the increased emphasis on discourse data, have also prepared linguistics for adopting a more Bakhtinian approach to language (cf. Spronck, 2006), as evidenced, e.g. in the emerging field of dialogue studies (e.g. Du Bois, 2014).

While behavioural biology, philosophy and (neuro-)psychology explore the dialogic view of (inter)action by discovering its ontogenetic basis and establishing its conceptual coherence, linguistics is uniquely positioned to study the conventionalised mechanisms by which dialogic acts are constituted and the meaning making by which they operate. In the final section of this study I would like to sketch a proposal that takes the dialogic and socio-cognitive features of language into account when describing fundamental grammatical categories in language. The approach is embedded within the framework of fictive interaction (Pascual, 2014), but represents an analysis of grammar that has a more general application.\footnote{An expanded version of the account presented here is given in Spronck (accepted).}

7.3. Towards a socio-cognitive framework for grammatical analysis

Reported speech constructions provide a grammatical context within which a wide range of meanings can arise in the languages of the world (cf. section 3.2.2). Pascual (2014: 91) proposes that these meanings cover the ten semantic in types (267).\footnote{Also cf. the list from G"uldemann, 2008 on page 80. The classifications in (114) and (267) overlap to a large extent: Apart from signalling that the framed clause represents a reported speech event (‘reported evidence’ in 114), the constructions may express different varieties of reported thought (mental states in 267), reported intentionality (‘intention’ in 114, ‘desires’, ‘intentions’ in 267), evaluations and assessments by the reported speaker (‘deontic modality’ in 114, ‘emotional states’, ‘attempt’ in 267), one event following from another (indirect causation, similarity in 114, ‘causation’, ‘reason’ in 267, also see Larson, 1978: 86ff. and e.g. van der Voort, 2002: 320) and tense and aspectuality, involving two events following each other (‘proximate and future’ in 114, ‘states of affairs’, ‘purpose’, ‘future tense’ in 267). G"uldemann (2008) additionally lists ‘naming’, ‘illocution reinforcement’ and clause linkage in (114).}

\begin{enumerate}
\item ‘mental states’, ‘desires’, ‘intentions’;
\item ‘emotional states’, ‘attempt’;
\item ‘causation’, ‘reason’;
\item ‘states of affairs’, ‘purpose’, ‘future tense’.
\end{enumerate}
The grouping in (267) reflects four broader semantic classes into which, I believe, the cross-linguistically attested meanings of reported speech constructions can be divided. The functions in (267d), ‘states of affairs’, ‘purpose’, ‘future tense’, all reflect a view on the temporal organisation of an event. These functions are not relevant for framing constructions in Ungarinyin and I will not discuss them further here, but an example is shown in (115) on page 81, in which an Usan reported speech construction is interpreted as expressing the beginning of an action, a type of aspectual meaning Smith (2003; 2010) calls ‘viewpoint aspect’: ‘The aspectual viewpoint of a sentence is like the lens of a camera. It focuses on all or part of the situation expressed by a sentence, making the focused information visible’ (Smith, 2003: 68, also cf. Smith, 2010: 382). What unites the functions in (267d) is that they include an event structure that is viewed or represented in relation to some entity or other event (see Güldemann, 2008: 71ff).

The functions in (267c), ‘causation’, ‘reason’, are similar to the intention-causation interpretation of framing constructions in Ungarinyin: the subject referent of the framing clause intends the subject of the framed clause to perform an action. My impression of this ‘causation’ function in other languages is that they often also involve a meaning of intentionality, but this would have to be established systematically.

The functions in (267b), ‘emotional states’, ‘attempt’, represent affective meanings, they express an evaluative stance. Ungarinyin does not include this type, but it was illustrated with the ‘modal’ interpretation of the Usan reported speech construction in (116), and Larson (1978) and van der Voort (2002) report many similar examples in languages of South-America.

The functions that I will focus on here are those in (267a), ‘mental states’, ‘desires’, ‘intentions’ (and speech). These functions are expressed by Ungarinyin framing constructions as, more specifically, reported speech, reported thought and reported intentionality, which each are a specific reflection of the reported speech situation in figure 3.1, either as external speech, internal speech or imagined speech. As such, they reflect the three events that are central to the definition of evidentiality in Jakobson (1957) (see section 6.5). With the schematic representation in (268), Jakobson (1957: 135) famously formalises this definition:

\[(E^n E^{ns}/E^s)\]

In words: An evidential meaning consists of a narrated event \((E^n, \text{ some event talked about, i.e. a reported message for a reported speech evidential meaning})\), a narrated speech event \((E^{ns}, \text{ the event in which the speaker perceives the reported message})\) and this narrated event.

\[13\] In discussing these functions for his sample languages, Güldemann (2008: 72) refers to this function as ‘temporal relation’ ‘because the common denominator at issue is how a certain state of affairs is related to another state of affairs regarding any aspect of the dimension of time’.

\[14\] Pascual (2014) does not list ‘speech’, since her classification focuses on fictive interaction, the non-literal use of reported speech constructions, i.e. on non-speech interpretations.
about a narrated speech event has a referential relation with the (current) speech event (/Eₘ). An evidential expression positions the speaker in the current speech event Eₘ with respect to the narrated event Eₙ through the specified narrated speech event Eₙₛ, thus allowing the addressee to interpret the way in which the speaker epistemologically relates to the narrated event.¹⁵

While the schema in (268) clearly shows the event structure of the reported speech event, there are certain features that the labels do not reveal: Each of the events in (268) crucially involves one or more discourse participants. Figure 7.2 illustrates this point: For every narrated event there are one or more referents involved in the event talked about. The narrated speech event also inevitably involves discourse participants, the reported speaker and reported addressee/bystander, as does the current speech event. Each of these participants, which are implicit in the model in (268), are a necessary part of the meaning of a (reported speech) evidential construction, such as a framing construction.

My proposal is this: when reflected in a grammatical construction, the hidden participants in the meaning structure of reported speech become part of a conventional grammatical meaning that can give rise to the varying ‘perspective’ functions in (267), and perhaps others. The task is to examine the type and variety of these perspective meanings, which can be achieved by giving participants an explicit role in the characterisation of grammatical structure. The semantic communalities between the categories which reported speech constructions cross-linguistically tend to encode provide a socio-cognitive framework for grammatical analysis that can be couched within the dimensions of the reported speech situation. This proposal applies an approach to language in which the ‘conversation frame’ underlies every aspect of grammar (Pascual, 2014) and draws on Jakobson (1957), who first formalised an interpretation of grammatical categories that takes as a starting point their ability to index discourse participants (cf. Kockelman, 2004). Not coincidentally, Jakobson (1957) was also one of the first linguistic studies to introduce Volosinov ([1929] 1973) in the West and to introduce its

¹⁵The notion ‘narrated speech event’ primarily suggests reportative evidentiality/reported speech, but as Kockelman (2004) and San Roque and Loughnane (2012) show, the definition in (268) also applies to other types of evidentiality. San Roque and Loughnane’s (2012) reformulation of the ‘narrated speech event’ as ‘perception event’ is a useful label to replace the former notion in Jakobson’ (1957) model in (268) when applying it to, e.g., sensory or inferential evidentiality.
Towards a socio-cognitive framework for grammatical analysis

Evans (2010) demonstrates, depends on understanding the roles of the discourse participants involved in the current speech situation and those represented in speech. Figure 7.3 shows that such roles are constantly shifting, being updated and mutually influencing each other: the social identity of discourse participants both conditions and is reshaped by conversational roles, as well as the conceptualisation of other minds and the portrayal of events involving discourse participants. Within such a dynamic and constantly evolving speech situation ‘speakers may adopt an unlimited number of footings or perspectives from which to project epistemic or affective stance, including certainty of the truth of a complement’ (Field, 1997: 810).

An approach to grammatical categories that takes into account the dynamic environment of conversation needs to represent the dynamic and interacting perspectives associated with the roles Evans (2010) lists in figure 7.3, i.e. speakers, addressees, bystanders and referents, and explain how these relate to grammatical categories. Considering the semantic classes in (267), speakers, addressees, bystanders and referents may each adopt or be attributed a view on the temporal structure of the relevant (represented) events, on the intentions, attitudes or on the positions. I would like to tentatively characterise each of these perspectives as a participant type as in (269), although this list is probably neither exhaustive, nor sufficient in its characterisation.

(269)  a. REFERENTIAL PARTICIPANTS: participants being singled out and presented as objects of reference;
b. **EVIDENTIAL PARTICIPANTS**: discourse participants who are represented as being involved in two discourse events, the current speech event and some event being talked about (cf. Jakobson, 1957: 135);

c. **MODAL PARTICIPANTS**: discourse participants who are understood as the source of a mental attitude (involved in the meaning of modality, (some) interjections and evaluative constructions);

d. **ASPECTUAL PARTICIPANTS**: discourse participants from whose viewpoint an event is temporally represented (e.g. beginning, middle or end of an event or a combination of these or of multiple events);

e. **DIALOGIC PARTICIPANTS**: discourse entities in response to whom or in anticipation of whose views the respective utterance is made.

A referential participant is any entity that can be represented as a referential term in language. This is the only participant type for which mainstream linguistics has so far developed a comprehensive and systematic account: referential participants are shown in representations of semantic or conceptual structure and can be directly related to referential devices. Referential participants can have conventionalised functions called semantic roles. Characterising an evidential meaning requires characterising evidential participants, which necessarily involve the current speaker. This accounts for their general property of being subjective in the sense of Traugott (1989), a property Padučeva (2011) calls ‘egocentrism’. The direct relation to the current speech situation forces grammarians to consider the relation between the pragmatic roles of the (represented) speech situation and the represented semantic ones (see, e.g., Bergqvist, 2012). The literature on modality has come up with its own type of participants, either to characterise the entity qualifying/quantifying a proposition or as the anchor of a (speaker) attitude (see chapter 4). Smith (2003; 2010) shows that aspect involves a perspective type, and hence a type of aspectual participant.\(^{16}\) These properties have occasionally all been referred to in the linguistic literature as ‘deictic’ or (inter)subjective, but no systematic relation between them has so far been established.

The final type of participants in (269), dialogic participants, have had the shortest history in linguistics, but they have been central to the characterisation of dialogic stance categories in chapter 4 (also see Du Bois, 2007; 2014; Irvine, 1996). In determining the conventionalised roles dialogic participants can take on, grammarians could benefit from argumentative semantics and related models (Anscombe and Ducrot, 1976; Ducrot, 2009; Nolke et al., 2004; also see Verhagen, 2005).

\(^{16}\)As appendix J shows, I have coded several aspectual features for the texts Coate (1966) but during an initial exploration of the data none of these features proved relevant for either defenestration or cohesion, under the approaches taken in chapters 4 and 5. This is certainly an area worth further investigation, however.
In order to understand how the participant types in (269) are grammatically expressed, linguistics suggests roughly five strategies:

(270) a. morphologically;
b. lexically;
c. syntactically;
d. prosodically;
e. indexically.

Traditionally, linguistic analysis focusses on how referential participants ‘map onto’ or ‘semantically align with’ morphemes, lexemes or syntactic constructions, which has led to both other participant types and more unexpected forms of grammatical expression being ignored. In order to fully understand the behaviour of participant types, an encompassing account of indexicality is needed, both by examining how participants may be indexed by a pragmatic context (cf. Silverstein, 1976b: 29) and explicitly indexed as part of the grammatical meaning of, e.g., a modal construction.17 The distinction between the two is currently entirely unclear in linguistics, since, as Fludernik (1989) states, indexical meaning has traditionally mostly been overlooked: ‘Linguistics foregrounds the pragmatic notion of successful reference’ which leads to a narrow focus on ‘reference to items that are physically present to interlocutors, and reference to items that are present only contextually (Fludernik, 1989: 99).

If there is one thing that the analysis of reported speech teaches us, it is that people constantly discuss, relate to and qualify discourse entities, present and non-present. Reported speech constructions in the languages of the world show us the range of participants that can be talked about, the perspective types that can be expressed and the grammatical means by which these can become part of the grammatical structure. A ‘reported speech linguistics’, an approach to grammatical categories that systematically takes into account how they represent perspectives in a same way the reported speech situation forces us to do, will take a big step towards recognising the expression of social cognition in language.

17 For example, I believe that the fact that modality is ‘one of the most problematic and controversial notions’ in linguistics (Nuyts, 2005: 5) is more symptomatic of the emphasis on referential categories in grammatical analysis and attempts to characterise the indexically signalled modal meanings with referential means than of the inherent complexity of modality itself.
Appendices
Appendix A. Ungarinyin morphonology

For a detailed treatment of Ungarinyin phonetics, phonology and morphonology the reader is referred to Rumsey (1982: 1–30). Apart from the minor orthographic differences indicated in section 1.2.3, the glosses in this study follow the morphophonemic notation and analysis in Rumsey (1982), including the subscripted letters shown in A.1. These indicate possible morphophonemic alternations that Rumsey (1982: 17–24) refers to as ‘first’ and ‘second’ degree (consonant) strengthening. In certain phonological environments, the phonemes represented on the third row in figure A.1, may be expressed as the phoneme on the row above (first degree strengthening) or the top row (second degree strengthening).

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
mb & & & & \text{ngk} \\
b & j & d & rd & k \\
w_1 & y_1 & y_2 & r & w_2 \\
u & i & y_2 & & a_1 \\
o & e & & \ \\
& a_2 & \\
\end{array}
\]

Table A.1.: Ungarinyin morphophonemics (Rumsey, 1982: 17)
Appendix B. Interjections from Coate and Elkin (1974)

Interjection types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLG</td>
<td>Allignment marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>Attention grabber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALL</td>
<td>Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST</td>
<td>Conversation unit boundary marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>Exclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>Formulaic language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESI</td>
<td>Hesitation marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>Incitement (includes warnings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONOM</td>
<td>Onomatopaeic expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRW</td>
<td>Swear word</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interjection</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>eh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaa</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>exclamation of impatience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aka</td>
<td>ALLG</td>
<td>not so!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akay</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>hey!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akayi</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>ooh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amay</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>exclamation to attract attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amunkuri</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>success, good wishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ay</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>call to attract attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baada</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>never mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baw</td>
<td>ALLG</td>
<td>right oh!, alright!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inci</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>come! (to call a dog), cf. meme ‘be off!’ (to a dog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beja</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>finish, alright, enough, ready, that’s all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bininga!</td>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>crack him!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>interjection, go on!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bubuy</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>keep going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bukay</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>hi you!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix B. Ungarinyin Interjections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buwaw</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>signal word (used by a man carrying news to the camp at night)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>eh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emay</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>hey you! (cf akay! 'hey!')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emi</td>
<td>HESI</td>
<td>thing-ama-bob, so-and-so, used to bridge the gap while recalling the name or word required (cf. umbundi ‘what-ya-ma-call-it’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ewa</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>eh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ey</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>hey!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>eh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>interrogative and exclamatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>HESI</td>
<td>a reproof introducer (a long sounding and emphatic i:::)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irrakay</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>exclamation of surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jangku</td>
<td>ALLG</td>
<td>you know!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jawjaw</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>alarm signal (repetition denoting urgency and excitement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jijow</td>
<td>ALLG</td>
<td>good job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jiji</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>just a moment, ok (cf waliwali ‘wait a bit’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joye</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>‘ah yes!’ see karrikari ‘yes, of course’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jurrumbul</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>apology, beg pardon, excuse me, exclamation (eg. hey i’m here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaakaw</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>a long call ending with a sharp shrill note to draw attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakaku</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>got it, good job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakaykakay</td>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>come on!, hurry! (repetition denoting impatience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kareri</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>oh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kari</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>oh yes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karikari</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>yes, of course!, see karri ‘oh, yes!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaw</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>call to draw attention, shout of anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kay</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>exclamation, hey!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keju</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>got him!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kejuk</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>hurray!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kijud</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>hurray! see kejuk ‘hurray!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokaykokay</td>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>come, hurry (impatient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kukuk</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>sh..., stop, must not, no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuwi</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>(exclamation) by jingo!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libubun</td>
<td>ONOM</td>
<td>noise made by treading on a loose stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lokuja</td>
<td>ONOM</td>
<td>the sound made by clapping the hands on the thighs (in singing), see lakuda ‘to clap’, cf. mandorka ‘to beat time’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lungkulungku</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>regret, I’m sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majororun</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>had enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>HESI</td>
<td>affected cough (like a hesitant speaker thinking of the next word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marrey</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>(exclamation), oh dear, oh goodness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meme</td>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>be off! (to send a dog away), cf. bebe ‘come!’ (to a dog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mirrey</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>oh dear, oh goodness (miley also means female genitals, so it is not allowed as an exclamation by young people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mungiya-</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>greeting (suffix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrey</td>
<td>SWRW</td>
<td>swear word meaning big hole (child’s word, nadej)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nga</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>here take it! (said as a grunt, similar to English, ‘here’), also used as an affirmative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngadarru</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>poor fellow!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngakun</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>exclamation used when a man sees something accidentally (e.g. a woman sitting down carelessly and exposing herself, may be equal to English ‘ugh’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nganey</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>hey!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngaray</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>(vocative), oh, woman, hey woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngebawa</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>poor fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngee</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>ooh!, alas!, (may imply ‘so here you are’, intonation indicating the meaning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngungu</td>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>give it to me (said like a grunt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhn nhn</td>
<td>ONOM</td>
<td>noise or laugh like the neighing of a horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyanay</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>oh girl, oh woman (exclamation to attract attention), hey woman!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyany</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>hey you! see nyanay ‘hey, woman!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyodili</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>hey lass!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruwayj</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>(idiom), rustling, a little (from ru ‘a little’, wayj ‘to throw’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa</td>
<td>ONOM</td>
<td>noise (of water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa:</td>
<td>CALL</td>
<td>a noise (hunting call)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warlarlu</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>no trouble, friendly, level, no bumps (idiom) without a ripple in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waruna</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>talk about!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waw</td>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>exclamation: look out!, don’t!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way</td>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>behold!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wey</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>hey!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wo</td>
<td>ONOM</td>
<td>the buzz of the little honey bee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ungarinyin</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wondimi</td>
<td>HESI</td>
<td>what’s-its-name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wongarun</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>anyway, see <em>wangarrun</em> ‘well, anyhow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wongarrunka</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>my goodness!, oh, goodness!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worija</td>
<td>COUB</td>
<td>just because, oh well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wow</td>
<td>INCI</td>
<td>stop!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wulay</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>oh, my word, see <em>wurla</em> ‘to speak’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wunarrerriwunyirri</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>talk about! see <em>warruna</em> ‘talk about!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wurr (wurrurr)</td>
<td>ONOM</td>
<td>whirrr (long trilled ‘r’ sound of whirling stick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wurrakey</td>
<td>EXCM</td>
<td>exclamation of pain; goodness!, by jingo!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yama</td>
<td>AGRB</td>
<td>hey!, to attract attention, also question, inviting assent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yey yey yey</td>
<td>CALL</td>
<td>a war cry (usually with strong aspirate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yo</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>go on!, continue!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yow</td>
<td>ALLG</td>
<td>yes, to consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yowye</td>
<td>ALLG</td>
<td>that’s right, you’re right, see <em>yow</em> ‘yes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marey!</td>
<td>‘oh dear’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way!</td>
<td>‘behold!’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayi!</td>
<td>‘ho there’ (exclamation to attract attention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rokay</td>
<td>(expression of sympathy or surprise)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wulayi</td>
<td>‘woe!’ (on hearing bad news)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koweykowey</td>
<td>‘it’s here, it’s here’ (to attract attention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amalarrrnungiya</td>
<td>‘hail!’; ‘thank you!’ (lit. to turn the forehead)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waw!</td>
<td>‘look out’ (used in reproof or admonition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meyimeyi!</td>
<td>‘well now;’ ‘now then!’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a!</td>
<td>‘eh’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yow</td>
<td>‘yes’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yowyaliyow!</td>
<td>‘yes,’ ‘yes, that’s O.K!’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burray, bray</td>
<td>‘no’ (in response to a question other than those concerned with number and class)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aw!</td>
<td>‘no’ (with a shrug of the shoulder)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aka</td>
<td>‘not so’ (as a contradiction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karri</td>
<td>‘ah yes’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karrikarri</td>
<td>‘ah yes, yes’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waliwali</td>
<td>‘wait a bit’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>korrkorrro</td>
<td>‘quickly’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abarn</td>
<td>‘be quiet’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bebe</td>
<td>(a call to a dog to come)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meme</td>
<td>(to send a dog away)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.1.: List of ‘interjections’ in Coate and Oates (1970: 63)
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A story by Pansy Nulgit (Ngalkit)
Recording: 100903-24NGUN, 00:03-10:40

(1) nyina nyalwangarri buluba nyangka (.11)
    nyinda ny-alwangarri buluk-wa nya-o-ngka
  f.PROX f-old.person look.around-ITRV 3fsg-go-PST

  “that old girl bin lookaround”
  ‘This old woman was looking around’

(2) manjarn nyangki rimij wudmanira kanda narnburr (.16)
    manjarn nyangki rimij wu-rr-ma-ni-ra kanda narnburr
  stone who steal 3n,m.O-3pl.S-take-PST-1sg.IO n,m.PROX paperbark

  “who bin robim my silver and note?”
  ‘Who stole my coins and banknotes?’

(3) nyingankarra rimij wunjumanira (.14)
    nyingan=karra rimij wu-nja-ni-ra
  2sg=MAYBE steal 3n,m.O-2sg.S-take-PST-1sg.IO

  “might be you bin stealing mine?”
  ‘Maybe you’re the one stealing my things’

(4) anjaku rimij nginkenungarri ngin maji buluk ba wura
    anja-ku rimij ngin-wa2-yi-nu-ngarri ngin maji buluk ba2-a wura
  what-DAT steal 1sg-IRR-be-2sg-SUB 1sg MUST look.around IMP-go sideways

  jadan (.21)
  jadan
  properly

  “I never rob you you make sure look around properly”
  ‘Why would I steal from you? Why would I rob you? You should look around properly’
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(5) bidningengkerri (.08)
birr-ninga-yi-ngka2-yirri
3pl-put-REFL-PST-CONT

twopela bin telim self
‘they said to each other’

(6) yow nyunganngayu ru rimij wunjumanira (.15)
yow nyungan-nga-yu ru rimij wu-njo2-ma-ni-ra
yeah 2sg-ONLY-LAT just steal 3n.w.O-2sg.S-take-PST-1sg.IO

“You the one bin rob me”
“you the one who stole it from me’

(7) jajarrngaliku (.06)
ja-jarrngali-ku
REDUP-play-DAT

“you mob go play around”
‘just for fun’

(8) rimij wunjumanira (.11)
rimij win-ja2-ma-ni-ra
steal 3n.w.O-2sg.S-take-PST-1sg.IO

“You bin stealim mine”
“You stole it from me’

(9) and nyalwangarri nyina nyumara anjaku rimij nginkenungarri
ny-alwangarri nyina nyao2-ma-ra anja-ku rimij ngin-w2a2-y2i-nu-ngarri

nyangkikarra rimij wudmani (.17)
nyangki=karra rimij wu-rr-ma-ni
who=INDEF steal 3n.w.O-3pl.S-take-PST

“That old girl bin say I never bin getim yours might be some one bin getim yours”
‘This old woman said: “Why would I rob you? Someone else stole it”’

(10) nyumara (.11)
nyao2-ma-ra
3fsg-do-PST

“she saying”
‘she said’
(11)  yow (.08)
yow
yes
“yeah”
‘yeah’

(12)  wali buluba wungara mara wungo
wali buluk-w1a wu-ngao2-ra-ø mara wq2-ngao2-w1u-ø
WAIT look.around-ITRV 3n.w.O-1sg.S-go.to-FUT see 3n.w.O-1sg.S-act.on-FUT
kandakarra kunyarrakarra (.04)
kanda=karra kunyarra=karra
n.w.PROX=INDEF where=INDEF

“wait yet, I look around here, I findim somewhere here”
‘Wait a moment, I’m looking around for me, I may find it somewhere here’

(13)  ngonolkarra balya wumindani (.2)
ngonol=karra balya wu-ø-minda-ni
wind=maybe go 3n.w.O-3sg.S-take-PST

“might be wind bin blowim away”
‘Maybe the wind has taken it’

(14)  nyumara (.09)
nyq2-ma-ra
3fsg-do-PST

“she saying”
‘she said’

(15)  yow (.11)
yow
yes
“yeah”
‘yeah’

(16)  ada biyengkerri (.44)
ada biy-a-ngka-yirri
sit 3pl-go-PST-CONT

“they bin sitting down”
‘They were sitting down’
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(17) and balya ngamara (.13)
    balya nga1-ma-ra
    walk 1sg-do-PST

    “and me I bin go”
    ‘and I went’

(18) balya bungoni anjaku murlnbun kujilennyina (.04)
    balya ba2-nga2-w1-u-ni anja-ku murlnbun kurr-y1 ila-n-y1 i-na

    “I bin go looking them what for youpela argue yourselves”
    ‘I went to them. “Why are you arguing with each other?” ’

(19) ngin (.1)
    ngin
    1sg

    “me”
    ‘I (said)’

(20) anjaku... (.04)
    anja-ku
    what-DAT

    “what for”
    ‘ “Why?” ’

(21) manjarn di nyangkikarra rimij budmaranyarrikana
    manjarn di nyangki=karra rimij burr-ma-ra-nyarruku-na
    stone n whom ANAPH steal 3pl.S-do-PST-1pl.EXC.IO-PAUC

    wudmaninangka jojongarri narnburr (.19)
    wu-rr-ma-ni-nangka jo-jongarri narnburr
    3n.O-3pl.S-take-PST-3sg.IO REDUP-big paperbark

    “someone bin grabim they bin tellus all the big note here”
    ‘Someone stole money from a few of us and they are robbing him of large banknote(s)’

(22) ah: nyangkikarra? (.19)
    ah: nyangki=karra
    ah who=INDEF

    “ah, someone?”
    ‘Ah, but who?’

276
(23) wali buluba buwa jadan (.05)
wali buluk-wa ba₂-wa jadan
WAIT look around-ITRV IMP-FALL properly

“wait, look properly”

“What, look around properly”

(24) ngamernangka (.05)
nga₁-ma-ra-nangka
1sg.S-do-PST-3sg.IO

“he bin tellim”

‘I said to her’

(25) ngin (.08)
ngin
1sg

“me”

‘me’

(26) yow nyumara
yow nga₂-ma-ra
yes 3fsg-do-PST

“yes, she bin say”

‘Yeah,” she said’

[English translation, 3.03]

(27) wali wa barra ngunkumerndu juwibarn rimij
wali wa barra ngun-wa₂-ma-y₁ᵣndu juwibarn rimij
WAIT NEG story.telling 1sg.S-IRR-do-PST-3pl.IO bowerbird steal

amarangarri
a₁-ma-ra-ngarri
3msg-do-PST-SUB

“I never tell them juwibarn bin robim”

‘I did not tell them yet that the bowerbird had been stealing’ (lit.: For a while I did
not tell them stories when the bowerbird had been stealing)

[English translation, introducing the rest of the story, 3.23]
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(28) yilela birri mara wudnyi juwibarn dalmana nest (.09)
yila-la birri mara wa2-rr-w1 u-ni juwibarn dalmana nest
kid-REDUP pl.ANAPH see 3n_w.O-3pl.S-act.on-PST bowerbird nest

“all the kid bin findim langa his nest”
‘The children found (it) in the bowerbird’s nest’

(29) narnburr wadingarri (.09)
narnburr w-adingarri
paperbark n_w-much

“big mob note”
‘Many banknotes’

(30) yow! jirrikarra rimij inyinyarrukana juwibarn beja
yow! jirri=karra rimij a1-y2t-nyi-nyarruku-na juwibarn beja
yes m.ANAPH=MAYBE steal 3msg-be-PST-1pl.EXC-PAUC bowerbird ALREADY
layburru nyadi (.09)
layburru nyarr-y2t-◊
know 1pl.EXC-BE-PRS

“yow! we know that that one bin robim us mob”
‘Yeah, he was robbing us, the bowerbird, we know now’

(31) way biji wengarri manjarn
way biji wengarri manjarn
none CMPLV all.the.time money

“no money here all the time”
‘The money is gone very time’

[Summary and continuation in English, 1.33]

(32) ngaji mine (.2)
ngaji
mom:1sg

“mom”
‘(my) mom’

(33) nyumarera (.05)
nya2-ma-ra-ra
3fsg.S-do-PST-1sg.IO

“told me”
‘she said to me’
(34) *nalya* binjaawirri  *manjarn* birri  *wurrulun* (.13)
*nalya* bi-*ŋŋa*₂-w₂-o₂-i-yirri  *manjarn* birri  *wurrulun*
pile.up 3pl.O-2sg.S-IRR-be-PRS-CONT money  pl.ANAPH outside

“don’t put all the money outside”

‘“Don’t put your money outside”’

(35) *juwibarn* jirri  rimijbardayali  jirri  *nyumara*
*juwibarn* jirri  rimij-barda-yali  jirri  *nya₂-ma-ra*
bowerbird m.ANAPH steal-ACTOR-EMPH m.ANAPH 3fsg-do-PST

“that stealing bird he stealingbugger that one she bin tell me”

‘“The bowerbird is a thief,” she said’

[Summary and continuation in English, 2.9]

(36) *nyangki* kundungurlinina  *manjarn*? (.26)
*nyangki* kundą₂-ngurli-ni-na  *manjarn*
who  2pl.O:S-give-PST-PAUC money

“who bin givim you mob money?”

‘“Who gave you money?”’

(37) *ngamernduna*  (.08)
*ngą₁-ma-ra-rnda-na*
1sg.S-do-PST-3pl.IO-PAUC

“I tell them”

‘I told them’

(38) *buna*  *mangarri* warrij  *bunonnangarri*  (.16)
*bunda*  *mangarri* warrij  *bunó₂-w₁u-n-na-ngarri*
3pl.PROX food  cook  3pl.O:2pl.S-act.on-PRS-PAUC-SUB

“they bin getim that mangarri”

‘“You cook this food”’

(39) *juwibarn* dambun  *muno*  buluba  *nyayangkanangarri*  (.1)
*juwibarn* dambun  *muno*  buluk-w₁a  *nyarr-a-ngkₐ₂-na-ngarri*
bowerbird camp  m.DIST look-ITRV 1pl.EXC-go.PST-PAUC-SUB

“langa his place we bin look around”

‘And we looked around the bowerbird’s house’
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(40) mara wanyidnina kanda manjarn
mara waŋ-ŋurr-w1 u-ni-na kanda manjarn
see 3n-w.O-1pl.EXC.S-act.on-PST-PAUC m.PROX money

budmernara (.09)
burr-ma-ra-na-ra
3pl-do-PST-PAUC-1sg.IO

“They bin find that manjarn they bin tell me”

‘“We found this money,” they told me’

(41) ah! (.19)
ah
ah

“yow!”

‘Ah!’

(42) rimijbardaka jina juwibarn ngamara
rimij-barda=ka jina juwibarn ngaŋ1-ma-ra
steal-AGENT=Q m.PROX bowerbird 1sg-do-PST

“That juwibarn stealingbugger”

‘“Is that a thief?” I asked’

[Summary and continuation in English, 6.44]

(43) balya budmangarri jubako birriyara (.14)
balya burr-ma-a-ngarri jubako birr-iyara
walk 3pl-do-PRS-SUB tobacco 3pl-where

“They walk, where my tobacco?”

‘And they are walking, “Where is my tobacco?”’

(44) nyangku rimij bundumani
nyangki rimij bundaŋ2-ma-ni
who steal 3pl.O:3pl.S-take-PST

“Who bin stealim mine?”

‘Who stole it [lit.: them]?’

(45) yilela buono nak bundomindaningarri biliderri (.08)
yila-la buono nak bundaŋ2-minda-ni-ngarri biliderri
child-REDUP pl.DIST listen 3pl.O:3pl.S-take-PST-SUB old.people

“The kids bin listening to the old people”

‘After they listened to the old people...’
“...the children said: “We try to look around”

“they bin go look at his”

‘Then they took them back, yeah’

‘They found them in his [nest]. “He stole them,” they said’

‘in our camp side nothing’

‘[He did] not [steal] from our home’
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(51) only *buno* *bililerringa*
    *buno* *bililerrri-nga*
    pl.DIST old.people-EMPH

“only them old people”

‘Only [from] the old people’

[Summary and continuation in English, .46]

(52) he bin eh: putim handkerchief foldim ap *yidninganiningarri* doublem (.13)
    *irr-ninga-ni-ngarri* 3msg.O:3pl.S-put-PST-SUB

‘While they folded it up [viz. the handkerchief]’

(53) *jalungku* *jalungku* yidningani
    *billara* nalya yidningani (.06)
    *jalungku* *jalungku* *irr-ninga-ni*
    *billa-ra* nalya *yirr-ninga-ni*

“they bin foldim ap and hidim langa his pillow”

‘They folded it [i.e. the handkerchief with valuables] up and put it in their pillow’

(54) *balya* amaran*garri* rorrij anduman*ningarri* *balya*
    *balya* a$_1$-ma-ra-ngarri rorrij anda$_2$-ma-ni-ngarri *balya*
    go 3msg-do-PST-SUB snatch 3pl.O:3sg.S-take-PST-SUB go
    *andumindani* (.04)
    *anda$_2$-minda-ni* 3pl.O:3sg.S-take-PST

“he bin go snatchim things and then he bin takim away”

‘When he came and snatched them he took them away’

(55) *anangkara* dambura nalya andiningani
    *anangka-ra* dambu-ra nalya anda$_2$-ninga-ni
    m.POSS-LOC camp-LOC pile.up 3pl.O:3sg.S-put-PST

“he bin putim down langa his camp”

‘He put them in his home’

[English summary, 1.54]
(56) rimij andumarningarri (.07)
    rimij andaq-ma-mi-ngarri
steal 3sg.O:msg.S-take-PST-SUB

"when he bin stealim"

'When he steals'

(57) juwibarn  proper rimijbarda (.19)
    juwibarn rimij-barra
bowerbird steal-ACTOR

"juwibarn [proper] stealingbugger"

'The bowerbird is a real thief'

(58) when every time (.21)

(59) amanangka Sally (.05)
    a1-ma-nangka
3msg.S-do-3sg.IO

'he said to her, Sally'

(60) juwibarn jinda rimij andaamara (.81)
    juwibarn jinda rimij andaq-w2-a2-mara
bowerbird m.PROX steal 3pl.O:3sg.S-IRR-take

"this juwibarn he might grabim"

' "This bowerbird may steal them" '

(61) all of spoon buna (.06)
    buna
pl.PROX

'Spoons...'

(62) fork buna (.19)
    buna
pl.PROX

'Forks...'

(63) nalya inyingarri anangka dambura (.2)
    nalya a1-y2i-nyi-ngarri anangka dambun-ra
pile.up 3msg-be-PST-SUB m.POSS camp-LOC

"he bin pilim ap langa his home"

'He stacked [things] up in his home'
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(64) *anja buna* (.9)
*anja buna*
what pl.PROX

“what that one”
‘What are those?’

(65) broken enamels, yuno, cups and plates stackimap

(66) *anangkara dambu-ra nalya inyingarri ru*. (.1)
*anangka-ra dambu-ra nalya a1-yi-nyi-ngarri ru*
m.POSS-LOC camp-LOC pile.up 3msg-be-PST-SUB just

“langa his home he bin pilim ap”
‘He just stacked [things] in his house’

(67) *joli biji biyingkangarri bottle*. (.06)
*joli biji burr-a-ngka-ngarri*
return CMPLV 3pl-go-PST-SUB

“he bin still go back collecting bottle”
‘And they had come back with bottles’

(68) *nalya inyingarri barral di anangkara dambura*. (.19)
*nalya a1-yi-nyi-ngarri barral di anangka-ra dambun-ra*
pile.up 3msg-be-PST-SUB bottle nw-.ANAPH m.POSS-LOC camp-LOC

“he bin pilimap bottle langa his home”
‘He piled the bottle [pieces] up in his home’

(69) *and* *manjarn kunin wininganinjarri buno bottlenyine*. (.06)
*manjarn kunin wo2-o-iniga-ni-ngarri buno bottle-nyine*
money cover.up 3nwa.O-3sg.S-put-PST-SUB pl.DIST bottle-INST

“he bin coverimap money and that bottle”
‘And he covered up the money with those bottles’

(70) *and* *yilela birri mara widningarri*. (.06)
*yila-la birri mara wo2-rw1 u-ni-ngarri*
child-REDUP pl.ANAPH see 3nwa.O-3pl.S-ACT.ON-PST-SUB

“the kids bin findim”
‘And the children found it’
(71)  [and] bunda anja bunda (.31)
bunda anja bunda pl.PROX what pl.PROX

“what this one here”
‘ “What are these?” ’

(72)  wurannyine nuvaliba birrinyiyali findim mara wudnyi all the
wuran-nyine nuwaliba birr-y2i-nyi-yali mara wu-rr-y2i-nyi
stick-INST ¿break? 3pl-be-PST-EMPH see 3n.O-3pl.S-be-PST

manjarn na
manjarn money

“they bin breakimap with a stick, findim manjarn”
‘They broke (it) open with a stick and found the money’

[English summary and continuation, 4.6]

(73)  rimijbarda juwibarn
rimij-barda juwibarn
steal-ACTOR bowerbird

“stealingbugger juwibarn”
‘The bowerbird is a thief’

[English summary and continuation, 1.43]

(74)  juwibarnkarra rimij i rimijbardayali jirri (.07)
juwibarn=karra rimij a1-y1i rimij-barda-y2i-ali jirri
bowerbird=maybe steal 3msg-be steal-ACTOR-EMPH m.ANAPH

“that juwibarn he stealingbugger that one”
‘The bowerbird is stealing it, he is a thief’

(57)  alyinga nalyawa ngadi mayara
alyi-nga nalya-w1a ngarr-y1i mayara
underneath-ONLY pile.up-ITRV 1pl.INC.S-be house

“underneath we all putim inside langa house”
‘We hide it inside the house’

[English summary and continuation, 3.65]
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(76) when they always findim chuckim rock langa manjarn dow
      manjarn dow
      stone    target

    widni (.05)
    wu-rr-w1 u-ni
    3nw.O-3pl.S-act.on-PST

‘They threw a rock’

(77) ngurr ngimanangka    budmara
    ngurr nga1-yi-ma-nangka    burr-ma-ra
hit    1sg-FUT-do-3sg.IO 3pl-do-PST

“I want to try hitim they say”

‘They wanted to hit it’

[English summary and continuation, 1.91]

(78) yoliba    angka
    yoliba    a1-a-ngka
¿carry? 3msg-go-PST

“he bin carryim away”

‘He carried it away’

[Conversation, 1.59]

(79) nimanima    (.18)
    nima-nima
heavy-REDUP

“heavy one”

‘[It’s] too heavy’

(80) nimanima    (.17)
    nima-nima
heavy-REDUP

“heavy one”

‘[It’s] too heavy’
“he bin liftim ap heavy one”
‘And then when he lifted the really heavy thing’

“he bin fly down sit langa ground”
‘He sat on the ground’

“langa grass”
‘in the grass’

“and...”
‘and...’

“He lifted it up again”

“He carried it off and piled it up in the middle [of his nest]’
“he bin climb ap on top langa branch he bin hanging ap he bin look no men, woman or kid he saying”

‘He climbed on top of the branch, holds onto it while he looked around. “No men, women or children,” he thought’

“He always collected and took it away and threw it in his camp’

[English summary, 1.95]
(92) balya budmaralu  damburaku  joli  birriyarri  (.11)
     balya  burr-ma-ra-lu  dambu-ra-ku  joli  birt-iy-a-rrri
     go  3pl-do-PST-PROX  camp-LOC-DAT  return  3pl-FUT-go-DU

  “they go back home and they come back”

  ‘The went on their way back home and when they will return’

(93)    bija  jarrad wumani  (.06)
     bija  jarrad  wu-o-ma-ni
CMPLV  lift.up  3nsg.O-3sg.S-take-PST

  “he bin liftimap na”

  ‘He had already picked it up’

(94)    balya  wumindani  waj  inyi  anangka  dambura
     balya  wu-o-minda-ni  waj  a$_1$-y$_2$-yi-nyi  anangka  dambu-ra
     go  3n$_w$.O-3sg.S-TAKE-PST  throw  3nsg-BE-PST  m.POSS  camp-LOC

  “he bin takim chuckim down langa his nest”

  ‘He has taken it and thrown [it] in his nest’

Figure C.1.: The nest of a bowerbird (picture taken in Halls Creek, WA)
Appendix D. Ranger bush trip (111013-01NGUN, 0:01-1:25)

In the annotated texts, every new, full referent is circled with an uninterrupted line, \(<\text{referent}\>\), and every subsequent full mention is represented with a dashed line, \(<\text{referent}^1\>\). Bound pronouns are underlined with an uninterrupted line for a first reference, \(<\text{bound pronoun}\>\), and a dashed line at subsequent reference bound pronoun (in case of portmanteau morphemes in which one referent is first mentioned and one has been mentioned before, the segment will be marked as a first mention, i.e. with an uninterrupted line). Non-referenced temporal expressions are underlined with a wavy line, \(<\text{temporal expression}\>\), and locations are underlined with a dotted line, \(<\text{location}\>\). When these are encoded as arguments on the verb, they are circled with a wavy line, \(<\text{temporal expression}\>\), or with a dotted line, \(<\text{location}\>\), respectively. Reduced referential devices are both underlined and circled, with uninterrupted lines at first mention, \(<\text{referent}\>\), and dashed lines at subsequent mention, \(<\text{referent}^1\>\).

Syntactic dependencies are indicated through markings over the respective grammatical elements. Subordinate clauses are indicated through arrows over the relevant morpheme (which is represented in bold italics), indicating the direction of the dependency, subordinating \(<\text{id}\>\). Indeterminate/insubordinate subordinating constructions are marked with an uninterrupted line over the relevant bold, italicised morpheme, insubordinating \(<\text{id}\>\). Connectives are indicated by a bend line (‘hat’) over the respective construction (which is represented in bold italics), \(<\text{connective}\>\).

The transcriptions of the narrative and the dialogue also include the pitch contours (representing the first formant, F1) for the respective utterance. The pitch range relative: breaks in the contour and fluctuations within a sentence are indicated but not the absolute differences in pitch between subsequent contours.

\(^1\)Singular referents that may be assumed to be part of a group that has been previously introduced are represented as first mentions rather than ‘inferred’, i.e. as already introduced referents.
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(1) jina manamananarr (.01) idmundani (.02) kumanananga

jina manamananarr
m.PROX camera

barij birrinyi (.02)

"This camera they bin takim early morning they bin getap"

‘They took the camera and got up early morning’

(2) nalijanga koj budmara ngurru ngurru budmara (.02)

nalija-nga koj burr-ma-ra ngurru ngurru burr-ma-ra
tea-EMPH drink 3pl.do-PST take.off take.off 3pl.do-PST

"They bin drink tea and they bin off"

‘They drank tea and left’

(3) idmindani jinda mananarr jinda liny

irr-minda-ni jinda mananarr jinda liny
3msg.O:3pl.S-take-PST m.PROX camera m.PROX see

ango budmara nalywa birrinyi ngarri (.02)
ango-Ø burr-ma-ra nalywa birr2-ŋ2i-nyi-ngarri

"They bin take that picture want to go lookim where they bin setim ap"

‘They took that picture and wanted me to look at it, after they had set up the camera’
“Afternoon time they want to go lookim”
‘In the afternoon, they wanted to have a look at [the picture]’

“They bin pickimap they own one where they bin pickimap”
‘They picked it up already, they picked up their own one’

“Langa him langa him langa him they bin all snatchim (might make mistake)”
‘His, his, his, they all quickly collected their one’
(7) \( \tilde{d}_i \) joli amindanilu\( \tilde{a}_1 \)-minda-ni=lu-ngarri \( n_w \)

\( \tilde{d}_i \) joli \( \tilde{a}_1 \)-minda-ni=lu-ngarri \( n_w \)

ANAPH return 3msg-bring-PST=PROX-SUB

“Then they go back”

‘Then when he came back…’

(8) joli idmindanilu\( \tilde{a}_1 \)-minda-ni=lu-ngarri \( n_w \)

joli \( \tilde{a}_1 \)-minda-ni=lu-ngarri \( n_w \)

return 3msg.O:3pl.S-bring-PST=PROX-SUB night.time 1pl.EXC.O:S-show-PST

(.015) almaru (.02)

almaru

white

“When they bin bringim back nighttime they bin show us white people”

‘In the evening, when they brought them back, the white bloke showed it to us’

(9) liny nyun-wu-ø na amaranyarriku

liny nyun-wu-ø na a\( \tilde{a}_1 \)-ma-ra-nyarriku

see sg.O:2sg.S-act.on-FUT INTER 3msg-do-PST-1pl.EXC.IO see

anyijilani:: (01)

a\( \tilde{a}_1 \)-nyirr-y\( \tilde{a}_1 \) ila-ni::

3msg.O:1pl.EXC.S-hold-PST

“You mob want to lookim he bin tellus mipela bin lookimap”

‘He wanted us to look at it and we looked at it’
“That animal bird what bin langa that camera we bin lookim na I bin callim all the name”

‘We saw this bird that was in the camera, and I called its name’

“That bird we bin lookim other one na”

‘This bird and then we suddenly saw another one, oh!’
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(12) \[\text{marnjarn kuna}\] ada \[\text{wu-ma}\] bulonga \[\text{angkal} \rightarrow \text{ngarri}\]
marnjarn kuno ada wu-ø-ma bulonga \(\tilde{a}\)-a-ngka=lu-\(\text{ngarri}\)
rock n\(_w\)-DIST sit \(3n_w\)-O:3sg.S-take come.out \(\tilde{a}\)-go-PST=PROX-SUB

\(\tilde{wujingarri}\) (.045)

wujingarri native.cat

“That rock where he sitting native.cat bin come out na”
‘After he came out, the native cat went to sit on that rock over there’

(13) \(\tilde{wujingarri}\) (.03) \(\tilde{wujingarri}\) bulong \(\tilde{angkalu}\)
wujingarri wujingarri bulong \(\tilde{a}\)-a-ngka=lu

native.cat native.cat come.out \(\tilde{a}\)-go-PST=PROX

“Native cat bin come out”
‘The native cat came forward’

(14) \text{marnjarn burdu di ada angka}\rightarrow \text{barnjara}\rightarrow (.02) \(\tilde{erringga}\)
marnjarn burdu di ada \(\tilde{a}\)-a-ngka barnjara ra errin-nga
stone small n\(_w\) sit \(\tilde{a}\)-go-PST cave-LOC one-EMPH

“Little rock they bin sit down langa cave, onepela”
‘He sat down on a small rock in the cave, just one’
Appendix E. A dialogue (090812JENGPDI, 00:25-02:07)

The following dialogue is taken from a run of the Family problems picture task (as described in San Roque et al., 2012), performed by Pansy Nulgit (NG) and Jilgi Edwards (JE). During the task the speakers ordered 17 pictures into a story and told the resulting story several times. The dialogue below is the final retelling of the story, and before the start of the transcription JE was asked to tell it. The annotations are as in appendix D. For this text the extreme pitch off-sets for each contour are shown alongside the pitch contours.

(1) NG: \[ \text{\textbf{jinda-kurle}} \quad \text{\textbf{aniyangarri wan}} \]
\text{\textit{jinda-kurle}} \quad \text{\textit{aniyangarri}}
m.PROX-first \quad m.good

'This first [picture] is a good one'

(2) JE: \[ \text{\textbf{aniyangarri - jino}} \]
\text{\textit{aniyangarri}} \quad \text{\textit{jino}}
m.good-NMLZ \quad m.DIST

'This one is good'
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(3) NG: mardu mardu biyarri
        mardu mardu birr-a-rri
        walk walk 3pl-go-DU

"Walking they two"
'They two are walking'

(4) JE: mardu mardu biyarri yilakurde
        mardu mardu biy-a-rri yila-kurde
        walk walk 3pl-go-DU child-COM

"Walking they two with a kid"
'They two are walking with a child'

(5) NG: oyowo jukul bidirri
        yow jukul birr-y2i-rri
        INTER happy 3pl-be-DU

"Yeah, happy them two"
'They two are happy'
(6) JE: yeah.. jukul bidi (.85)  
jukul birr-y1i  
happy 3pl-be  

‘They are happy’

(7) NG: wurlan milimili... wurla burriwin  
wurlan milimili... wurla birr-y2i-y1i-n  
talk paper talk 3pl-be-REFL-PRS  

“They talk themselves”  
‘The story on the paper... they are talking to each other’

(8) JE: wurla birriwin yorr bidi  
wurla birr-y2i-y1i-n yorr birr-y2i  
talk 3pl-be-REFL-PRS group.sit 3pl-be  

“Talking sitting down”  
‘They are talking to each other, they are sitting down together’

(9) NG: aniyangarri  
a1-ninya-ngarri  
m-good-NMLZ  

‘Good one’
Appendix E. A dialogue (090812JENGPDl, 00:25-02:07)

(10) JE

aniyangarr... milimili...

a\textsubscript{1}-niya-ngarr... milimili...
m.good-NMLZ paper

“Right one”
‘Good picture’

(11) NG:

mindin\textsubscript{ngke}

barij

e

mindi-ningke

barij

\underline{a\textsubscript{1}-\underline{y}_{2}\textsubscript{i}}

n\textsubscript{m}.ANAPH-from stand.up 3msg-be

“Form here he bin get up”
‘He gets up from here’

(12) JE:

barij

i

barij

\underline{a\textsubscript{1}-\underline{y}_{2}\textsubscript{i}}

stand.up 3msg-be

‘He gets up’

(13) NG:

kokoj

budma [laughs]

ko-koj

burr\textsubscript{ma}

REDUP-drink 3pl-do

“Big mob drinking”
‘They are drinking’
(14) JE: yow, bundayu kojba biya ngabun
yow, bunda-yu koj-ba biy-a ngabun
yeah, pl.PROX-LAT drink-ITRV 3pl-go beer

‘Yeah, and now they begin to drink beer’

(15) NG birringiyarr wari mumundanngarri
birr-ingiyarr wari mo₂-minda-n-ngarri
3pl-gut burn 3n.m.O:3sg.S-take-PRS-SUB

“the guts it is burning”

‘It burns their guts’

(16) JE: yow
yow
yeah

‘Yeah’

(17) NG: balya ama wungayku-yu
balya a₁-ma wungay-ku-yu
go 3msg-go woman-DAT-LAT

“He go looking for woman”

‘And now he goes to the woman’
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(18) JE: \textit{wungay-ku-yu} balya \textit{a1}-ma \textit{jinda} \textit{a-ma} \textit{jinda} \textit{go} \textit{3msg-go} \textit{m.DEM.PROX}

‘And he goes to the woman’

(19) NG: \textit{ngurr-ba nyu-mi}ndan
\textit{ngurr-ba nyu1-mi}nda-n
hit-ITRV 3fsg.O:3sg.S-take-PRS

“He belts her”

‘He bashes her’

(20) JE: \textit{ngurr-ba }\textit{nyinda} \textit{and yilakurde}
\textit{ngurr-ba nyinda} \textit{yilakurde}
hit-ITRV f.PROX child-COM

‘Hit her and the child she has’

(21) NG: \textit{yow}
\textit{yow}
yeah

‘Yeah’
(22) \[ di \quad jangalaj \quad balyaja \quad ama \quad [...] \quad (.015) \]
\[ di \quad jangalaj \quad balya-ja \quad a_1-ma \]
\[ n_2\text{-ANAPH spread.out} \quad \text{go-CONN} \quad 3\text{msg-do} \]

‘He splits off and goes away’

(23) \[ \langle burruru \rangle \quad bundayu_{eo} \quad nambarr \quad burrw\text{-}in \]
\[ burruru \quad bunda-yu \quad nambarr \quad burr-y_i\text{-}y_1\text{-}i\text{-}n \]
\[ \text{men} \quad \text{pl.PROX-LAT} \quad \text{gather} \quad 3\text{pl-BE-REFL-PRS} \]

‘Here they are gathering’

‘And those men there gather together’

(24) \[ koko \quad \textit{bingarri} \quad (.03) \]
\[ ko-koj \quad \textit{burr-y}_2\text{-}i\text{-}ngarri \]
\[ \text{REDUP-drink} \quad 3\text{pl-BE-SUB} \]

‘Drinking’
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(25) kokoj je bidina (.02)
    REDUP-drink again 3pl-BE-PÅUC

“They are drinking more”
‘They are drinking again’

(26) wungay ngurr nyilan
    woman hit 3sg.O:3sg.S-HOLD-PRS m.PROX-LAT INTER sit 3msg-DO

“Him here sitting down”
‘And he hits the woman, he sits down’

(27) jinaka m.PROX=Q

“This lot”
‘What about this one?’
(28) \( \text{that}_{\text{exo}} \text{ the... anyangarri...} \) \( \text{wuniyangarri woorlan} \)
\( \text{that the... } a_1 \text{-nya-ngarri...} \) \( w_1 \text{-niyangarri woorlan} \)
\( \text{m-good-NMLZ} \) \( n_m \text{-good talk} \)

“Good word”

‘That is the right story’

(29) \( \text{kokoj} \) \( \text{en-garri::} \) \( \text{kandayu}_{\text{exo}} \) \( \text{na} \)
\( \text{ko-koj} \) \( a_1-y_2 \text{-ngarri::} \) \( \text{kanda-yu} \)
\( \text{REDUP-drink msg-be-SUB} \) \( n_m \text{.PROX.LAT} \)

“Drinking here”

‘And after he was drinking here...’

(30) \( \text{ngurrba nyumindani} \)
\( \text{ngurr-}a \) \( ^a_2 \text{-o-minda-ni} \)
\( \text{hit-ITRV 3fsg.O-3sg.S-take-PST} \)

‘...he hit her’

(31) JE: \( \text{ngurrba [ nyumindani} \)
\( \text{ngurr-}a \) \( ^a_2 \text{-o-minda-ni} \)
\( \text{hit-ITRV 3fsg.O-3sg.S-take-PST} \)

‘He assaults her’
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(32) NG: nyinda nyinda f.PROX wurla talk o₁-o-w₁ u-n 3msg.O-3sg.S-act.on-PRS yirrkalngarri balya policeman go

bumalu
bu-ma=lu
IMP-do=PROX

“she ringing up police come here”

“She tells the policeman to come”

(33) kanda kanda n wila-kurde child-COM ngurrba nguindani nyuma
kanda yila-kurde ngurr-ba ngu₁-a-minda-ni nyu₂-ma
nw-PROX child-COM hit-ITRV 1sg.O-3sg.S-take-PST 3fsg-do

“He bin belting me she says”

‘Now she says: “He hit me and the child”’

(34) [ yirrkalngarri balya amalu balya amundan
yirrkalngarri balya o₁-ma=lu balya o₁-a-minda-n	policeman go 3msg-do=PROX go 3msg.O-3sg.S-take-PRS

“Police comes (and) takes him away”

‘The policeman comes and takes him’

---

1In the original recording of this utterance the speaker mistakenly uses the form ama ‘he says’ instead of nyuma ‘she says’ in line (33), but subsequently translated it –as demonstrated above– with the contextually appropriate referent ‘she’. In order to avoid confusion I have edited the transcription above.
(35) **JE:** yi... ]

‘Po...’

(36) **NG:** kanda darak awan

kanda darak a-ŋ

n_prox come 3msg-fall-PRS

‘Here he bin come here’

‘Now he comes down’

(37) **JE:** [ hm

‘Hm’

(38) **NG:** ije bun ] munda burr a melburra

a₁-o-ŋ ibu-n munda burr a₁-a melburra 3msg.O-3sg.S-hold-PRS m_prox lock.up 3msg-go forever

‘They lock father up here for good’

‘He holds him and here he gets locked up forever’
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(39) JE: *burr* a
     *burr* å1-a
     lock.up 3msg-go

  ‘He gets locked up’

(40) NG: *melburra*
     *melburra*
     forever

  “For good”
  ‘Forever’
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The transcription below has been glossed, segmented and re-transcribed based on the cassette tape recording accompanying Coate (1970), a booklet entitled *Ngarinjin stress and intonation* on which the opening section on prosody in Coate and Oates (1970) is based. The transcription here corresponds to the text on pages 2–10 in Coate (1970), although there are considerable discrepancies between that text and the sound recording. Unfortunately, the cassette tape that has been preserved with the publication covers only half of the transcription in Coate (1970), which continues for another ten pages, but which are not able to be included in this re-transcription.

The relevant pages from Coate (1970) are photographically reproduced following the re-transcription on pages 341–349.

The translations from Coate (1970) are represented below in double quotes (" ") and an alternative free translation is given in single quotation marks (‘ ’). The cassette tape starts with the following announcement: “This tape was recorded by Mr. H.H.J. Coate at Derby, Western Australia in 1967. It illustrates patterns of stress and intonation in the [Ungarinyin] language. Passages from this tape have been used in the chapter on stress and intonation written by Dr. A. Capell. This is included in a grammar of [Ungarinyin] by Mr. Coate and Mrs. Jeanette Oates published by the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra. The speakers are Friday Budbad and David Mowarljali and are shown as A and B in this interlinear transcription.”

(1) A: minamu minda-mu 1 ungunja Umalakundaka? (.02)
  minda-mu ungunja umalakunda=ka
  nm.PROX-EMPH what Umalakunda=Q

‘That place was Umalakundinda, right?’

1 Alan Rumsey points out that this Worrora term (see the analysis chapter 5).
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(2) B: \textit{mn!}  \\
\textit{mn}  \\
\textit{hm}  \\
\textit{‘Mn!’}

(3) A: \textit{wurlan winjiningarangarri nyinakulawada} (.03)  \\
\textit{wurlan \textit{w}_{2}-\textit{nj}_{2}-\textit{inga-ra-nga}\textit{rri nyinakulawada}}  \\
language 3\textit{n}_{w}.O-2\textit{sg}.S-PST-SUB love.song  \\
\textit{‘Where you told me about the love song’}

(4) B: \textit{yow} (.03)  \\
\textit{yow}  \\
INTER  \\
\textit{‘Yes’}

(5) A: \textit{karn nyindinyingarri!} (.02)  \\
\textit{karn nyin-\textit{y}_{2}-\textit{nyi-nga}\textit{rri}}  \\
sing 2\textit{sg}.BE-PST-SUB  \\
\textit{‘Where you sang [the love song] to me’}

(6) B: \textit{e, aka} (.06)  \\
\textit{e aka}  \\
ah NOT.SO  \\
\textit{‘Ah, no, that’s not right’}

(7) \textit{Umalakudinda yamingki} (.06)  \\
\textit{Umalakudinda yamingki}  \\
Umalakudinda downstream  \\
\textit{‘Umalakudinda is downstream [from there]’}

(8) \textit{arrir} \textit{Yilurrun...} (.15)  \\
\textit{arrir} \textit{Yilurrun}  \\
about Yilurrun  \\
\textit{‘[This one is] Yilurrun’}

(9) A: \textit{dambun mindi?}  \\
\textit{dambun mindi}  \\
place \textit{n}_{m}.PROX  \\
\textit{‘Is that the place?’}
(10) B: Yilurrundali (.06)
Yilurrun-y2ali
Yilurrun-INDEED

‘That is indeed Yilurrun’

(11) A: Yilurrun di kunya budmanangka di
Yilurrun di kunya burr-ma-nangka di
Yilurrun n_w-.ANAPH what 3pl.S-do-3sg.IO n_w-.ANAPH

‘Yilurun is what that place is called’

(12) anja werr won? (.03)
anja werr w2-σ-w1 u-n
what compose 3n_w-.O-3sg.S-act.on-PRS

‘What is it devoted to?’

(13) B: arri yidmungkal? (.05)
arri yidmungkal
about bushes

‘Those bushes [you mean]?’

(14) A: ah! (.04)
ah

‘Ah!’

(15) B: yidmungkal di? (.1)
yidmungkal di
bushes n_w-.ANAPH

‘The bushes?’

(16) A: wanjinaka wembarr woni
wanjina=ka wembarr w2-σ-w1 u-ni
wanjina=Q break 3n_w-.O-3sgS-act.on.PST

‘Did the Wanjina break it?’

(17) B: aka, warrmuna (.04)
aka, warrmuna
NOT.SO opossum

‘No, the possum’
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(18) A: *warrmuna?*
   *warrmuna*
   opossum

   ‘The possum?’

(19) B: *e-e...*
   *hmhm*

   ‘Yeah, yeah’

(20) A: *kunya amarerrri jiiri warrmuna?*. (.17)
   *kunya {-#a1-ma-ra-yirri jiiri warrmuna* what 3msg-do-PST-CONT m.ANAPH opossum

   ‘What was the opossum doing?’

(21) B: *munomuna wumindanerrri*. (.09)
   *munu-muna wu-o-minda-n-yirri* nm.PROX-REDUP 3n.O-3sg.S-take-PRS-CONT

   ‘He is taking it [the bushes] at that place over there’

(22) *manuba angka yidmingkal di*. (.07)
   *manuk-w1 a 1-o-angka yidmingkal di* shoulder.carry-ITRV 3msg-go-PST bushes nANAPH

   ‘He carried the bushes on his shoulder’

(23) di muna waj ngay, amara, waj inyi. (.09)
   *di muna waj ngai-a o1-ma-ra waj 1-y2i-nya* nANAPH n.PROX 1sg-FUT-go 3msg-do-PST throw 3msg-be-PST

   ‘Then he said: “I throw them [it] here.” He threw them [it] down’

(24) *Yilurrun*. (.04)
    *Yilurrun*
    Yilurrun

    ‘At Yilurrun’

(25) *wanangkalin namu*. (.02)
    *wanangkalin namu* cliff

    ‘Where the cliff is’
(26) A: *kunyalwula* wumangalu di
       *kunyal-wula* wa₂-ø-ma-nga-lu di
where-PROX 3n_m.O-3sg.S-take-PST-PROX n_m.ANAPH

   ‘Where did he take it from?’

(27) B: *arri* Kuleman (.15)
       *arri* Kuleman
about Kuleman

   ‘That is Kuleman’

(28) *kanda* Kuleman (.04)
       *kanda* Kuleman
n_m.PROX Kuleman

   ‘Kuleman is here’

(29) A: *ya* munda Diliri-ra?
       *ya* munda Diliri-ra
CONN n_m.PROX Diliri-LOC

   ‘And is this place at Diliri?’

(30) B: *wawi* munda (.05)
       *wawi* munda
plain n_m.AMBIPH

   ‘Here on this plain’

(31) A: *ya* anja yidmungkal di wembarr woningarri?
       *ya* anja yidmungkal di wembarr wu₁-ø-nil-nga-ngari
CONN what bushes n_m.ANAPH break n_m.O-3sg.S-act.on-PST-SUB

   ‘And what bushes did he break?’

(32) B: *kawijan*! (.1)
       *kawijan*
box.tree

   ‘Box tree’

(33) A: *anjaku* di (.07)
       *anja-ku* di?
what-DAT n_m.ANAPH

   ‘But why then?’
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(34) B: balowa ngiywanya amara (.07)
    balowa nugu2-i1y1-a-nya a1-ma-ra
    spread.out 1sg-FUT-fall-DIST 3msg-do-PST
    ‘He wanted to spread it out’

(35) A: wul ngima amara
    wul nugu2-y1-ma a1-ma-ra
    sleep 1sg-FUT-do 3msg-do-PST
    ‘ “I want to sleep,” he said’

(36) B: amarayali (.06)
    a1-ma-ra-y2ali
    3msg-do-PST-INDEED
    ‘That’s what he said’

(37) di (.13)
    di
    nw-.ANAPH
    ‘Then’

(38) bala wungo amara arri ngawa menyi
    bala wu-nugu1-a1-u-ø a1-ma-ra arri ngawa meny
    spread 3nsw.O-1sg.S-act.on-FUT 3msg-do-PST about rain Unfortunately
    merr amanga (.03)
    merr a1-ø-ma-nya
    get.near 3msg.O-3sg.S-TAKE-PST
    ‘ “I spread it out,” he thought. And when there was rain, it got close to him’

(39) jinda Jangkurumen? (.04)
    jinda Jangkurumen
    m.PROX Jangkurumen
    ‘this Jangkurumen’ 2

(40) A: yow (.04)
    yow
    yes
    ‘Yeah’

2The transcription in Coate (1970) attributes this line to speaker A, interpreting it as a question establishing the referent.
‘Then, when the rain hit him he cast them [the bushes] away’

‘He/it made him/itself into water and near there is rippling water there, Yilurrun’

‘Is there a cliff [here]?’

‘A cliff runs from here in this direction’

‘It flows’

‘It flows’

‘It has a waterlily’
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(48) A: yow dali murrumanga munda dambun?
yow dali moq₂-ø-irra₂-ma-nga munda dambun
yes name 3mₘ.Ο-3sg.S-take-PST nmₘ.PROX place

‘Oh yes, did he name that place?’

(49) B: munda Yilurrun kudma, irrumara
munda Yilurrun kurr-ma a₁-irra₂-ma-ra
nmₘ.PROX Yilurrun 2pl-do 3msg-DEFS-do-PST

‘He said: “You call this place Yilurrun” ’

(50) A: kajinngarringa wurreyirri?
kajinngarri-nga wu-irra₂-ŋ₂i-yirri
permanently-EMPH 3nᵽ.DEFS-be-CONT

‘Does it go on eternally?’

(51) B: kajinngarringa wurreyirri
kajinngarri-nga wu-irra₂-ŋ₂i-yirri
permanently-ONLY 3nᵽ.DEFS-be-CONT

‘It goes on eternally’

(52) A: dali wirriwelannyirri?
dali woq₂-rr-irra₂-ŋ₁ ila-n-nyirri
name 3nᵽ.Ο-3pl.S-DEFS-hold-PRS-DU

‘Do those two still keep that name?’

(53) B: dali wirriwelannyirri
dali woq₂-rr-irra₂-ŋ₁ ila-n-nyirri
name 3nᵽ.Ο-3pl.S-DEFS-hold-PRS-DU

‘They two will keep that name’

(54) A: andu kanda ada irruma di?
andu kunya ada a₁-irra₂-ma-ø di
m.AMBIPH where ada 3msg-DEFS-do-PRS nᵽ.ANAPH

‘And where does he stay then?’

(55) B: arriyu wandimi?
arrī-yu w-andimi
about-LAT nᵽ-whatchamacallit

‘And he, eh, what’s his name...’
(56) A: Yilkiyangkan (.13)
    Yilkiyangkan
    ‘Yilkiyangkan’

(57) wijika irroden di? (.03)
    wijī=ka a₁-rra₂-oda-y₁ i-n di
    truly=Q 3msg-DEFS-paint-REFL-PRS³ nᵢw.ANAPH
    ‘It is his painting, right?’

(58) B: aw, burya wa angkode runga mardumardu
    aw burya wa a-u₂a₂-oda-y₁ i ru-nga mardu-mardu
    oh no NEG 3msg-IRR-paint-REFL just-ONLY walk-REDUP
    ankerri mangurre
    a₁-a-nga-yirri mangurre
    3msg-go-PST-CONT half.way
    ‘No, this is not [the place of] his painting, he had only just come halfway’

(59) A: a! (.08)
    a
    ah
    ‘Ah!’

(60) B: wa angkode di joli ingalungarri (.06)
    wa a-u₂a₂-oda-y₁ i di joli a₁-ŋa₁-ŋu-ŋa ngari
    NEG 3msg-IRR-paint-REFL nᵢw.ANAPH return 3msg-be-PST-PROX-SUB
    ‘He did not get painted because he was on his way back then’

(61) Yilkiyalukn joli ingalungarri wandimi... (.05)
    Yilkiyalukn joli a₁-ŋa₁-ŋu-ŋa ngari w-andimi
    Yilkiyalukn return 3msg-be-PST-PROX-SUB nᵢw-whatchamacallit
    ‘Yilkiyalukn returned to, eh, what’s it called...’

(62) dobakba wiyak awani (.06)
    dobak-ba wiyak a₁-w₁a-ni
    ¿high-way? go.down msg-fall-PST
    ‘[From] up high, down he went’

³The segmentation of this verb into a root -oda- ‘paint’ and a reflexive suffix is slightly artificial because this verb only occurs as a reflexive form.
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(63) di Kuleman wuran-nyine angkerri darr irruma
di Kuleman wuran-nyine a1-a-ngka-yirri darr a1-rra2-ma
n_w.-ANAPH Kuleman branch-COM 3msg-go-PST-CONT stand.up 3msg-DEFS-do

mandarral jongarri di (.13)
mandarral jongarri di

gum.tree big.one n_w.-ANAPH

‘It went to Kuleman with a big stick. He stands there as a big gum tree’

(64) di munda (.12)
di munda
n_w.-ANAPH n_m.PROX

‘Then here’

(65) ngiyamurr kulajkulaj mungonyirri (.15)
ngiy-amurr kula-kulaj ma2-ng2-w1 u-n-y1irri
1sg-sperm water-REDUP 3n_m.O-1sg.S-act.on-PRS-CONT

‘ “I am watering it with my sperm,” ’

(66) amara (.09)
a1-ma-ra
3msg-do-PST

‘he said’

(67) a nyandu winjangan bay winjora
a nyandu winjangan bay wu-nj2-w1 u-ra
CONN 3fsg.AMBIPH fire spin 3n_w.O-2sg.S-act.on-1sg.IO

‘And she [said:] “spin fire to me,” ’

(68) nyumanangka nyinda, umbun walwi (.06)
nyo2-ma-o-nangka nyinda umbun walwi
3fsg.S-do-PRS-3sg.IO f.PROX what’s-it-called blue.tongue.lizard

‘she says, eh, the blue tongue lizard’

(69) A: a! (.04)
a
ah

‘Ah!’
(70) B: kanda manjarn liriri birrimanangkayali kana (.04)
kanda manjarn liriri birri-ma-nangka-y2ali kana
n_m.PROX rock blue.tongue.lizard 3pl.DEFS-do-3sg.IO-INDEED n_m.PROX

‘This rock here they call blue tongue lizard’

(71) A: kunyal mardu nyangkerri nyinda?
kunyal mardu nya2-a-ngka-yirri nyinda
where walk 3fsg-go-PST-CONT f.PROX

‘Where was she traveling to?’

(72) B: mindiranga buk nyangka di nyanamalamu
mindi-ra-nga buk nya2-a-ngka di nya2-namala-mu
n_m.PROX-LOC-ONLY arrive 3fsg-go-PST n_w.ANAPH f-hand-SPEC

winjangun bay winjora ngiyanamala bunda
winjangun bay wa2-nya2-w1u-s-ra ngiy-anamala bunda
fire spin 3n_w.O-2sg.S-ACT.ON-IMP-1sg.IO 1sg-hand pl.AMBIPH

bunguluwannyirri dubala birringarri nyumara walamba
bu-nya1-ulua-n-nyirri dubala birri-y2i-ngarri nya2-ma-ra walamba
3pl.O-1sg.S-be.afraid-DU red 3pl.DEFS-be-SUB 3fsg-do-PST plains.kangaroo

ba angkerri
ba a1-a-ngka-yirri (.07)
arrive 3msg-go-PST-CONT

‘She came right here: “Spin the fire to my hand here, I am afraid of those two because they are red,” she said. The red plains kangaroo emerged’

(73) kundu muna (.07)
kundu muna
half.way n_m.PROX

‘This place is halfway’

(74) A: a! (.07)
a
ah

‘Ah!’
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(75) B: *di jina ke onerriyali*
    *di jina ke a₁-ɔ-w₁ u-ni-y₁irri-y₂ali*
    warrmuna (0.07)
    warrmuna
    possum
    ‘Then she called out to the ring-tailed possum’

(76) A: *nyindaku lirrirri?*
    *nyinda-ku lirrirri*
    f.PROX-DAT blue.tongue.lizard
    ‘The blue tongue lizard?’

(77) B: *lirrirri (.02)*
    *lirrirri*
    blue.tongue.lizard
    ‘The blue tongue lizard’

(78) *di walwi nyindi?*
    *di walwi nyindi*
    nwa-ANAPH blue.tongue.lizard f.AMBIPH
    ‘That one is the blue tongue lizard?’

(79) A: *yeah!*
    *yeah*
    ‘Yeah!’

(80) B: *hnhn (.04)*
    *hnhn*
    ‘Hm-hm’

(81) *nyindi-yali ke onerri ngiyamala burruba*
    *nyindi-y₂ali ke a₁-ɔ-w₁ u-ni-y₁irri ngiy-anamala burruba*
    f.AMBIPH-INDEED call 3msg.O-3sg.S-act.on-PST-CONT 1sg-arm too.short
    mumennyirri winjangun bay winjora (.11)
    mo₂-ma-ɔ₁-i-ɔ-nyirri winjangun bay wa₂-nja₂-w₁u-ra
    3nₘ-do-REFL-PRS-CONT fire turn 3nₘ.O-2sg.S-act.on-1sg.IO
    ‘She’s the one who called: “My two arms are too short for me, you spin the fire to me” ’

320
"I am afraid of those two, when they are red," she said to the plain kangaroo.

'I am arriving at Bulungen here, I am calling this my camp'

'She was saying to him'

'No'

'Wait a moment'

'I am making my sperm flow'
Appendix F. Yilurrun and conversation

(89) kajingka balya nyindaranya
    kajinka balya nyinda2-o2-a-ra-nya
    CANNOT go 2sg-IRR-GO-1sg.IO-DIST

‘You can’t come to me’

(90) nyingannga bòy wo mindimu nyinganingken nga
    nyingan nga bòy wo2-o-w1 u mindi mu nyingingen nga
    2sg-ONLY turn 3inw.O-sg.S-act.on n_m ANAPH-EMPH yourself-ONLY

‘You spin this [place] yourself’

(91) wurlan ngurringala kanda wurla janbunyirri
    wurlan ngurringala kanda wurla jan-y1 ibu-n-yirri
language completely.different n_m .PROX talk 2sg.O:1sg.S-throw-PRS-CONT

Ungkumi nyumara
    Ungkumi nyoa2-ma-ra
Unggumi 3fsg-do-PST

‘I am talking a completely different language to you here, Unggumi,” she said’

(92) nyandu walwi
    nyandu walwi
fsg.AMBIPH blue.tongue.lizard

‘This blue tongue lizard’

(93) A: arri nyandu wungarinyin=ka wurla nyumerri?
    arri nyandu wu-ngarinyin=ka nyinda wurla nyoa2-ma-yirri
about fsg.AMBIPH nw-ngarinyin=Q fsg.PROX speak fsg-do-CONT

‘And she, was she speaking Ungarinyin?’

(94) B: aka, Ungkumi
    aka Ungkumi
    NOT.SO Ungkumi

‘No, Unggumi’

(95) A: a! (0.04)
    a!
    Ah!

‘Ah!’
(96) B: *Ungkumi wurla nyumara* (.04)
*Ungkumi wurla nya₂-ma-ra*
Ungkumi speak 3fsg-do-PST

‘She spoke Unggumi’

(97) A: *kunyalwalu nyangkalu?* (.03)
*kunyal=walu nya₂-a-ngka=lu*
where=PROX 3fsg-go-PST=PROX

‘Where did she come from?’

(98) B: *kalamun nyangkanya kanda di* (.13)
*kalamun nya₂-a-ngka=nya kanda di*
long,ago 3fsg-go-PST=DIST nₘ-PROX nₚw-ANAPH

‘She went away from here a long time ago’

(99) munda jari moni Manangkarl? (.02)
munda jari nya₂-s-w₁_u-ni Manangkarl
nₘ.AMBIPH leave 3nₘ.O-3sg.S-act.on-PST Manangkarl

‘Did she leave from here via the Manangkarl river?’

(100) A: *Manangkarl* (.09)
*Manangkarl*
Manangkarl

‘Manangkarl’

(101) B: *yow* (.02)
yow
INTER

‘Yes’

(102) A: *di nyamanangkarlyali di*
*di nya₂-manangkarl-y₂ali di*
nₚw-ANAPH fsg-river.ite-INDEED nₚw-ANAPH

‘Then she was a river-ite?’

(103) B: *nyamanangkarlyali nyindamu* (.12)
*nya₂-manangkarl-y₂ali nyinda-mu*
fsg-river.ite-INDEED f.PROX-EMPH

Yes, she was a river-ite’
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(104) di  andu  (.06)  
    di  andu 
    n-w. ANAPH m. AMBIPH  

‘Then he...’

(105) ke  oninya  jina  warrmuna  (.03)  
    ke  a₁-ø-w₁ u-n  jina  warrmuna  
    call 3msg.O-3sg.S-act.on-PRS m.PROX possum  

‘...called the possum’

(106) A:  ᵃⁿ!  (.09)  
    ᵃⁿ  INTER  

‘Hn!’

(107) B:  balya  bunalu  winjangun  bay  wunjora  bunda  
    balya  bu-ma-lu  winjangun  bay  wu-nja₂-w₁ u-ra  bunda  
    go  IMP-do=PROX fire  turn 3n_w.O-2sg.S-act.on-1sg pl.AMBIPH  
    bunguluwannyirri  dubala  biyirringarri  
    bu-nja₂-uluya-n-nyirri  dubala  bi-ŋ₂-yirri-ngarri  
    3pl.O-1ag.S-be.afraid-PRS-DU red  3pl-be-PST-CONT-SUB  
    nyumernangka  walamba  jinda  (.05)  
    nyja₂-ma-ra-nangka  walamba  jinda  
    3fsg-do-PST-3sg.IO red.plains.kangaroo m.PROX  

‘Come here, spin the fire to me, I am afraid of them because they are red,” she said to the plains kangaroo’

(108) A:  nyinda  lirrirri  nyumara  
    nyinda  lirrirri  nyja₂-ma-ra  
    f.PROX blue.tongue.lizard 3fsg-do-PST  

‘Did the blue tongue lizard say that?’

(109) B:  yaw  walwi  nyina  nyumara  (.05)  
    yaw  walwi  nyina  nyja₂-ma-ra  
    INTER blue.tongue.lizard f.PROX 3fsg-do-PST  

‘Yes,” said the blue tongue lizard’

(110) A:  hmhm
(111) B: *buna bunguluwannyirri* (.16)
*buna bunguluwannyirri*
3pl.PROX 3pl.O-1sg.S-be.afraid-DU
‘I fear them’

(112) “kanganonuwulkungariyani” (.15)
“[Unggumi words]”

(113) “dubala nganama karriyanga?” (.14)
“Red, where-from-they come?”

(114) *nyumara nyandu* (.16)
*nyumara nyandu*
3fsg-do-PST f.AMBIPH
‘she said’

(115) *aka* (.08)
*aka*
NOT.SO
‘No’

(116) *ngiyamurr kulangkulaj mungonyirri yow ngiyamurr ngiy-amurr kulaj-kulaj ma2-ngao2-w1-u-n-yirri yow ngiy-amurr*
*1sg-sperm flow-REDUP 3nm.O-1sg.S-act.on-PRS-CONT INTER 1sg-sperm*
*kulangkulaj mungonyirri kajingka balya kulaj-kulaj ma2-ngao2-w1-u-n-yirri kajingka balya*
flow-REDUP 3nm.O-1sg.S-act.on-PRS-CONT CANNOT go

*nyingkaranya* (.17)
*nyingkaranya*
2sg-IRR-go-1sg.IO=DIST
‘I am letting my sperm flow, yes, I am letting my sperm flow. You can’t leave me’

(117) *aningkennga bay wo amanangka andu warrmuna*  
*aningkennga bay wo amanangka andu warrmuna*
3msg.REFL-EMPH turn 3nm-3sg-act.on 3msg-do-3sg.IO m.AMBIPH possum

‘He himself spins it,” the possum said to her’

(118) A: *ngurraka muna ku-kulaj monerri?* 
*ngurraka muna ku-kulaj monerri?*
ground=Q nm.AMBIPH REDUP-flow 3nm.O-3sg.S-ACT.on-PRS-CONT
‘He is watering this ground?’
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(119) B: *arr* ngurra muna? (.2)  
arr ngurra muna  
about ground nm.AMBIPH  
‘This ground?’

(120) *kanda* roundbala mirreyali ngabun (.11)  
kanda roundbala mə$_2$-irrə$_2$-y$_2$-y$_2$-ali ngabun  
nm.PROX round nm.DEFS-be-INDEED water  
‘The water here is round’

(121) *kanda* burroyali munda we muwan (.17)  
kanda burro-y$_2$-ali munda we mə$_2$-w$_1$a-n  
nm.PROX flat.stone-INDEED nm.AMBIPH lie 3nm-fall-PRS  
‘This flat stone lies down here’

(122) A: *burro*  
burro  
flat.stone  
‘A flat stone’

(123) B: *manjarn* di? (.04)  
manjarn di  
stone nw.ANAPH  
‘The stone’

(124) A: *e-e*  
e-e  
INTER  
‘Yes, yes’

(125) *balalon*  
balalon  
flat.stone  
‘A flat stone’

(126) B: *balalon* kanda (.12)  
balalon kanda  
flat.stone nm.PROX  
‘There is a flat stone here’
(127) A: ngabun wurriwuna?
   ngabun wu-irra₂-w₁ u-na
   water  3nᵢ-DEFS-act.on-PAUC
   ‘Is there any water?’

(128) B: aw wurreyirri (.13)
   aw wu-irra₂-ŋ₂-i-yirri
   INTER 3nᵢ-DEFS-be-CONT
   ‘Ah, it [i.e. the water] is there’

(129) mawingki little bit darr amangarri di (.1)
   mawingki little bit darr a₁-ma-ngarri di
   cold stand 3msg-do-SUB nᵢ-ANAPH
   ‘It is cold - a little bit- when he stands there’

(130) mawingki wurruwanbalungarri di barrawurran (.1)
   mawingki wu-irra₂-w₁ a-n=walu-ngarri di barrawurran
   cold  nᵢ-DEFS-fall-PRS=PROX-SUB nᵢ-ANAPH dry.season
   ‘When the dry season sets in [it is] cold’

(131) diyalı way wurre (.09)
   di-ŋ₂ ali way wu-irra₂-ŋ₂ i
   nᵢ-INDIEED nothing 3nᵢ-DEFS-be
   ‘Then, when that time is over’

(132) mangulu wulala mangarri di (.05)
   mangulu wulala ma₂-a-ngarri di
   cane.grass yellow 3nᵢ₉-go-SUB nᵢ-ANAPH
   ‘When the grass becomes yellow’

(133) A: yow
   yow
   INTER
   ‘Yes’

[Tape switched being off and on again.]

Howard Coate: In the next few phrases we’re showing him some of the bones out of a book and big turtle and we’re gonna ask him a few questions.
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(134)  B: *juluwara* \hspace{1cm} *jirri* (0.09)  
\hspace{1cm} *juluwarra* \hspace{1cm} *jirri* 
long.neck.turtle m.PROX 

‘This is a turtle’

(135)  *wijika* you know\(^4\) *nyindi* na (0.17)  
\hspace{1cm} *wijika* you know \hspace{1cm} *nyindi* now 
Q \hspace{1cm} f.ANAPH-EMPH 

‘Did you know her?’

(136)  A: *mardumarl* (0.03)  
\hspace{1cm} *mardumarl* 
turtle  

‘Turtle’

(137)  B: *mardumarl jinda* (0.12)  
\hspace{1cm} *mardumarl jinda* 
turtle m.PROX  

‘This is a turtle’

(138)  *jinda* \hspace{1cm} *minjarlngarri* \hspace{1cm} *merri*  
\hspace{1cm} *jinda* \hspace{1cm} *minjarl-ngarri ma\(_2\)-erri*  
m.PROX eat-NMLZ  \hspace{1cm} 3n\(_m\)-one  

‘This is one meal’

(139)  A: *jirri\(^5\)* (0.06)  
\hspace{1cm} *jirri*  
m.ANAPH  

‘This one’

(140)  B: *erri beja ngurr ngurrumara* (0.05)  
\hspace{1cm} *erri beja ngurr ng\(_a\_1\)-ir\(_r\_2\)-ma-ra*  
one ASP kill  \hspace{1cm} 1sg.DEFS-do-PST  

‘I already killed one...’

\(^4\)Coate (1970) transcribes this English phrase with the Ungarinyin coverb *layburru* ‘know’, 
\(^5\)Howard Coate added the following comment in his transcription here: ‘Note here the Ngarinyin speaker 
finishes the sentence of the other speaker! (often do in English)’
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(141) \textit{muna Jilarriba}  
muna Jilarriba  
here Munja.mission

‘...here at Munja mission’

(142) \textit{A: lalangkarrunangka jirri?}  
lalangkarra-nangka jirri  
salt.water-GEN m.ANAPH

‘Is this a saltwater [turtle]?’

(143) \textit{B: lalangkarrunangka jina} (.1)  
lalangkarrunangka jina  
salt.water-GEN m.PROX

‘Of this saltwater [turtle]...’

(144) \textit{beja ngurr ngamarra erri} (.1)  
beja ngurr nga\textsubscript{1}-ma-ra erri  
ASP kill 1sg-do-PST one

‘...I have killed one already’

(145) \textit{marda angkerri ngabun balaj umbaningarri muna worndu}  
marda a\textsubscript{1}-a-ngka\textsubscript{2}-yirri ngabun balaj wo\textsubscript{2}-w\textsubscript{1} a-ni-ngarri muna worndu  
walk 3msg-go-PST-CONT water reverse n\textsubscript{w}-fall-PST-SUB n\textsubscript{m}.PROX sea  
irrirra moningarri di (.02)  
irrirra wo\textsubscript{2}-w\textsubscript{1} u-ni-ngarri di  
sliding.back 3n\textsubscript{m}.act.on-PST-SUB n\textsubscript{w}.ANAPH

‘He was walking. The water was going down here. Then the sea was sliding back’

(146) \textit{A: yow} (.03)  
yow  
INTER

‘Yes’

(147) \textit{B: di marda ayirri ngamara ngurr ngurrumernangka} (.11)  
di marda a\textsubscript{1}-a-yirri nga\textsubscript{1}-ma-ra ngurr nga\textsubscript{1}-irra\textsubscript{2}-ma-ra-nangka  
n\textsubscript{w}.ANAPH walk msg-go-CONT 1sg-do-PST kill 1sg-DEFS-do-PST-3sg.IO

‘Then he was walking, I did it, I killed it’
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(148) ngala jina mardumarl
ngala jina mardumarl
animal m.PROX long.neck.turtle

‘This animal, the turtle’

(149) A: hn
hn
INTER

‘Hn’

(150) B: e-e (.08)
e-e
INTER

‘Yeah’

(151) murrumay di wali (.08)
murrumay di wali
long.ago n_m..ANAPH moment

‘A long time ago’

(152) muna (.08)
muna
n_m..PROX

‘Here’

(153) ngartu mardu marngarri warramba munda mardangarri
ngartu mardu ma2-o-ar-n-ngarri warrambo munda m-ardangarri
flood walk n_m.O-sg.S-GO-PRS-SUB flood n_m..AMBIPH n_m..large

‘When it was coming to the flood, a large flood was here’

(154) A: e (.06)
e
INTER

‘Hm’

(155) B: kalun bandayilu (.13)
kalun bandayilu
?? world

‘This world’
(156) umbun woningarri
umbun wo₂-a-w₁ u-ni-ngarri
what’s it 3nᵢ₉, O-3sg.S-act.on-PST-SUB
‘Ehm, it made it’

(157) A: ng (.11)
ng
INTER
‘Yes’

(158) B: murrumay di (.29)
murrumay di
long.ago nᵢ₉.ANAPH
‘Some time long ago’

(159) kanangkan di (.09)
kanangkan di
today nᵢ₉.ANAPH
‘Nowadays’

(160) burduyu irreyirri (.03)
burdu-yu a₁-irro₂-iₙ₂-i-yirri
small-LAT 3msg.DEFS-be-CONT
‘This one is becoming small’

(161) A: yow (.07)
yow
INTER
‘Yeah’

(162) B: arri jinda li anjoni milimilira
arri jinda li a₁-njo₂-w₁ u-ni milimili-ra
about m.PROX see 3msg.O-2sg.S-act.on-PST paper-LOC
odenngarri (.03)
a₁-ode-n-ngarri
3msg.be.painted-PRS-SUB
‘Look at this picture here that is shown in the book’
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(163) A: *hm* (.21)

hm

INTER

‘Hm’

(164) B: *diyali amara wali* (.07)

\( \text{di-}y_2\text{ali} \ a_1\text{-}ma-ra \ wali \)

\( n_w.\text{ANAPH-INDEED 3msg-do-PST moment} \)

‘That he did at a time...’

(165) *murrumay di* (.04)

\( murrumay \ di \)

long.ago \( n_w.\text{ANAPH} \)

‘...a long time ago’

(166) *arrangunangka wandi andongarri* birri ngala (.03)

\( \text{arrangu-nangka} \ wandi \ anda_2-w_1 \ u-ni-ngarri \ birri \ ngala \)

above-GEN create 3pl.O:3sg.S-act.on-PST-SUB pl.ANAPH animal

‘God created these animals’

(167) *biwu di wa burrkengi* (.03)

\( \text{biwu} \ di \ wa \ burr-w_2a_2-y_2i-ngi \)

small \( n_w.\text{ANAPH NEG 3pl-IRR-be-OPT.PST} \)

‘so that they wouldn’t be small’

(168) A: *burrkengi* (.09)

\( \text{burr-w}_2a_2-y_2i-ngi \)

3pl-IRR-be-OPT.PST

‘They wouldn’t be small’

(169) B: *jinda ari li anjon?* (.03)

\( \text{jinda} \ ari \ li \ a_1\text{-}nj_a_2-w_1 \ u-n \)

m.PROX man see 3msg.O:2sg.S-act.on-PRS

‘Do you see this man?’ [Presumably on the picture shown]

(170) A: *jinda* (.08)

\( \text{jinda} \)

m.PROX

‘Him’
(171) B:  jinda  wudenngarri  di  jinda
        jinda  wudenngarri  di  jinda
    m.PROX leg.section  n{w}.ANAPH m.PROX

    ‘This is his leg section here’

(172) =A:  hm
        hm
    INTER

    ‘Hm’

(173) =B:  wuluma  nyino  ni  banjumindani  olman  balmarr
        wuluma  nyino  ni  b{a}_2-nja*_minda-ni  olman  balmarr
    turtle  f.AMBIPH think 3pl.O-2sg.S-take-PST leg.joint fork

        umangarri
        w{a}_2-ma-ngarri
    3n{_w}.do-SUB

    ‘The turtle has her mind here her leg joint comes together’

(174)  yow  (.09)
        yow
    yow

    ‘yeah’

(175)  alangkun  di  ari  jirri  mindinga  amunduw{w}.win  (.05)
        a-langkun  di  ari  jirri  mindi-nga  a{3}-munduwi-n
    m-head  n{w}.ANAPH man  m.ANAPH n{m}.ANAPH-EMPH 3msg-be.far-PRS

    ‘Up until here his head [resembles] a man’

(176)  A:  hm
        hm
    INTER

    ‘Hm’

(177) B:  ari  jina  li  bo
        ari  jina  li  b{a}_2-w{1}u
    man  m.PROX see IMP-act.on

    ‘Look, this is a man’
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(178)  
\[ \text{jinda darr irruma} \]  
\[ \text{jinda darr } a_1 \text{-irra}_2 \text{-ma} \]  
m.PRX stand.up 3msg-DEFS-do  

‘He is standing up’

(179)  
A:  
\[ e \]  
\[ \text{e} \]  
\[ \text{INTER} \]  
\[ (0.08) \]  
\[ \text{‘Hm’} \]

(180)  
B:  
\[ \text{arri andu jindayali juluwaru} \]  
\[ \text{arri andu jinda-y}_2 \text{ali juluwaru} \]  
about m.AMBIPH m.PROX-Indeed long.neck.turtle  

‘That one is this long neck turtle’

(181)  
\[ \text{andukule } jirri \]  
\[ \text{andu-kule } jirri \]  
m.AMBIPH-first m.ANAPH  

‘He was the first one’

(182)  
A:  
\[ jirri \]  
\[ \text{jirri} \]  
\[ \text{m.ANAPH} \]  
\[ (0.1) \]  
\[ \text{‘He’} \]

(183)  
\[ \text{ngarrun wali wa ngarrirrin ngarrkengingarri} \]  
\[ \text{ngarrun wali wa ngarrirrin ngarr}_2 \text{-y}_2 \text{i-} \text{-ngi-ngarri} \]  
1pl.INC moment NEG be.born 1pl.INC-IRR-BE-PST-SUB  

‘We would not have been born yet’

(184)  
B:  
\[ e-e \]  
\[ \text{e}-e \]  
\[ \text{INTER} \]  
\[ (0.03) \]  
\[ \text{‘Hhn’} \]

(185)  
\[ \text{wali burray} \]  
\[ \text{wali burray} \]  
moment NEG  

‘Not yet’
‘He was one of the first ones’

‘Yeah’

‘God’

‘When the place was still bad because the men...’

‘...were chasing evil’

‘He had already made them, those animals were already there’

‘They were there’
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(194) B: ngala birri (.19)
  ngala birri
  animal pl.ANAPH

  ‘The animals’

(195) jowarda jina ni admindan (.03)
  jowarda jina ni arr-minda-n
  horse m.PROX think 3msg.O:1pl.INC.S-take-PRS

  ‘We think about the horse’

(196) A: hm (.09)
  hm
  INTER

  ‘Hm’

(197) B: arri bunda (.16)
  arri bunda
  about pl.ANAPH

  ‘About these’

(198) budlangka kanda miyali (.04)
  burr-langka kanda mə2-y2i-y2ali
  3pl-tail n_{m}.PROX n_{m}.be-indeed

  ‘These here are their tails’

(199) A: yardu
  yardu
  right

  ‘That’s right’

(200) B: arri muno hospital murrowi (.05)
  arri muno hospital mə2-ə-irrə2-w1u-yi
  about m.DIST 3n_{m}.O-3sg.DEFS.S-act.on.OPT.PST

  ‘Let there be a hospital here’

(201) A: birri (.05)
  birri
  pl.ANAPH

  ‘They’
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(202) B: *budlangkun burrungurrali di* (.15)
    *burr-langkun burr-ungurrali di*
    3pl-head 3pl-face n<sub>u</sub>.ANAPH

    ‘Their heads and their faces’

(203) *nyinda burrunguyali muno we nyumerrira* (.14)

    *nyinda burr-ungu-y<sub>2</sub>ali muno we nya<sub>2</sub>-ma-yirri-ra*
    f.PROX 3pl-body-Indeed m.DIST lie.down 3fsg-do-CONT-1sg.IO

    ‘She lies their bodies down here for me’

(204) A: *yow kunya birriwiyirri bunda?* (.12)

    *yow kunya birriwa<sub>2</sub>-y<sub>1</sub>i-yirri bunda*
    INTER where 3pl.DEFS-be-CONT pl.AMBIPH

    ‘Yes, where are these?’

(205) B: *murrumay di burrangkawurr wiji mara*

    *murrumay di burr-angkawurr wiji mara*
    long.ago n<sub>u</sub>.ANAPH 3pl-bone Q see

    *nyinjonerri?* (.14)
    *nyinjaa<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>1</sub>n-yirri*
    3fsg.O:2sg.S-act.on-PRS-CONT

    ‘The bones are from long ago, have you seen her?’

(206) A: *burray*

    *burray*
    NEG

    ‘No’

(207) B: *muno ngadakara dam bun*

    *muno ngadaka-ra dam bun*
    m.DIST 1pl.INC.POSS-LOC place

    ‘There in our camp’
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(208) A: *burray*
   *burray*
   NEG
   ‘No’

(209) *wa mamara bangkuwi-yirri bunda kajin* (.15)
   *wa ma-mara bangaw2w2u2yi-yirri bunda kajin*
   NEG REDUP-see 3pl.O:1sg.S-IRR-ACT.ON-PST-CONT pl.PROX like
   ‘I did not see [ones] like these’

(210) *kunya birri-yirri ngabundaka* (.1)
   *kunya birri2yi-yirri ngabun-ra=ka*
   where 3pl.DEFS-be-CONT water-LOC=Q
   ‘Where are these? In the water?’

(211) B: *o bandeyan kanda* (.06)
   *o bandeyan kanda*
   INTER world m.PROX
   ‘Oh, [in] this world’

(212) A: *bandeyan mardu biya* (.07)
   *bandeyan mardu biy-a*
   world walk 3pl-go
   ‘They walk in this world’

(213) B: *yali kajin* (.09)
   *yali kajin*
   kangaroo like
   ‘[They were] like a kangaroo’

(214) A: *burray wa mara bangkuw*
   *burray wa mara bangaw2w2u2yi*
   NEG NEG see 3pl.O:1sg.S-IRR-ACT.ON-OPT.PST
   ‘No, I did not see them’

(215) B: *burray wa mara bangkuw*
   *burray wa mara bangaw2w2u2yi*
   NEG NEG see 3pl.O:1sg.S-IRR-ACT.ON-OPT.PST
   ‘No, I did not see them’
(216) **bunda** (.09)

'B他们会说话吗？'

(217) **biju birriwenyirringarri burrawawonkarra wiji babarra**

'After they two were already finished, did they tell them stories?'

(218) A: **burray** (.14)

‘No’

(219) B: **manambarra birri burru**

‘The male elders’

(220) A: **yow**

‘Yeah’

(221) B: **wa barra bundamindi**

‘They didn’t tell them the story’

(222) **ije wa barra andamindeyali burray** (.06)

‘Father did not tell them’
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(223) ngaji (.11)

ngaji

mum

‘[Nor] mother’

(224) ije wa barra ankamindeyali

ije wa barra a-wa₂₂₉minda-ya₂ali

dad NEG tell 1sg.O:3msg.S-IRR-TAKE-INDEED

‘Father didn’t tell me’

The original transcription in Coate (1970) of the recording on which the text above is based, is reproduced on pages 341–349. (The shaded area on page 349 marks the text in the transcription that is not included in the sound recording and hence was not available for re-transcription.)
A: Minamu uündja Umalaguninda? B: Mn!
That place what Umalaguninda? Mn!

A: Wulan windjiniñaraṇari njinagulawada
language you put it The "(love song)

B: Jaw. A: Gaņ njindinjiñari! B: E!
"Yes' Sing her when you did! 'ah yes.

A: Umalagudinda jamiŋi. B: Jaw; aga; munda
Umalagudinda down stream. Yes, not so, there

jamiŋi. A: Ari, Ilurun dambun mindi. B: Dambun
downstream. About Ilurun place there. Place

mindi? A: Ilurun dambun mindi. Ilurun-di gunja
there? Ilurun place it is. Ilurun what

budmananga di? Andja wer won? Ari
they call it that? What compose he does it? About

idmungal. B: idmungal-di. A: Wandjina wembad
bushes. Wandjina broke

wonu? B: Aga, wadmuna. A: Wadmuna?
it he did? Not so, Opossum. Opossum?

B: e....e... A: Gunja ameri djiri wadmuna?
that's it! What was he doing he opossum?

Munomunawu umindaneri, manuba a nga idmungal-di
Carrying it he was, carrying he went bushes

Di muna wajdj ḋaj, amara. Wajdj inji
Then here throw I will, he said. threw he did

Ilurun wanangalin namu. A: Gunjal wula
Ilurun cliff that place. Where from

umaŋalu di? B: Ari Guleman ganda Guleman
he got that? About Guleman this Guleman.

Figure F.1.: Facsimile of Coate (1970: 2)
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A: Mumunda Diliri ra? B: Wawi munda, ja
This place Diliri at? plain this, yes.

A: Andja idmuŋal-di wembad woniŋari?
What bushes break he did?

B: Gawidjan! A: Andjagu di? B: Balowa
Box tree! What for? Spreading

ŋijorije, amara. Wul ŋi:ma ’amara
I’ll make it, he said. Sleep I will, he said

jali. Di bala wuŋo amara. Ari
that. Then spread it I will, he said. What about

ŋawa manji meɾ amana. A: Djinda
the rain it did got onto him it got. This

Djaŋgurumen? B: Jaw; Di ŋawa djinda
Djaŋgurumen? Yes; Then rain this

oniŋari wajdj wurebin; ŋabundju
was-hitting-him threw he it away; water to

wondidj wuruwŋa, ŋulaŋula mada wurimeri
made it was into, rippling now it is

namu Ilurun. A: Dulgo wanangalin ganda wo:
that Ilurun. Gorge cliff this runs

wuruwan? B: Wo: wuruwan; manbada gude.
it does? Runs it does; waterlily it has.

A: Jo; dali murumana minda dambun? B: Ilurun
Yes; name it took that place? Ilurun

munda gudma, irumara. A: Gadjinŋariŋa
this you(pl) call it, he said. Always

wurejiri? A: Dali wiriwelunjiri? B: Dali
it continues? Name they are holding? Name

Figure F.2.: Facsimile of Coate (1970: 3)
wiriwelunjiri. Andu ganda ada iruma di?
they are holding. He here remain he-does?

B: Ari wandimi Ilgijalgan. A: Widjiga
About, what's-its-name? Ilgijalgan. Is it

iroden di? B: Aw, buraj wa angode
his painting that? No, not not his painting,

ruŋa madumadu aŋge:ri maŋure. A: A: B: Wa
only travelling he was half-way. Ah! not

angode. Di djoli injalunari Ilgijalgun
his painting. Then return he did Ilgijalgun

di djoli injalunari wandimi Doba wijag
then return he did to what's-its-name Doba down

awani. Di Guleman wuran njiniŋe daŋ irumara
he went. Then Guleman tree with stand he does

mandaral djonaridi. Di munda nijamur guladjà
gum tree big one. Then here my sperm watering

guladjà munonunjiri, amara. Ari njandu,
watering I-am-doing-to-it, he said. About her,

windjanun baj windjo:ra njimananga njinda
fire spin it-for-me she said to him, she

umbun walwi. A: A: B: Ganda
what-you-ma-call-it, walwi. Ah! This

mandjan liliri birimananga jali
rock blue tongue lizard they call it; thats

ganda. A: Gunjal madu njangeri njindi?
it. Where travelling she-was along she?

Mindirana bug njanga Di njanamala windjanun
Right here arrive she did Then her-hand fire

Figure F.3.: Facsimile of Coate (1970: 4)
baj windjo:ra, njjanamala. Bunda buŋuluwannjiri spin it-for me, my hands. These I am afraid of
dubala budiriŋari njinmara. Walamba red they are she said. Plains kangaroo
ba aŋge:ri gundu muno A: A! Di arriving he was side gap there Ah, Then
djina ge oneri jali wadmina njinda he calling he-is-him opossum this
liriri B: Liriri A: Di blue tongue lizard. Blue tongue lizard. Then
Walwi njindi? Ḟ Ḟ njindijali ge oneri. lizard she is? Mm she's the one calling him-she-is
ŋjianamala buruba mumennjiri windjaŋun baj My hands too short they are fire spin
windjo:ra. Bunda buŋuluwannjiri baba it-for-me. Those I-fear-them arrive
bijeriŋari dubala bidijiri njumenanga when they did red they are she-said-to-him
walamba jali djinda. A: A! B: Munda Bulungen plains-kangaroo this. Ah! Here Bulungen
dali ba Ḟajiri dambun minda ge Ḟameri, it-is arriving I am place this calling I am,
njumarenjinanga. Aga wali ŋjamanadj guladjguladj she-said-to-him. Not so, still my sperm watering
munonnjiri, gadjinga bali njinda:ranja; I-am-it, can't go I-can't-to-you;
njanaŋa baj wo mindimu njijaningenŋa. Wulan you-yourself spin it that yourself only. Language
Ourinjala ganda wula djenbunjiri Ungumi njumara. Different this talk you do to me Ungumi she said.

A: Njandu valwi ari njandu
She blue tongue lizard About her,

Qarjin? Not so, Ungumi. Ah! Ungumi

wula njimara. A: Gunjal walu njangalu? B: Di
spoke she did. Where from she came? Then

galamun njanganja ganda. A: Munda djari
long ago she came here. This place left

she-it. Meda River Manaqgal? 'Yes', Then

njamaqgalalinjina nja manaqgal njindamu? B: Di
she-is a river-ite from Manaqgal that one Then

andu ge ondjina wadmina. A: 00
he called out to the opossum. Yes, yes!

balja B: bumalu windjaqun baj wundjo:ra buna
Come here fire spin it-for-me them

buquluwannjiri dubala bidinjiriniari njumaqnga
I am afraid of red they are she said to him

walamba djinda A: Njinda liriri
plains kangaroo this one. She blue tongue lizard

B: Jaw valwi njina njumara buna
Yes blue tongue lizard she she said these

guquluwannjiri Ganganonuwulgunarijani dubala
I-am-afraid-of (Ungumi words) red

Qanama garijana? njumara njandu. Aga,
where-from they-come? she said she. Not so,
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Figure F.6.: Facsimile of Coate (1970: 7)

guladj guladj mununjiri jaw. Di gadjinga balji watering I-am-the-place, yes. Then can't go

njingaranja, njijaningenga baj wo, amananga I-can't-to-you, you-yourself spin it, he said to her.

Andu wadmina qura-ga muna guladj guladj mo:neri? He opossum ground this watering it-he-was?

B: Ari qura muna? Ganda round bala mire qabun. About ground this? This round place it is water.

Ganda buro jālimun we muwon. B: e,e, balalon This flat stone lies it does. yes, yes, flat

gana qabun wuriwuna? B: Au; wurejiri water stone it is. Water any? No; temporary water

mawingi little bit dar amaranaridi, mawingi cold little bit stand where it does, cold

wuruwanbalunaridi barawaran. A: Di jali waj wur when it comes dry season. That time finish it is

marulu wulala mararidi? B: Ja, qo. grass seed yellow when it comes? Yes, that's so.
(The water lasts till the beginning of the cold season).

Questions

Djulwara djiri widjiga lajbiru njindinanga, Madumal Turtle this did-you-know you-did-him, Turtle

djinda djinda mindjaliŋari meriŋari 'Djiri' this This eat the ones we do 'he'

(Note here the Narinjin speaker finishes the sentence of the other speaker! (often do in English))
Eri bedja Qur Qurumara muna Djilariba
One already kill I did to it there (at) Mundja

'lalanaŋga djiri 'lalanaŋga djina'
'a salt water one this 'a salt water one? this'

'bedja Qur Namara' eri mada angeri
'already kill I did' one travelling he was about

 Näbun baladji umbanĩ̊nari muna. wondu
water going back (tide) it was this. sea

irira moniŋaridi. 'Jow' di mada ajiri
sliding back it was. 'Yes' then travelling he was

Namara Qud Qurumenaŋga qala
(I did) (kill it then) kill I did it creature

djina madumag. 'ŋŋ' murumajdi wali muna qalu
this turtle 'yes' long ago while this flood

madu maŋaŋari waramba muna maŋaŋari 'E'
going when it was flood it was big 'eh'

Ganda bandejan umbun wonĩ̊nari
This world it what-you-ma-call-it it did to it

'ŋŋ' murumajdi ganaŋgan di buduju irejiri
'Yes' long ago to day time small become it is

'Jow' 'ari djinda li andjoni milimili ra
'Yes' about this look at it the book in

odenĩ̊nari 'ŋŋ' dijali amara wali
its picture. 'Ah' that time he did while

murumajdi Araŋunanga wondi andoniŋari biri
a long time ago God made them he did these

qala biwudi wa burgeni 'burgeni'
creatures small ones not they weren't 'they didn't

Figure F.7.: Facsimile of Coate (1970: 8)
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djinda arí li andjon? 'Djinda 'djinda' wudēnari
This man look you do this one 'this one' his leg

djindjinda 'ʊn' wulumara njino ni
section 'Yes' turtle she over there mind

bandumindanja 'olmaŋ balmad umaŋari
inntake che her upper leg joint where it does (where it joins)

Alaŋun arí djiri mindi ʊa amundance M̱, arí djina
his head man this there only that far M̱, man this

li bo 'djinda dad irumeŋari.
look you (imperative) 'this one standing up one

E arí andu djindajali djuluwara 'Andugule
Eh, About him this one turtle this is 'first one

djiri naruŋ wali wa ʊaririn ʊargenŋari wali ʊburaj
he the we while not alive we were not while not

bandu gule naŋga djidjinda 'jow'. Araŋunangga
they first belonging to this kind 'Yes'. God

djiri dambun malwa minjiŋaridi bururu wulwa gudu
He place bad this was men evil chasing

wurwineriiŋari. 'Jow' bidja anduronii bunda ʊala
they were. 'Yes' finish he did-them these animals

bidju biriwenji 'biriwenji' 'Nala-biri jowada
finished they were 'they were' 'animals' horse

djina ni admindanja. 'M̱' Ari bunda budlaṉga
this think about let us. 'M̱' About these their tails

gandamijali jádu arí umuno hospital biririŋ
here it is about over there hospital their bodies

budlaṉgun buruŋuralidi
their heads their faces (their tails about here and
their faces there)

Figure F.8.: Facsimile of Coate (1970: 9)
Njina buruŋuŋalimbiŋa. Jaw gunja biriwinjiri bunda? She their body part. Yes, where were they stopping?

Muruŋumai di burangawud widji maŋa njindoni? of Old time their bones have you seen you have them?

'Buŋraŋ, muno ŋadagara dambun' 'Buraj wa mamarə No, over there our home'? 'No, not see banguwijiri bunda gadjin gunja biriŋiri ŋabun them I didn't these as Where these water daga bidijiri 'Ow bandejan ganda 'bandejan in? these are? 'Oh the world this' 'world they madubijia jali gadjin. 'Buraj wa məra used to go kangaroo like. 'No, not see banguwijiri Buraj wa məra banguvi bunda I didn't them No, not see them I didn't these bidju biriwenjirĩnari burawawongara widji finish (they were the ones) the old people have you babara bundumindanjiri? Buraj manambara bururu story they were telling you?No elders men 'Jow' wa bara binda:mindejiri idje wa 'Yes' not story they didn't tell me father not adminde ŋadji, idje wa bara anda:minara tell me mother, father not tell they didn't me

'mandjuŋa buŋ majiri dyidjinda Garirinjina 'Ari 'Wind only out comes this one Garirinjina 'about bunda bururu jali bunda ruŋa ada umbanjiri these men these only sitting down it is angubandi the cloud (it comes down slowly like a big cold freeze)
Appendix G. Fishing

A story by Pansy Nulgit (Ngalkad)
Recording: 100903-02NGUN, 0:01-1:10

(1) wana jalku ngiya nyunmangarri
wana jalku ngiy-a nyin-ma-ngarri
if fishing 1sg.FUT-go 2sg-do-SUB

“you say if you want to go fishing”
‘When you want to go fishing’

(2) marduk nyinangarri::
marduk nyin-a-ngarri::
walk 2sg-GO-SUB

“you walking”
‘You walk and walk’

(3) karnangkurr nyingananga balimba nyinmarn
karnangkurr nying-ananga balimba nyin-ma-rn
dog 2sg-POSS follow 2sg-TAKE-PRS

“your dog following you”
‘Your dog follows you’

(4) ngabundayu
ngabun-ra-yu
water-LOC-LAT

“langa water”
‘to the water’
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(5) waj nyidingarri wul a
    waj nyi-ŋ2i-ngarri wul a
throw 2sg-BE-SUB sleep 3msg-GO

“chuckim, trow line he sleep”
‘When you throw in your line, he sleeps’

(6) liny nyinjilan
    liny nyin-ŋ2ila-n
see 2sg.O:S-HOLD-PRS

‘they’re watching you’

(7) ngala bunjumarnngarri ngabunwula
    ngala bunju-ma-rn-ngarri ngabun-wula
animal 3pl.O:2sg.S-take-PRS-SUB water-PROX

“you getting ngala from water”
‘then you’re getting fish from the water’

(8) waj nyindingarri wuralun
    waj nyinda-ŋ2i-ngarri wuralun
throw 2sg-BE-SUB outside

“you chuckim outside”
‘and you throw them aside’

(9) ngurrara
    ngurra-ra
ground-LOC

“langa ground”
‘On the ground’

(10) andu karnangkurr wul wulnga e
    andu karnangkurr wul wul-nga a1-ŋ2i
3msg.AM BipH dog sleep sleep-ONLY 3msg-BE

“he still laying down quiet”
‘and this dog just keeps sleeping’
(11) wul wul engarri
    wul wul a₁⁻²⁻i-ŋarri
    sleep sleep 3msg-BE-SUB

    “he sleeping”

    ‘and sleeping’

(12) di bunjumarrnju waj
    di bunjumarrnju waj
    nὡ.ANAPH more? throw

    “you getim more and chuckim outside”

    ‘Then you throw aside more’

(13) anjamangarn barij nyinqi amanu
    anjamangarn barij nyinqi a₁ma-nu
    when get.up FUT-BE 3msg-do-2sg.IO

    “what time you get up, he telling you”

    ‘When will you go back?” he asks you’

(14) that karnangkurr barij nyindi
    that karnangkurr barij nyinda₁⁻²⁻i
    dog get.up 2sg-BE

    “dog he get up”

    ‘the dog gets up’

(15) winjangun denba nyina::
    winjangun den-ba nyina::
    fire kindle-ITRV 3f.PROX

    ‘this fire keeps burning a little’

(16) liny liny anyijilan
    liny liny anyi⁻²⁻ila-n
    look look 3msg.O:2sg.S-HOLD-PRS

    “looking at you”

    ‘he looks intently at you’
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(17) anjamangarn ngunngurli amangarri karnangkurr
    anjamangarn ngun-ngurli a1-ma-ngarri karnangkurr
    when 1sg.O:2sg.S.FUT-give 3msg-do-SUB dog

    “dog saying what time you gotta chuckim mine”
    ‘The dog thinks: “When will you give me something?” ’

(18) karnangkurr barij e andumarn now rorij
    karnangkurr barij a1-y2i andaq-ma-rn now rorij
dog get.up 3msg-BE 3msg.O:3sg.S-take-PRS snatch
    andumarn
    andaq-ma-rn
3msg.O:3sg.S-TAKE-PRS

    “he get up and snatchim, he taking him”
    ‘He gets up and takes one, he snatches it’

(19) di nungurrij ama
    di nungurrij a1ma
    n-w.AnAPH run.away 3msg-do

    “he take off”
    ‘then he runs away’

(20) balya andumindarn anangkaku minjarl minjarl
    balya andaq-minda-rn anangka-ku minjarl minjarl
    go 3msg.O:3sg.S-take-PRS 3msg.POSS-DAT eat eat

    “for himself eat”
    ‘he goes and eats by himself’

(21) jinda orroli karnangkurr nyinganangka
    jinda orroli karnangkurr nying-anangka
    m.PROX dingo dog 2sg-POSS

    ‘this dingo, this dog of yours’

(22) yow
    yow
    yeah

    ‘Yes’
Appendix H. Albert Burungga’s story about the mother-in-law

The lines transcribed below as (1-63) have been transliterated to the community orthography used in this study, checked against the sound recording. Where necessary a revised transcription and/or translation was provided. The word ‘[click]’ marks places in the recording where the tape has audibly been stopped, indicating an interruption in the telling of the story.

(1)  wurlan  kanda babarra wadmindan
    wurlan  kanda ba-barra warr-minda-n
language n_w.PROX REDUP-talk 3n_w.O:1pl.incl.S-TAKE-PRS

‘The language that we are talking about’

(2)  kanda rambarrku di
    kanda rambarr-ku di
n_w.PROX mother.in.law-DAT n_w.ANAPH

‘This one is for the mother-in-law’

(3)  andukule rambarr bidningaykingerringarri
    andu-kule rambarr birr-ninga-yi-ngka-yirri-ngarri
m.AMBIPH-first barrier 3pl-put-REFL-PST-CONT-SUB

‘He was the first one when they put a barrier between each other’

(4)  rambarr kanda kunyalwalu wangkalu nyangki warndij
    rambarr kanda kunyal=walu w2-a-ngka-lu nyangki warndij
screen n_w.PROX where=PROX 3n_w-go-PST-PST-PROX somebody create
    woni
    w2-ø-w1 u-ni
3n_w.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PST

‘Where did this screen come from? Who made it?’

(5)  wanjina wandi woni kanda dambu
    wanjina wandi w2-ø-w1 u-ni kanda dambu
wanjina create 3n_w.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PST n_w.PROX place
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‘The wanjina created this place’

(6) dikule rambarr
di-kule rambarr
n_w..ANAPH-first screen

“And then, then the screen first’

(7) diyu rambarr birriwinjingaŋka bandu
di-yu rambarr birri-ŋə2-ininga-yiŋka bandu
n_w..ANAPH-LAT screen 3pl.DEFS-PUT-REFL-PST 3pl.AMBIPH

‘Then they put the screen between each other’

(8) umburu nyindi kunanji nyindi wandi woni
umburu nyindi kunanji nyindi wandi wo2-ŋu1u-ni
watch-ma-callit f.ANAPH porcupine f.ANAPH create 3n_w.O:3sg.S-ACT.ON-PST

“She, eh, what’s it, the porcupine made it’

(9) kanda mara biji nyarrriwinirringarri munda
kanda mara biji nyarri-w1u-n-yrri-ngarri munda
n_w..PROX find COMPLV 3fsg.O:1pl.EXC-ACT.ON-PRS-CONT-SUB n_m..PROX

‘And every time we would see her here’

(10) mamardumen ngayirringarri di manda
ma-mardumen ngə1-a-yrri-ngarri di manda
REDUP-walk.about 1sg.GO-CONT-SUB n_w..ANAPH meet
ngadirron
ngao2-irra2-u-n
1pl.INC.O:3.S-DEFS-ACT.ON-PRS

‘When I walk about, then she meets us’

(11) di yidu nyirre
di yidu nyə2-rra2-y1i
n_w..ANAPH put.head.down 3fsg-DEFS-BE

‘Then she puts her head down’

(12) di rambarrali mindi ngadumaramarnnyirri
di rambarr-ali mindi ngəda2-marrama-n-yrri
n_w..ANAPH screen-EMPH n_m..ANAPH 1pl.INC:3sg.S-avoid-PRS-DU

‘Then there is a barrier, she avoids us two’
‘Those first ones followed her’

[Click]

‘And that is when we two observe avoidance first’

[Click]

‘This mother-in-law when she gives birth to her’

‘She places her for him as a wife’

‘Then she does not talk to him’

[Click]
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(19) ma... walmanangka
  walmanangka
mother-in-law

‘The mother-in-law’

(20) di wa li angko
    di wa li a₂-w₂ a₂-w₁ u- ø

 negate see 3msg.O:3sg.S-IRR-ACT-ON-PRS

‘Then she does not look at him’

(21) andu ngurringa ayirri nyandu ngurringa
    andu ngurringa a₁-a-yirri nyandu ngurringa

 different 3msg-go-CONT f.AMBIPH different

‘He is going somewhere different and she is going somewhere different’

(22) di runga
    di ru- nga

 negate only-EMPH

‘Then only’

(23) nyindanga ni... kulin nyonyiningangkangarringa nyindi
    nyinda- nga kulin nyao₂-u₃ u-ni-nangka-ngarri- nga nyindi

 PROX ONLY bear 3msg.O:3sg.S-ACT-ON-PST-3sg.IO-SUB-ONLY f.ANAPH

 jajal nyumerrinangka ngabun bunda aw winjangun
 jajalu nyao₂-ma-yirri-nangka ngabun bunda aw winjangun

 give.chance.to.come.close 3msg.DO-CONT-3sg.IO water 3pl.PROX and fire

‘She only carries her for him and she does not allow him to come close, they are water
and fire’

(24) kanda wa mamarda angkulu
    kanda wa ma-marda a₁-a-ngka-lu

 PROX NEG REDUP-walk 3msg-GO-PST-PROX

‘He did not come here’

(25) andu manangkaynga marda ayirri jirri di
    andu manangkay- nga marda a₁-a-yirri jirri di

 AMBIPH separate-ONLY walk 3msg-GO-CONT m.ANAPH nw.ANAPH

‘He only walks separate then’
(26) andu
        andu
    m.AMBIPH

    ‘He’

(27) kulun nyumanangkangarri walmanagka
    kulun ny$a2$-ma-nangka-ngarri walmanagka
    bear 3fsg-DO-1sg.IO-SUB his.mother-in-law

    ‘When she carries for him, the mother-in-law’

(28) di wurlan kanda wurla nyumangarri di
    di wurlan kanda wurla ny$a2$-ma-ngarri di
    n$_w$.ANAPH language w.PROX talk 3fsg-DO-SUB n$_w$.ANAPH

    ‘And then she talks this language’

(29) wa jardan wurla angko
    wa jardan wurla a$_1$-a-ngka
    NEG straight talk 3msg-GO-PST

    ‘He did not talk straight’

(30) di wa
    di wa
    n$_w$.ANAPH NEG

    ‘And not’

(31) di mindi angkalu wa nyingkumanangka
    di mindi a$_1$-a-ngka=lu wa nying$a2$-w$_2$-w$_2$-ma-ngarri
    n$_w$.ANAPH m.ANAPH 3msg-go-PST=PROX NEG 3fsg-IRR-do-3sg.IO

    ‘And there she does not say ‘angkalu’ (he came) to/about him’

(32) worrjiniwalu mindi
    worrji-ni-walu mindi
    3pl.go[Y]-PST=PROX m.ANAPH

    ‘He came[Y] here’

(33) nyuma di worrjininya nyuma
    ny$a2$-ma di worrji-ni=nya ny$a2$-ma
    3fsg-do n$_w$.ANAPH 3pl.go[Y]-PST=DIST 3fsg-do

    ‘Here she says: “he went[Y]” ’
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(34) \textit{di} \textit{worrjiningunda} \textit{nyuma}  \\
\textit{di} \textit{worrji-ni-ngunda} \textit{nyog-ma}  \\
\text{ANAPH 3pl.go[Y]-PST-ADESS 3fsg-do}  \\
‘Then she says: “He walks[Y] around here” ’

(35) \textit{kanda} \textit{marda angka} \textit{munda} \textit{mindi} \textit{wa nyungkuma}  \\
\textit{kanda} \textit{marda a1-a-ngka} \textit{munda} \textit{mindi} \textit{wa nyang-a2-w2-a2-ma}  \\
\text{ANAPH PROX walk 3msg-GO-PST ANAPH NEG 3fsg-IRR-do}  \\
‘Now she does not say ‘he walked’ ’

[Click]

(36) \textit{di} \textit{wulari bunda} \textit{anangka} \textit{andumindingarri} \textit{yinda}  \\
\textit{di} \textit{wulari bunda} \textit{anangka} \textit{and-a2-mindi-ngarri} \textit{yinda}  \\
\text{ANAPH things 3pl.PROX 3msg:sg.POSS 3pl.O:3sg.S-take-SUB spear}  \\
‘And his possessions, when he takes spears’

(37) \textit{yinda} \textit{birri} \textit{wa} \textit{yinda} \textit{nyungkumarndu}  \\
\textit{yinda} \textit{birri} \textit{wa} \textit{yinda} \textit{nyang-a2-ma-rndu}  \\
\text{ANAPH spear 3pl.PROX NEG spear 3fsg-IRR-do-3pl.IO}  \\
‘These spears, she doesn’t call them ‘yinda’ ’

(38) \textit{nalan} \textit{nyumarndu}  \\
\textit{nalan} \textit{nyog-ma-rndu}  \\
\text{ANAPH spear[Y] 3fsg-do-3pl.IO}  \\
‘She calls them ‘nalan[Y]’ ’

(39) \textit{da} \textit{ondonngarri}  \\
\textit{da} \textit{and-a2-w1-un-ngarri}  \\
\text{ANAPH pierce 3pl.O:3sg.S-act.on}  \\
‘When he pierces them’

(40) \textit{birri} \textit{wa} \textit{dalij andamanangka} \textit{jardan nga} \textit{wulari}  \\
\textit{birri} \textit{wa} \textit{dalij and-a2-ma-nangka} \textit{jardan nga} \textit{wulari}  \\
\text{ANAPH NEG call 3pl.O:3sg-TAKE-3sg.IO straight-ONLY things}  \\
‘She doesn’t call those things with respect to him straight’

[Click]
(41) kandanga wadulu balya arnbalu barrarra loyaloyanda
kanda-nga wadulu balya a₁-o-a-rn=walu barrarra loyaloyanda
nᵰ close go 3msg.O:3sg.S-GO=PROX war.place close.to.the.time
di
di
nᵰ ANAPH

‘She only then comes close to him, around wartime’

(42) yinda angkuwanangka nak angko nyuma
yinda a₂-o₂-a₁-a-nangka nak a-u₂-o₂-w₁ u ny₀₂-ma
spear 3msg-IRR-FALL-3sg.IO spear 3msg.O:3sg.S-IRR-ACT.ON 3sg-do

‘A spear might fall on him, it may spear him,” she says’

(43) di kanda daluk nyuwanyinangka arnma
di kanda deluk nyₐ₂-w₁-a-ni-nangka arnma
nᵰ ANAPH nᵰ PROX go.through 3sg-FALL-PST-3sg.IO area.between.the.legs

‘Then she went through his legs for him’

(44) di wuda jinda ngurrba ngurrba amindan wuda
di wuda jinda ngurr-ba ngurr-ba a₁-o-minda-n wuda
nᵰ ANAPH legs m.PROX hit-ASP hit-ASP 3msg.O:3sg.S-TAKE-PRS legs

‘Then she hits his him [on the] leg’

(45) umburumyine di yidminjarl ngurrba amindan
umburu-nyine di yidminjarl ngurr-ba a₁-o-minda-n

di
di
nᵰ ANAPH

‘With, what’s it, bushes she hits him then’

(46) wurrumarn a₁ nyumanangka
w₁-o-irra₂-ma-rn a₁ ny₀₁-ma-nangka
3msg.O:3sg.S-DEFS-take-PRS INTER 3sg-do-3sg.IO

‘She takes it (the bushes). She says “Ay” to him’

(47) jinda manuk angkumera nyumanangka
jinda manuk anga₂-o₂-a₁-ma-ra ny₀₂-ma-nangka
m.PROX lift.up 3msg.O:3sg.S-IRR-TAKE-1sg.IO 3sg-do-3sg.IO

‘He might lift it up for me,” she says about him’
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(48) di jalwarr amarn waj ebun
di jalwarr? a1-ơ-ma-rn waj a1-y1 ibu-n

‘He lifts it up and throws it’

[Click]

(49) malyan di wa wurla angko wa wadulu
malyan di wa wurla a-w2a2-w1u-ơ wa wadulu
for.nothing nur-ANAPH NEG talk 3msg.O:3sg.S-IRR-ACT.ON-PRS NEG close

angkaralu dinga di wadulu
a-w2a2-(r)a-ơ=lu di-nga di wadulu
3msg.O:3sg.S-IRR-GO-PRS=PROX nur-ANAPH-ONLY nur-ANAPH come.close

arnbalu
a1-ơ-rn=walu
3msg.O:3sg.S-GO-PRS=PROX

‘She does not talk to him without a reason, does not come close to him only then does she come close...’

(50) yindakunga
yinda-ku-nga
spear-DAT-ONLY

‘...for the spear’

(51) di kanda malyan di ngurringa mardu nyayirri
di kanda malyan di ngurri-nga mardu nya2-a-yirri
nur-ANAPH nur-PROX for.nothing nur-ANAPH different-ONLY walk 3fsg-DO-CONT

dimu
di-mu
nur-ANAPH-EMPH

‘When there is no reason, then she is going in another direction’

(52) nyindinga madakanga nyindi nyandi nyumarnngarringa
nyinda-nga madaka-nga nyindi nyandu nya2-ơ-ma-rn-ngarri-nga
fsg.PROX-ONLY wife-ONLY fsg.ANAPH fsg.AMBIPH 3fsg.O:3sg.S-take-PRS-SUB

nyindyanga jad nyebinyinangka
nyindi-nga jad nya2-y1 ibu-n-anangka
fsg.ANAPH-ONLY hang 3fsg-THROW-PRS-3sg.IO

‘Only his wife when he takes her, only she is next to him’
(53) kanda wurlan walmanangkanyinangka wurla arn
kanda wurlan wurlan walmanangka-nyinangka wurla a₁-s-a-rn
nᵢw.PROX language mother.in.law-GEN talk 3msg.O-3sg.S-go-PRS

‘This language his mother-in-law talks to him’

[Click]

(54) nyingkumayali kanda
nyang-w₂-a₂-ma-y₂ ali kanda
3fsg-IRR-take-Indeed nᵢw.PROX

‘She does not speak’

(55) dingkurra a wurla nyumangarri kanda
dingkurra a₁-a wurla nya₂-ma-ngarri kanda
on.on.side 3msg-go talk 3fsg-do-Sub nᵢw.PROX

‘He goes on one side when she is talking here’

(56) andu wunangunangka wurda amarrn di di
andu wurangu-nangka wurda a₁-s-ma-rn di di
m.AMBIPH husband-GEN join 3msg.O-3sg-go-PRS nᵢw.ANAPH nᵢw.ANAPH
nyumanyayali di wurlan
nya₂-ma-nya₂-ali di wurlan
3fsg-go-DIST-EMPH nᵢw.ANAPH language

‘When she marries her husband then she uses the language’

(57) kanda wunngeju inya di kana ngamara na
kanda wungern-ju nga₂-y₂i-nya di kanda nga₂-ma-ra na
nᵢw.PROX woman-LAT 1sg-be-DIST nᵢw.ANAPH nᵢw.PROX 1sg-do-PST INTER
nyuma
nya₂-ma
3fsg-do

‘Now I become a woman, I have talked now,” she says’

(58) di burrorra di yalan di diyu dalij
di burrorra di yalan di di-yu dalij
nᵢw.ANAPH voice nᵢw.ANAPH talk[Y] nᵢw.ANAPH nᵢw.ANAPH-LAT call
nyayali kanda
nya₂-a-y₂ ali kanda
3fsg-go-Indeed nᵢw.PROX

‘And from then on she calls her voice and her language[Y]’
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(59)  
\[ \text{wandu} \]
\[ \text{wandu} \]
\[ n_wr.\text{AMBIPH} \]

‘That is it’

(60)  
\[ \text{wunangunangka amarn di ingarri di} \]
\[ \text{wunangu-nangka a}_1\text{-ma-rn di} \]
\[ \text{husband-GEN 3msg.O:3sg.S-take-PRS n}_w \text{.ANAPH 3msg-be-SUB n}_w \text{.ANAPH} \]

‘When she takes her husband, that is the time...’

(61)  
\[ \text{kanda wurlan bandarran wurla ngadiyirringarri} \]
\[ \text{kanda wurlan bandarran wurla ngarr-y}_2\text{i-yirri-ngarri} \]
\[ n_wr.\text{ANAPH language openly talk 1pl.INC-be-SUB} \]

‘...when we use the language openly’

(62)  
\[ \text{ke ngumara} \]
\[ \text{ke nga}_1\text{-ma-ra} \]
\[ \text{call 1sg-do-PST} \]

‘I called’

(63)  
\[ \text{wurla ngumara ngadmerringarri di yobobiyali} \]
\[ \text{wurla nga}_1\text{-ma-ra ngarr-ma-erri-ngarri di yobo-hi-y}_2\text{ali} \]
\[ \text{language 1sg-do-PST 1pl.INC-do-SUB n}_w \text{.ANAPH different-REDUP-Indeed} \]
\[ \text{di diyu bandarrangangka dimu} \]
\[ \text{di di-yu bandarra-nangka di-mu} \]
\[ n_wr.\text{ANAPH n}_w \text{.ANAPH-LAT openly-NMLZ n}_w \text{.ANAPH-EMPH} \]

‘“I talked” we say, differently, openly from now on’
The following lexicon is based on a semantic classification of the dictionary Coate and Elkin (1974), prepared using an electronic version of this dictionary provided to me by the Kimberley Language Resource Centre in Halls Creek.

I have used the lists below as an elicitation strategy for discussing language and had initially intended to check all words carefully and revise the lexicon with speakers. This has proven unsuccessful, however, since language consultants were anxious to discuss examples from the dictionary Coate and Elkin (1974), for two reasons: First, it contains many culturally sensitive terms that are either taboo (‘secret business’) or reflect cultural practises that contemporary Ungarinyin speakers disapprove of. Second, because Howard Coate worked with many speakers who are affiliated with the Worrorra, rather than the Ngarinyin ethnic group, the dictionary is perceived as ‘culturally owned’ by the Worrorra (even though these speakers were fluent in at least Ungarinyin, Worrorra and Wunambal).

The lexicon has been updated to the practical orthography used in this study and contains intriguing examples. But, unfortunately, it also contains many obvious mistakes (mainly transcription errors), only some of which I have corrected.

In the entries below the second column indicates the word class:

inter interjection
n noun
mod modifier
vi inflecting verb
vc coverb
vx verb (unclear if the word concerns a coverb or an inflecting verb on the basis of the available evidence)

The third column shows the description from the dictionary.

I have divided these words into five classes: speech act verbs and nouns, words reflecting manner of speech, words reflecting speech genres, onomatopoeic words/other words representing a sound and unclassified lexemes relating to language and communication.
I.1. Speech act verbs and nouns

- **amanangka** vi. he says (or does) to him. *Amerjangka*. He did to him. see -ma-, to do, to say.

- **amangari** vi. when he says. *Bada ango amarer*. Kill I will, he intends (he was saying he intends to kill him) (ratio obliqua is frequent in Ungarinyin).


- **amara** vi. he said (he did). *Amaralu*. He said it in this way. *Amaralu-nangka*. He said to him in this way. see -ma-, to do, to say.

- **amerndiri** vi. he told both of them. see -ma-, to do, to say.

- **amiyambu-** vi. rebuke. *Ngin angumiyambuni*. I stopped him, rebuked him. *Amiymibye*. He was reproved. see *amajambun*, to rebuke.

- **amungu** vi. allow. *Andumunguni*. He allowed them. see *amungun*, allow.

- **-anawa-** vi. promise, *anawajeni*. He promised him. *Anganawajin*. One who takes all responsibility. *Anganawewun*. I owe him (i am in debt to him). (cf *jowe*, to owe.)


- **anawajin** vi. promise (to do something). *Anjanawajin*. You promise him, *Anganawajin*. I repay him. see -anawa-, promise. (cf *jowe*, to owe, to promise.)

- **-anawala-** vi. accuse. *Anganawalani*. I accuse him. (cf *de*, to blame.)

- **-anawayeni** vi. promise. *Janawayeni*. You promised me. see -anawa-, promise.

- **-anawe-** vi. to remind, to talk to, farewell. *Bunganawanju*. I remind them. *Anganawenjin*. I farewell him. see -anawaje, farewell.

- **anawenjuwi** vi. to say goodbye. *Anganawenjuwiku*. I want to farewell him first. *Bunganawanjaku*. I want to farewell them. see -anawaje-, farewell.

- **-andiingkundi-** vi. to instruct. *Kajinka angkundikundiye*. He had not been instructed.

- **andiyawuneri** vi. he begged, he was begging. (cf *ngad*, to beg.)


- **aningkunda** vi. teach. *Aningkundani*. He taught them.

- **-aninire-** vi. to be cunning, to make excuses. *Andininireri*. He made excuses (cunningly). *Burandininireri*. They made excuses. *Bingininireri*. I was cunning to them.
I.1. Speech act verbs and nouns


-anjariyera- vi. to prevent, to say no. Binjariyera. You should have said no (not given permission). Nyinyaariyera (nyinjaawira or nyinyaawuraa. You didn’t hold her back from me. Bankiyare. They should have prevented them.


-arimbi- vi. to persuade, to urge. Angarimin. I persuade him. Irimbuneri. He is urging him. see irimbe to persuade.

-ariyangi- vi. refuse. Ariyangira. He refused me. Nyingkariyangira. She did not refuse me; gurgariyeyirri, don’t you (pl) refuse. Ngariyengka. I refuse. Wa kurkareyengenyirri. You (pl) did not refuse. see -ariye-, to refuse.


-awal- vi. discuss, implies to argue. Anja burawal biringkanyirri?. What are you two arguing for? Anja barwalun?. What shall we discuss with them? Wurwalunyirri. Discussion, council. (cf. dilaj, to argue.)

awulun vi. speak. Angaawulun. I speak. Angawuluni. I spoke to (or about) him.

ayambu vi. to rebuke, to prevent. Bandumayambuni. They rebuked them (they blocked them), see amijambu, rebuke.

ayandan vi. to urge. Angayandan. I urge him.

ayoiba vi. to answer. Angayo:oba. I answer him. Kajinka kundaayo:lbani. They definitely will not reply to you (pl). Wajo:lbani. It answers (e.g. the wax answers, responds to the heat).
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bala vc. -wu-. Bala umban wijin. The sore spread all over him. Wijin bala awani. The sore spread bala gurwa, you (pl) spread out (separate). Bala wungon blanket. I spread the blanket. Walan bala wungban. I spread the news.

balej vc. -yi-, -wu-, -ma-, -wa-, to polish, to comb, smooth, praise, (may also mean to retreat). Balej angon. I smooth him, praise him.

bali vc. -wa-, -wu-, smooth, bless, pride. Bali(j) nyinkuwiyirri. Don’t pride yourself (lit) smooth yourself. Baliba woni. He smoothed it (he blessed or praised it). see balej, to polish, to smooth.


baluba vc. -wu- to pacify. Baluba bo. Smooth her, pacify her (imper.). (cf balug, to smooth, to obliterate.)


barra vc. (mindi), to tell, to confess. Barra jankumendirri. Don’t tell it (about) me (lit) confessing don’t take me.

barrabarra vc. story, narrative, gossip, something to be told about. Barrabarran di the story. The statement. Babarra nyinkumerrira. Don’t confess to me. Babara nyinkumerri ngin da. Don’t confess to me.


barrerre vc. -ma-, to talk. Wali barrerre amerri. He is still talking.

barilyani vi. we alerted them. Barilyandani murumay. We alerted them before. see aljana, alert.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb/phrase</th>
<th>-wu-</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>barriwin</em></td>
<td>-wu-</td>
<td>to farewell. <em>Barriwin andoni</em>. He farewelled them. Note: implies stating a time for return <em>Barriwin angoni</em>. I fare-welled him (I’ll be seeing him).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>barka</em></td>
<td>-ela-</td>
<td>to jeer, to barrack. <em>Wa barka ırkeleyirri</em>. They don’t barrack him (don’t make a joke). (cf <em>berdka</em>, to insult.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bayawayudngari</em></td>
<td>-ma-</td>
<td>disputing, wrangling, loud voiced argument, not hearing the other side. <em>Bayirwayadmarengka</em>. They spun in circles as in a wrangling and stupid argument (sometimes called ‘tangled tongue’).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bengkawengal</em></td>
<td>-yi-</td>
<td>to struggle in argument. <em>Bengkawengal bidingayingka miringun</em>. They were both arguing with each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>berdka</em></td>
<td>-wu-</td>
<td>insult, criticise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>berka</em></td>
<td>-wu-</td>
<td>insult. see <em>berdka</em>, insult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bidingayingkeri</em></td>
<td>-yi-</td>
<td>they said one to the other (lit) they put it to each other (suggested it). see -inga-, to put.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bidingirri</em></td>
<td>-yi-</td>
<td>it was told to both. see -yi-, to be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bijindengkayalibiri</em></td>
<td>-yi-</td>
<td>they did (or said) to each other (joined each other in conversation). <em>Bijindengkangani</em>. They joined together (they are the ones joined).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bile</em></td>
<td>-ma-</td>
<td>to challenge. <em>Jerri kajinka bile ırkumara</em>. They can’t put it over jerry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>binbi</em></td>
<td>-uma-</td>
<td>to annoy. <em>Binbi mungumarn</em>. I annoy him (by making a noise). (cf <em>waj</em>, to disturb.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>birembire</em></td>
<td>-anju-, -uma-</td>
<td>confirm, ratify, seal. <em>Birembire anjun-ingari</em>. He has confirmed him (made him strong).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>birimernangka</em></td>
<td>-ma-</td>
<td>they said to him. see -ma-. To do, to say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>biyuba</em></td>
<td>-ma-</td>
<td>covering. <em>Biyuba nganjoneri</em>. He was covering me (with talk), defending me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bow</em></td>
<td>-ma-</td>
<td>to hail. <em>Bow birrimanangka</em>. They hailed him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>budmanangka</em></td>
<td>-ma-</td>
<td>they tell him. <em>Budmernangka</em>. They told him. see -ma- to do, to say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Bula**

-vc. -wu-, -yi-, -uma-, to blame, to accuse. *Bula inyingarri*. He is the one to blame. *Bula angumarn*. I accuse him (lit) I take him blame. *Andu jinda nangka*. He this one was the accuser. *Ngin bala (bula) nganduman*. He takes me for a suspect. *Nyangki bula inyi*. Who got blamed?

**Buladkuru**

-vc. -ebi-, -wa-, to come out openly, confess. *Wulan buladkuru webingka*. The message came out into the open. *Wulan buladkuru*

**Bulimba**

-vc. -wu-, flowery words which are not meant. *Bulimba bundonirri*. To talk sweet words in a cunning way. (cf. *bulin*, to deceive.)

**Bulin**

-vc. to deceive. *Bulin burwingkerri*. They deceived each other with plausibility (they were apologising to one another, not wishing to have an open row). *Bulin oni murdurungarri ari jiri laybiru angkeng-inangkangarri*. The man didn’t know (that it was) a policeman (who) spoke nicely to him.

**Bulkiki**

-vc. -ela-, to complain. *Bulkiki elanangkangarri*. Complained he had to him.

**Bulodkuru**


**Burawal**

-vc. -a-, to discuss. *Anja burawal biringkangirri*. What are they discussing?

**Burayingkal**

-vc. -ma-, to speak openly, fearlessly. *Burayingkal amerri*. He was speaking openly.

**Burrkayj**


**Burorl**

-vc. -wu-, to broadcast, tell out. *Andu burorl aino (unogo) amara*. He broadcast will, he says (he intends to broadcast it). *Burorl wuno*. Broadcast it (imper.) *Andu angkanya burorlinga woni*. He went out and broadcast it.
I.1. Speech act verbs and nouns

**buwaka** vc. come out with it: *Buladkuru wungebini.* I came out with it. *Buladkuru arebini.* We confessed him. *Buladkuru awan.* He comes out openly. *Wali bulodkurwa awe.* Wait till he comes out. (cf *wudmangkalani,* they confessed.)


**dajud** vc. -yi-, -nguli-, -ma-, teach, advise. *Dajud nginyiyeindu.* I taught them (or I was taught by them). *Dajud bidinyerri bandu ra.* They were taught by them. *Dajud budmaranangaruku.* They warned us. *Dajud-nangka.* A teacher (or pertaining to teaching). *Dajud nangka mindi.* A school, teaching place). *Dajud kudmangarri.* When you (pl) pray. *Dajud-daka mengi.* Let it be a meeting place. *Dajudnga burngulungka.* They give each other advice. (cf *dali,* to advise.)

**dala** vc. -wu-, to sort. *Dala anduroneryaruku.* Be was sorting them for us. Also to name. To advise, to call, to preach. see *dali,* to name.

**dali** vc. -ma-, -uma-, -yi-, to advise, to call, to name, to preach. *Burro:rru dali amarrerre.* He was calling into their ears (preaching to them). *Dali ngamanangka.* I warn him (i name him). *Dali mumarangyari.* It was called (named). *Dali angumarn.* I name him, take him naming. *Dali ngandumare.* You (pl) call me. *Dali burenda.* You advise them. see *dali.* (cf *dajurr,* to advise.)

**dalij** vc. -yi-, -uma-, to teach, advise, to call, to name. *Dalij ngindu.* I advise them. *Dalij nginu.* I advise you (I instruct you). *Bura dalij imandu.* He will advise them. *Wa dalij ngankengirendu.* I did not advise them *Dalij nyimangka.* He named her. see *dali,* to advise, to call.


**daran** vc. -anju-. *Daran ku nyadanjun di aman-yaruku.* He is confirming it for us. *Ari burar wa daranku angkengi amayambunku.* A man is not strong enough to prevent him.
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**de**
vc. -wu-, to blame, to accuse, to associate with. *De wongon*. I blame it. *De irwinngarriku*. They accuse him for (so they might accuse him). *De angon*. I accuse him. *De awingkanangkangarri*. He was accused (the one accused). *De murrwininangka*. They blamed it on to her (they put the name of the tree on her - the bulges on the tree looked like her breasts, so she takes the blame for looking like the tree).

**dewa**
vc. -yi-, to heap up, to blame. *Dewa irwininangka*. They blamed her for him (heaped up accusations). *Winjangun dewa birriwanyirri*. They heaped up fire. see de, to blame. (cf. *jow*, to heap.)

**dilangku**

**don**
vc. -ma-, -uma-, to attack, to savage, to pour over, to disagree. *Don budmarengka*. They savage each other. *Don nganmanga*. He savaged me. *Ngurrmanda don nganmanga*. Sweat was pouring over me. *Don bidmarengkerri*. They both ‘got onto’ one another. *Don nyinman*. I disagree with you. *Don ngadmarengka*. We disagree with each other. *Nyangan don bini janmanga*. You too quickly savaged me.

**dong**

**doru**

**dowayan**

I.1. Speech act verbs and nouns

**ijodo:dani** vi. they praised him. see -ododa-, welcome, praise.

**ilad** vc. -a-, to disagree, to sulk. **Ilad irrangka.** He got sulky. **Iladmade.** Disliked ones, sulky ones. **Ilelad.** Always sulky. **Ilad ngaanangka.** I disagree with him (lit) I go disagreeing or disappointed with him. **Ilarr angka.** He disagrees (and therefore he goes sulky). **Ilarr ngaangka.** I didn’t like it (didn’t appreciate it, went in disagreement). Idiom here is to go. Or going in that frame of mind. (cf amalgoni, angry.)

**ilarr** vc. to disagree. see **ilad,** to disagree, to sulk.

**ileru** vc. to interrogate. see **ledka** and **kaliwad,** to question.

**ilila** vc. to force, to call, to coerce. **Duruwin oni ililani.** He coerced him into ambush. **Nganjiliyani.** He forced me. **Nganjililani.** He was calling me (forcing me coercing me). **Wulannyaine angileli angandani.** I forced her with words.

**-imbi-** vi. to urge. **Irimbini.** He urged him. (cf -erumbu-, to persist.)

**-ingkunda-** vi. to notify. To teach. To remind. **Nyangki kundingkundani.** Who notified you? **Andingkundani.** He taught them. **Andiningkundaneriingarri.** As he taught them. **Nyiningkundengkangarri.** You were being taught (instructed).

**-ininini-** vi. to make excuse, to be cunning. **Andinininirerri.** He made excuses to them, tricking them. **Bingininererri.** I was cunning to them (I make excuses to them). **Anjinininira.** Don’t interfere, you are making excuses.

**-ininyile-** vi. to excuse. **Andininyilere.** He was making excuses, cunningly making excuses. see -ininini-, to make excuse.

**iniyawan** vi. to ask, to request. **Idniyawiningarri.** They are the one’s that asked him. **Anganiyawini.** I requested him. **Wana iniyawunngarri.** If he should ask. see -nijawa-, to ask.

**irimbe** vi. to persist. **Irimbeye.** Persuade. **Irimbunyirri.** He persists. **Angirimbunyirri.** I persist with him (I’m persuading him). **Anjurimbunyirri.** You are persuading him. **Kajinka burrkirimbeyen.** They won’t be persuaded.

**irigami** vx. to curse, he cursed. see **iri,** to hate.
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iya  vc. -wa-, -wu-, pride, vanity, to polish, to praise, to comb. *iya awingkerri.* He was proud of himself. *iya ngawinyinangka.* I’m proud of him. *Iyamorya.* Boaster, one who brags. *iya morerringarri.* when he was polishing it. *iya ngawinyirri.* I was polishing. *Wa iya angkuwingi.* He wasn’t proud (he wasn’t flash). *Iiya angingi.* I praised him. *Iyaabada.* A ‘know-all’. *Iyamaro.* A Wanjina’s name, the flash one, the proud one.

-iya-  vi. to curse, to swear, to revile, to blaspheme. *Anya yani.* I curse him. *Anji yani* (or *anjani yaniii.* You cursed him. *Bi yura.* Curse him (imper.) *Nyingi yara.* I curse her. *Iyani.* He reviled him. *Iyangarri.* One who reviles or blasphemes. *Bungi yara.* I’ll curse them. *Nyini yanngarri.* They curse you (may be used with *wurumen ari jara,* I’ll curse her).

-iyani-  vi. to request, to ask. *Jani yanini.* You requested me. (cf *wunud,* to beg. *-niyawaa.* To ask.)

iyolba  vi. to answer. *Idkuriyolba.* (can’t) they answer him (they might answer him). *Kajinka ankuriyolba.* I can’t answer him. *Iyolbani.* He answered him.

jadu  vc. -ma-, to slice, to cut, to interfere. *Jadu burrkumenangka.* Don’t slice it for him (don’t interfere).

jakalwa  vc. -yi-, to swing, to sway (in intercourse), also liar (perhaps one who swings away from the truth?).

-jan-  vi. to swear, *nganjenerri,* they are swearing at me. *Di menya nganjenerri di ilandnangka.* That because swearing at me that angry belonging to (I was angry because they were swearing at me). see -jana-, to curse.

jandu  vc. -uma-, to blame, to find fault. *Jandu angumarn.* I blame him. (cf *de,* to blame.)


jardi  vc. swear, blaspheme. *Jardi ngamanangka.* I swear at him.

jelewar  vc. -ela-, to make fun. *Jelawar angelan.* I humbug, I joke, I mock. (cf *umbili,* to mock.)
I.1. Speech act verbs and nouns

**jibara**

vc. -*ma*-, to lie, to deceive. *Jibara ngamanangka*. I lie to him. (cf *jigal*, lie.) see *jibare*, false, deceitful.

**jibare**

vc. -*uma*-, -*minda*-, -*yi*-, false, deceitful, lie. *Jibare nyindi*. She is a liar. *Jibare amarr angumarn*. I lie to him (lit) lie his ‘innards’ I take. see *bare*, lie.

**jikal**


**jiladwuli**

vc. -*ma*-, to contradict (said to be from *wuliliri*, one on top of another). *Jiladwuli amarenga*. He contradicted himself. Also said to mean ‘to make smaller, to contract out of’.

**jirimbi**

vc. -*wu*-, to sing, to curse. *Jirimbi irrwinina*. They sing him curse him (causing sickness from witchcraft).

**jok**

vc. -*minda*-, to report. *Jok wudmindanindu*. They brought a report to them (lit) a heap of words they brought to them.

**jongka**


**jowa**


**jowayen**

vc. -*ma*-, -*wu*-, to promise. *Jowayen bungonyirri*. I promise both.

**jowe**


**jowey**


**jukarre**

n. liar. see *jibarre*, false, lie.

**jukuruba**

vc. -*rn*-, to inform, to pimp. *Anjaku jukuruba janmanyirri*. Why are you telling on me? *Anjaku jukuruba ngandumanyineri wai*. Why are you (pl) pimping on me?.

**junjun**
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kalalak  vc.  -inga-, they told out the news (or were counting). Kalalak is the signal call for the easterners kalalala (northern call is bu yeeyeeye and je-je-je). Western call yey yeeye, southern call wey yeeye.

kalimbarij  vc.  -yi-, to ‘tip off’, to inform, to stir up. Kalimbarij

kaliwad  vc.  -ela-, to hold in question, to interrogate, to enquire, to criticise (therefore in a sense to persecute). Kaliwad angelan. I hold him in question. (cf. ledka, to question.)


kanjo  vc.  to plead, to resist (e.g. a brake). Kanjo inyiinangka. He pleaded for him. Kanjo inyerinangka. He continued to plead for him. (cf amun, to plead.)


kumanangka  vi.  you (pl) do (or, say) to him. see -ma-, to do or to say.

kuna  vc.  -ma-, to suggest, in this way, in this manner. Kuna ngamangarri wa wurkumarara. They don’t take my suggestion (lit) suggest that I-do not it-they-don’t-take. Kuna. This way, this is (how). Kuna umara. It happened this way. see kunayali, the same.

kuramad  vc.  -ma, to lie, to deceive. Kuramad kurrrkumarerrri. Don’t let them deceive you (lit) don’t let them pull your ‘innards’.

lalamba  vc.  to curse; lalamba biyingkalu. They came cursing.

ledka  vc.  to interrogate, to question, inquisitive, critical; ledka ngadelan, he holds us in question (he interrogates us); ledka ngandelier, he interrogates me. cf.nguja, to question; kaliwad, to hold in question.

lidka  vc.  to ask, to interrogate; anja lidka nyindiyirri? why are you inquisitive? see ledka, to interrogate.

lurumba  vc.  to make excuse, to be obstinate; lurumba burrwani they made excuses; lurumbada, an obstinate person (one that is full of excuses).
### I.1. Speech act verbs and nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Root</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>-ma-</strong></td>
<td>vi. root of the verb to do, to say (one of the six main auxiliary verbs): <em>wula amara</em>. He spoke (usually said as <em>wul’ amara</em>); <em>nyumara</em> she said; <em>amerndu</em> he said (or did) to them; <em>burrkumeeyirrinangka</em>, they might be reminding him; <em>irrumarayali di</em>, that is what he said; <em>Di amara</em>, that he said (or then he said); <em>bumara</em> tell me; <em>nyinma</em>, you say or do; <em>irrumerduna</em>, he said to the three; <em>ngamernangkakarra</em>, I suppose I told him; <em>ngamanangkakarra?</em> suppose I tell him?; <em>nyungkumerrika?</em> why can’t she say?; <em>bumaka?</em> you can do it?; <em>wa kurrkumanerri</em>, don’t you (pl) do it; <em>burrkumeyirrinangka</em>, they must have called her (or they might have called her); <em>ngadmer-rinangkangarri</em>, that is what we say concerning him (may also be used for intention); <em>kunyal mungumara nyinmerri?</em> where shall I go (where do you intend?) (there are many examples of this ratio obliqua).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>malamala</strong></td>
<td>vc. to vindicate, to defend, to declare innocent; <em>malamala burngulingka</em>, they were justifying each other; <em>malamala ama</em>, he was declaring (his innocence); <em>amalamala awininangka</em>, he was declaring (his innocence) to him; <em>malamala amerndu</em>, he declared his innocence to them (he said nothing to them, he had nothing to admit, no fault to confess); <em>malamala amaranggarrku</em>, no evidence he told us; <em>malu mindi wa mara murrkuwinangka malamala budmara</em>, (lit) scars not find them they-not-act-concerning him, nothing they said (they did not find scars on the man (so) they said no evidence; <em>malamalanangka</em>, a justifier (one who finds no evidence against); <em>amalamaloni</em>, he justified him (declared him not guilty, he was a witness that he did not do it); <em>amalamala winyi</em>, it justified him (witnessed he did not do it); <em>malamala angumarrawini</em>, I justify him (I verify he did not do it). see <em>malabala</em>, nothing, no sign. cf. <em>babaybabay</em>, widow’s word for no evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>manbay</strong></td>
<td>vc. to plead, to intercede; <em>nyangki manbay mungkumarara</em>, who will talk for me (intercede for me); <em>nyangki manbay mungkumanu</em>, who will talk for you (sing), (lit) who-plead-it-he-may-do for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-mandan-</strong></td>
<td>vi. to teach, to show, to learn; <em>angamandarn</em>, I teach him (train him); <em>angumandarn</em>, I take him (to teach him).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- **mangkala** vi. to confess, to tell out; wiirmangkalan, they confess; angumangkalan, I confess; wa wuirumangkule, they didn’t confess; anyaku umumungkumakalera? why didn’t you tell me?; umumangkala, you (pl) confess it. see -mangkal-, to discover, to find out.

- **mayambiye** vi. to persuade; angkumayambiyen, he will not be persuaded; ngankumayambiye, I will not be persuaded; burkumayambiyen, they won’t be persuaded; bumiyembiye, don’t be persuaded.

- **mayambu** vi. to rebuke, to prevent, to hold back, to comfort; amayambu, he rebuked him; anjamayambun nyarrunkurde? you are rebuking us also?: mumiyambu, he rebuked it (stopped it); angumayambu, I comfort him; ungkumayambiyengkangarri, in case he should be reproved.

- **murlumurlu** vc. to complain, to grizzle; murlumurlu ama, he grizzles; murlumurlu umangarri, he was complaining about it (lit) grizzling he was taking it; anya murlumurlu winjumangarri ilaka wondij ngiwi nyinmerri? why are you grizzling, do you intend to act like a child?

- **muruk** vc. to slander, to back-bite; wulan muruk bada, a slanderer. cf. buray-ingkal, to talk openly.

- **nangajangaja** vi. to argue, to question; budnangajangajangkerri, they were arguing. see -nguja-, to question; nangaja, to think for oneself.

- **ngad** vc. to ask, to beg, to petition; ngad inumara, you (pl) ask (imper); ngad anjumangangarri? what have you been asking?: ngad janman-ngarri, ‘when you ask me’; ngad ngangarri, ‘I’m the one begging’; da ngad angninganganaka I ask him (lit) asking I put it on him; cf. iyani, to ask.

- **ngadmayali di** vi. we say these things. see -ma-, to do, to say.

- **ngaja** vi. to question, to disagree; anganangajan, I question him (I disagree with him); nanganangajan, he disagrees with me; nanganangajan, he disagrees with him; wa ankanangaja, I agree with him (lit) I don’t question him; wa angkanangajan, he does not disagree with him. see -nguja-, to question.

- **ngajanga** vi. to judge, to question; wali madnangajangajara, we are still judging the place; arnogajangajara ‘we judge him’. see -nguja-, to question.

- **ngama** vi. I do, I say. see -ma-, to do, to say.

- **ngamakanngarri** vi. I habitually do, or say. see -ma-, to do, to say.

- **ngamara** vi. I did, I said. see -ma-, to say, to do.

- **ngandaaju** vc. to deceive; ngandajuni he fooled me. see -aju-, to feign.
I.1. Speech act verbs and nouns

**ngangada**
vc. to get cross with; *wa ngangada angkumandu*, he does not get cross with them; *nganangada*, he tells them off. cf. *ngandiba*, yelling.

**ngayad**
vc. to ask, to beg; *ngayad nguma*, I ask; *ngayad arimara*, let us ask him; *ngayad idmangangarri di*, they asked him (lit) requests they took to him; *ngayada anjaamarerri je*, don’t ask him again. see: *ngad*, to ask.

**ngekana**
vc. to mock, to criticise, to ridicule; *ngekana ijalani*, they mocked him; *wa ngekana ankuwi*, ‘I regarded him as alright (I did not criticise him)’.

**-ngijilanyirri**
vi. questioning; *wurngijanyirri*, they were wondering about it. see - *nguja*, to question.

**-nguja**
vi. to question, to doubt, to disbelieve, to ignore, to wonder; *kudngujanguje*, you (pl) question (you don’t believe); *badngujangarri*, we question them (we wonder about them); *arngujan*, we question him; *ngujarun-bada*, a sceptic; *ngujarinka janbinyirri*, you don’t believe (you question me); *nganjunguyarrini*, he might question me (might be sceptical of me); *ngarrun ngajunguyarrini*, we don’t take it seriously (we question it); *wa banyidngujarunngarri*, we don’t question them (we believe them); *ngujarun kudi*, you (pl) question; *anjungujarerri*, he ignored them both.

**ngun**
vc. to protest; *ngun-nangka*, a protestors; *ngun ngamenangka*, I protest to him; *ngun budmannarri*, if they protest; *ngun burngulingkanerri*, they protested to each other; *ngun ngadmarra*, we have troubled minds; *ngun-nangka mindiimu*, the protesting place. see *ngununuk*, resent, protest.

**-nguyo**
vi. to rebuke, to reprimand; *anganguyon*, I reprimand him; *nganguyoniwala*, he reprimanded me (in) this way. cf. - *iya*, curse, swear.

**-niyawa**
vi. to ask, to request; *ininiyawa*, you (pl) ask him, request him; *wa angkiniyawi*, he did not ask him; *aniyawini*, he asked him; *bibiyaw*, ask (imper); *wali anganiyaw-kule*, wait I will ask him first; *ngangiyanawan*, I request him; *anganiyawini*, I requested him; *anjaaniyawirrija*, don’t ask again; *ankiniyawan je*, I won’t ask again; *nyarrunyirri kajinka arkininyawanirriji je*, we both can’t ask again; *andu idniyawiningarri*, the one they requested. cf. *burrkayji*, to ask; *iyani*, to ask.

**nyimalunangka**
vi. she said to him.

**nyimbilin**
n. complainer, murmurer. see *bulami, murmur; nyanini*, to murmur.
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nyinayambu vi. to rebuke. kundumiyambunyirri, I rebuke you (pl). see amiyambun, to rebuke.

nyinini vc. murmuring, complaining. see nyanini, to murmur.

nyumarerrinya vi. she was saying along (that way she was saying). see -ma-, to do, to say.

nyungkuninerri vc. mumbling, complaining; nyungkununu bidinyere, they were mumbling; nyungkuna ngama, I complain. cf. nyanini, to murmur.

o:lba vi. to answer, to reply; ayolbani, he answered him.

-o:doda- vi. praise, be glad for, commend, welcome; ijododani, let them praise him; irrwudodare, they are praising him; angododan, I commend him; irrododani, they praised him; irruwododanerri, they were happy for him (they were welcoming him); ngododani, he commended him (she commended him); angidodani, we praised him; wa nyinkododa, I don’t commend you.

-o:labara- vi. to praise; nyadolbarararri, he praised both of us. cf. -o:doda-, praise.

ombilyo vi. to accuse, to find fault; malyan dangala kundombilyoni, nothing from that we accuse you (probably meaning nothing greater than that we accuse you of); ngadararu keyo anjaku janombilyon? poor fellow, for that why do you accuse me? (I’m a poor fellow so why do you accuse me?): yada andombilyoni, how did he cheat them.

-:re- vi. to agree with; wa andaarenyirri, he did not agree with them; wa andaare, he did not agree with them; wa angkure, he did not agree with him; wa bindaare, they did not mix with (agree with).

umalamalawi vi. to defend, to witness; angumalamaluwun, I witness for him. see amalamala, to defend.

-umaludka- vi. to defraud; anjumaludkaniika? did you defraud? see amaladka, to defraud.

umandiya n. permission; umandiyanga bundungulunyi, they gave them permission.

-umangkala- vi. to confess, to tell it out; ungumangkalan wuwakw ngenangka, I confess my sins; umangkalan, he confesses it; wadmangkalani, they all confessed; wadmangkalanyirri, they both confesses; wunumungkalanya, you (pl) confess. see -mangkala-, to confess; -mankule-, to discover.

-umayambi- vi. persuade; ngankumayambiyen, I won’t be persuaded; angkumayambiyen ngajinka burkirimbayen, they won’t be persuaded.

umbili vc. to mock, to amuse, to joke; imbili idmanga, they mocked him.
I.1. Speech act verbs and nouns

-umbune- vi. to urge; erumbunerri, he urged him or he was urging him. see erumbu, to persist.

-umiyambu- vi. to rebuke; angumiyambun. I prevent him (rebuke him). see amiyambu, to rebuke.

-umumba- vi. to deceive; nyadumumbani, they deceived us.

-umunga- vi. to order, to command; angumungun, I order him.

-unangaja- vi. to argue, to remonstrate; angunanguan, I argue (I question); ny-inangajan, I argue with you (I remonstrate with you); budungajariyenji, they remonstrate. see nuja, to question. cf. dilaj, to argue.

-unawanja- vi. to notify; andunawanjaningarri, he notified them; anganawenju kule, I want to notify him first (first of all I must say farewell, or notify them); bunganawenju kule, I tell them what time first of all (I first of all bid them farewell).

-unguja- vi. to question, to stir up anger by questioning; angungujarunngarri, one who questions, one who stirs up; ngujarunbada, (lit) the one who questions; wunungkungujarerri, do not question (imper); ngankungujara, he might not believe me (he might question me). see -nguja-, to question.

-unungu- vi. to order, to command; andumunguni, he ordered them.

wa vc. to reckon, to count; wa, wa, wa,

wajawiye n. deceit. angajuni, I deceive him. see -aju-, to pretend.

walkara vc. to confess; walkara wo:, he will confess; walkara, bo confess it (imper); walkara wuro, you (pl) confess it (imper); walkara woni biji, he confessed it (told it out). cf. -mangkala-, to confess.

wanbaj vc. to invite; wanbaj angumarn, I invite him in (I bring back); wanbaj ngandumanga, they invited me; wanbaj nyindumanga, they invite you; wanbaj angkuman, he might invite him. cf. waraj, to induce to stay.

wande vi. notify. andunawanjaningarri, he notified them; bura andunawande, he will notify them.

warunawarunerri vi. consulted, talked about. murrwarwarunerri, they talked about it.

wayne vi. to promise. angunuwayen, I promise him; anjinaawayen, you promise him.
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**wekarn**  
vx. -uma- to doubt, to question, to disagree. *wekarn wungkumara*, he might disagree with him. *wekarnkara*, he doubted me. *nganekani*, he doubted me. *wungekarnyniu*, I did not agree with you. *wekarn wungkekakara*, maybe he will disagree. *wekarn anjaku wa ngandamarakona wuraku*, for what reason did he not accept me. *wekarn yokiyali di*, this is the wrong way. *wekarni*, not the right thing. *angekarn*, he is not the man. see eka, disagree, question.

**wiilba**  
vc. enticing, forcing (by calling), to persuade (to do wrong); *wiilba nginyirrinangka no-ku*, enticed I did her for coitus (I persuaded her to have sexual intercourse).

**winbili**  
mod. scornful. *birri winbili*, scornful ones. see umbili, to mock.

**windid**  
vc. -wu- to insinuate, to swing around; *wulan windid winjaawirrira*, don’t insinuate (don’t turn the word around); *windid woni*, he swung it around (turned the word or meaning).

**wire**  
vc. -wu- talked about, judged; *wire mo:ni*, he judged the place. see wure, to judge.

**wirl**  
vc. -yi-, -minjala- to want, to pester, to plead; *wirl irrinangka*, he wants him; *mowarljali wire irrinangka*, he wants Mowarljali; *wirl bidiira*, I am wanted; *Watti wire inyanu*, Watti wants you (pesters for you); *wirl nyinjerri*, come on! she said; *wirl nyiminjalanerri*, he was pleading with her; *wirlmaro*, one who pleads or one who pleaded; *wirl minjali*, to beg a person to come (to one’s assistance); *wirl budminjengka*, they came to plead; *wirl ngadinangka*, we’ll keep calling him; *awirlwirl ngaka jinda*, he the pest; *burawirlwirl ngaka bunda*, pesterers, used in reference to those who keep on fighting. see awirlwirl, the wanting ones.

**wirlmaro**  
n. a pleader, one who pesters, to pursue with words. see *wirl*, want.

**wojolbani**  
vc. to praise. see olbara, to praise.

**wola**  
vc. word. *wola umbiingkangarri*, it was told to them. cf. *wula*, to talk.

**woy**  
vc. to warn, to advise; *woy bungoni*, I warned them; *woy barwun*, we warn them (now); *woy kule*, baro let us warn them first; *woy bono*! warn them!; *woy wangelan*, I hold him in warning (I hold many in warning, singular here stands for the plural); *woy bungungulu*, I give them advice.
I.1. Speech act verbs and nouns

**wude** vi. discuss; boast; *wurrwudengka*, they talk about it; *awudengka*, he was discussed; *ngarrwudengkerri*, we discuss; *burrwudengka*, they discuss (amongst themselves); *wa burrkuwudengi*, they did not discuss; *wa ngankuwudengi*, I did not boast; *awudengka*, he boasts (one who promises to fight); *ngarrwudengkanangka*, I boast (I promise to fight).

**wudmangkala** vi. they tell it out, confess; *wudmangkalani*, they confessed; *ungku-mangkalankarri*, he might confess it. see -mangkala-, to confess.

**wula** vc. to speak, voice, word, language, dialect; *wulaawila*, ‘light’ language (dialect of Ngarinyin or dialect of Wunambal); *wula jerikud*, deep words (southern or heavier dialect); *wul’ amara*, he spoke; *wula ngarrumara*, I spoke (long form, ‘heavy’ dialect, spoken by those whose totem is the kangaroo). *wa wula ngankumengarri*, if I had not spoken. *wula ngandoni*, he spoke to me (lit) he hit me with words. *wula arwarinya*, we both talked to him that way. *wula arvariwili*, we spoke to him in this way. *wula bijilengkerri*, they were question fighting. *wulaadi wula nyadinyinere*, we were both talking about it. *wula wulaabangarri*, sweet words. *wula umbingkanu*, it was spoken to them. *wula aduneri arangunangka*, he was talking to the one above (unusual verb form) (he was praying to god); *wula ngadaroninya*, he was advising us. *wula aradunerri*, he kept talking to him; *wula* is frequently shortened to *wul’*; *wul’ amendu*, he said to them. *wulay*! oh, my word! *wulawula nyelan*, he holds her in conversation.

**wulaawiri** vc. to counsel. *wulaawiri birriwanga*, they took counsel. (cf. -uwadu-, counsel.)


**wulawa** vc. to defend. *wulawa bungumanda*, I make my defence to them.

**wulmaw** inter. greeting, salutation. (cf. amaladmingiya, greetings.)
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wulowa  vc. statement, evidence. wulowa idmindanerri, they gave evidence for him, (lit) evidence they were taking for him, or they were taking his evidence. (cf. junjun, to give, to take evidence.)

wuningara  vi. he put it, he called it. see -ininga-, to put, to make.

wuningkundiye  vi. teaching. see -ingkunda-, to notify, to teach.

wunumindarayali  vi. to give advice. wunumindarayali wulan, to give advice. kakanda wunumindarayali wulan, you two take my advice. (cf. munda, to heed.)

wunura  vc. to beg. wururangarriyakabiri, let us go and ask them. see wunud, to beg.

wura  vc. of indirect talking. wula wura wonyirri, he was talking indirectly. wera sideways, also used for indirect talking.

wuraabada  n. backbiter, one who talks behind. (cf. muruk, slander.)

wure  vc. to judge, to advise, to discuss, to counsel, to criticise; nyangki je wurewe kundaawara budmendirri? who again advise they may you (pl) for me, they said (who will advise you for me, or in my place); wure wururnini dambun, they were discussing the place (were judging the place); wurueka wa wanden wunungkumarera? (lit) judge not true you don’t put me? (you don’t judge me as true, why don’t you believe me?); wurere iwwrningarri di, they judged him; wure wunungkayirri, don’t judge; wali wure wurriwini let us talk it over; wururualungyinerri, they discuss it; wurere wurrwunngar-rira, a council; wurereen di, judgment; wali ni wure mungonyirri, I’m still thinking it over; oru mindi wure monerri, In his mind he was judging.

wuremonja  vc. curse. wuremonju ngame, I denounce. see wure, to judge.

wurlawurla  vc. to talk, to harangue; wururlawurla wulangkanay, doubtful talk (crooked talk); wurlawurla buronya, you speak to him (harangue him). see wula, to speak.

yamuwa  vc. to curse. yamuwa angon, I swear at him.

-yana-  vi. curse. angiyan, I curse him; ariyanyirri, we both curse him. see -jan-, to swear.

yard  vc. promise to fight. yard inyi, he promised to fight (he boasted, ie. promised to eat the opposing party).

yare  vc. to urge, to coerce, to persuade. yare bundumanga. They urged them. jirri yare ngandumarn. He forced us (urged us). yar angumarn. I persuade him (coerce him). see -anjaro-, urge.
I.2. Manner of speech

**yarr** vc. to urge. *yarr angumanga*, I urged him along. see *yare*, to urge, to coerce.

**yaw** vc. to insult, to abuse. *yaw idmindanerri*, they both abused him (lit) they took him abuse. *yaw budmernangka*, they were reviling him (insulting him). *yaw budmindengka*, they insulted each other. *yaw bada*. a blasphemer.

**yiluk** vc. to scorn, to mock, to abuse. *yiluk idmanga*, they mocked him. *yiluk amanga*, he scorned him. *yiluba idmanga*, they repeatedly mocked her (hurt her more deeply). see *umbili*, to mock.

**yokunba** vc. to deceive, to trick. *yokunba andanjun*, he deceives them. see *yodiyan*, to trick.

**yowa** vc. complain, abuse. *ngarrun kajinka yowa marrkumunda*, we can’t abuse them. see *yaw*, to insult, to abuse.

**yurrumalu** vi. he says in this way. *andu yurrumalu*, he replies in this way.

**yurrumara** vc. this is what he said (this is what he emphatically said). see *amara*, he said; *-ma*, to do, to say.

I.2. Manner of speech


**baljawi** n. steady talker, careful deliberate talker. (cf *ungkulyuw-ilji*, a fast talker.)

**boywa** vc. *-yi*, *-wu*, to scream, to howl, to cry out. *Boywa ngi*. I scream. *Boywangarri bininya*. The screaming ones. *Ngin nguru nyinmin-darri boyua nyinangka nyangarri*. I heard you screaming when you were going along. *Boyboy midni*. They screamed at it (called out in extremes).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buluybuluy</td>
<td>ve. -wu-, chattering. <em>Ngala buluybuluy midni.</em> The birds were chattering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dawawi</td>
<td>ve. -ma-, to stammer, to stutter. <em>Dawawi ngama.</em> I stammer. (cf yabled, tongue-tied.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diyaliyawa</td>
<td>ve. -a-, chatter. <em>Diyaliyawa warankerri.</em> It was chattering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dowawi</td>
<td>ve. to stammer, to stutter. (cf arnbulay idublad, impediment of the tongue.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dulnguk</td>
<td>ve. -ma-, to grunt. <em>Dulnguk ama.</em> He grunts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dunguk</td>
<td>ve. -ma-, to grunt. <em>Dunguk ngama.</em> I grunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irikaywa</td>
<td>ve. -yi-, to call out, to yell, to chatter. <em>Ngabun irikay we.</em> The water calls. see jabalikoko, to chatter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jarangal</td>
<td>ve. -minde-, to babble, to chatter. <em>Jarangal budmindengka.</em> They babble, talk nonsense (colloq. they talk something nothing). (cf jabalikoko, to chatter.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jarangol</td>
<td>ve. -ma-, to chatter. <em>Jarangol budmara.</em> Yapping, chatter. see jarrangal, to babble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jawalak</td>
<td>ve. -ma-, to chatter, talking. (cf jarangal, to babble.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jilbadiba</td>
<td>ve. -a-, to chatter. <em>Jilbadiba bidi.</em> Chattering they were (cf jarangal, to babble.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jinyaynba</td>
<td>vx. whimpering, cry of the new born.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jir</td>
<td>vc. -ma-, -yi-, to exclaim, to scream, squeal, shout. <em>Jir ngama.</em> I scream. <em>Jir amara.</em> He squealed. <em>Jir admararri.</em> We shout (eg. when lifting a heavy weight). see jirwa, to lament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jirwa</td>
<td>ve. -yi-, -ma-, -ebi-, -wu-, to lament, to scream, to wail, to weep. <em>Jirwa kure.</em> You (pl) shall weep. <em>Jirwa nyinkeyirri.</em> Don’t weep. <em>Jirwa nyirrwininyene.</em> I made her scream (lit) I sent her screaming. <em>Jirwa nyirrwininyene.</em> She was screaming. see jir, to exclaim, to scream. (cf woda, to cry.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jowalak</td>
<td>ve. -ma-, to chatter. <em>Jowalak nyimarangarri di.</em> She chattered at that time. (cf jarangal, to babble.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junnguba</td>
<td>ve. -yi-, to grunt. <em>Junnguba nge.</em> I grunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jurud-jurud</td>
<td>ve. -ma-, to mumble. <em>Jurud-jurud nyimararri.</em> She was mumbling (repetition for emphasis and continuous action).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key</td>
<td>ve. -ma-, to call. <em>Key ama.</em> ‘Key!’ he called. (cf ke, call.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koy</td>
<td>n. shrill call.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I.2. Manner of speech

kurkur  vc.  -ma-, to signal, to call. Kurkur budmara. They called.
kuyoya  vc.  to whisper. Kuyoya nyina wula ngajila (lit) Whisper with talk let us (let us talk in whispers).
malkowa  vc.  to shout; malkowa biyingkalu, they were shouting as they came along. cf. malka, to dance, the shouting that accompanies the dancing.

manando  n.  big voiced one.
maraymaray  vc.  howling, whining; maraymaray manyidniperri, we were howling.
ngalurra  vc.  to be cross, to speak roughly; ngalurra nyadurani, they were cross with us; ngalurra ngandurani, they spoke roughly to me (came to me with a shout); ngalura idani, they were cross (spoke roughly) to him. cf. nganjarr, roughly.

ngandiba  vc.  yelling, roaring; anja ngandiba siyirri jirrimu? what is he swearing at? anja ngandiba umindanyirri? what did he roar? (what word is he swearing?).
ngaradngarad  vc.  to shout; ngaradngarad nyamaanangka, I shout at him; ngaradngarad budmara, they shout.
ngarlungarlu  vc.  to be jabbering, making a lot of noise by talking; ngalungalu budmara, they were jabbering (they were making a loud noise).

ngabad  vc.  to sigh, to express disgust, annoyance; ngabad wunganju, I make it sigh (I sigh); ngabad biyerri, they were sighing; minjal ngabad angoninga, (lit) eat wish him-I-had-only (I wish I had eaten it).

ningkununu  vc.  -ma- to grumble; ningkununu ngama, I grumble.
nyanini  vc.  -ma- to murmur; yanini budmara, they murmured; yanini irrangka, he is murmuring (going murmuring); yanini inyerri, he was murmuring; yanini bidinyerri, they were murmuring.

nyowalnyowul  n.  babbling, all talking at one time.
onba  vc.  to hum, to growl; onba bidiyirri, growling they were (or humming, eg. bees); onba iringarri, they growl at him.

ungkuljuwilji  n.  a fast talker. cf. baljawi, slow, deliberate talker.

-unnunu-  vc.  to murmur; nyungkununu bidingkerri, they murmured. cf. yanini, murmur.

wodul  n.  low (possibly in tone) song.
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**yeba**  vc. to yell (warriors shout as they march). *yinda yeba idmindani*, as they took their spears they yelled ... (a pronounced aspirate sound). see *yey yey*, war cry.

**yerol**  vc. to shout, to yell, to cry out. *yerol yama*, I cry out; *yerol amara*, he called out. (cf. *yeba*, to yell.)

**yeyawa**  vc. *yeyawa wangkerri ngabun*, chattering water.

**yeyowa**  vc. to chatter. *yeyowa wangkerri ngabun*, the water goes chattering. see *yeyawa*, chattering.

**I.3. Speech genre**

**ajiro**  n. ‘funny talk’.

**akaruru**  vc. bow down, talk humbly, polite, softly spoken, also the name of the special ‘rambad’ and ‘widow’s’ language, I talk politely (I talk in ‘rambad’ language). *Akaruru ungumindan*, I talk humbly (lit) humbly I take words. *Akaruru umindani*, He was polite, reserved. *Anjaku akaruru nyima*? Why are you polite? *Wayingingala ngamannungu nyandu nyumararrinya akaruru wula onerrinya*, (lit) father-in-law I call you only she was saying that way in ‘rambad’ language (in the *akaruru* language she said ‘I call you my father-in-law’).

**barrarrabarrarra**  n. story, narrative (longer form of *barrabarra*, story could possibly be a plural form).

**dangkan**  vc. -ma-, -nguli-, to take the strain. *Dangkan budmarri*, They strained. *Dangkan budngulinyin*, They gave the strain to each other. *Dangkan bijelangka*, They strained their relationship (they quarrelled amongst themselves).

**dankan**  vc. -ma-, to over-ride. *Dankan budmendengka*, They tried to stop each other (tried to over-ride each other). *Dandan janku-minderri*, Don’t over-ride me. *Dankan*, Used of a hammering argument. *Dankan bijelenyirri*, hammer themselves in argument (one trying to overpower the other).
**I.3. Speech genre**

**daru**

**dilaj**

**dor**
vc. -wu-, -nguli-, -ininga-, to bump, to hit. *Dor wurrwunerri.* They were bumping it. *Wulan dor wurrwinyirri.* They were answering with emphasis (discussing with forcefulness). *Mangarri dor bangir-wininangka.* We ate the food for her (bumped it off). *Dor angoni.* I bumped him (off). *Dor ungulin.* I give it a bump. *Dor anginingan.* I put a bump (into him), can also be used for sexual intercourse.

**duludu**
vc. -wu-, blackmail. *Duludu bundon.* They tempt (or force) them to do it.

**erimbi**

**erimbu**
vi. to persuade, to trouble. *Angerimbun.* I trouble him. see.

-erumbu-
vi. to persuade, to pester. *Angerumbunyirri.* I urge him (persist with him). *Nyerumbun wulal nyi.* Her beauty gets on us (overpowers us). *Nyinderumbunyirri.* You are persistent. see *erimbe*, to persist, to persuade. *Irimbe.* To persuade.

**iluk**
vc. -yi-, to argue, to abuse, to despise. *Iluk bidayingka.* They despise each other. *Iluk angumarn.* I despise him (lit) take him despising.

-iren-
vi. to argue. *Wula bijirenyirri.* They were arguing (lit) word fighting. *Wula ngajirenyirri.* We argue.

**jajendu**
vc. -ela-, to persecute. *Jajendu ngandeleni.* They persecuted me. (cf -orije- to persecute.)

**jajerri**
vc. -ma-, -wu-, to bother, to harass, to persecute. *Jajerri nyinkumerrri.* Don’t bother, don’t harass (don’t be in a hurry). *Wa jajerri ngankume.* I don’t harass, cause trouble. *Kajinka jajerri nyinko.* I won’t bother you. *Jajerri nyangoru nyinkumerrri.* Don’t bother your head (lit) don’t bother your ears. (cf -alengka-, to bother.)
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**Jimbebe**

n. repeater (in talk), to join up (eg. building with building). *Wulan jimbananja woni*. To repeat, join up with argument (one who brings up old arguments and joins them on to the present issue). see *jimba*, next to.

**Jol**


**Joruba**

vc. *-ma*, counsel. *Wali joruba budmorenga*. For a while they counselled each other. *Joruba idmangerri*. They were counselling him (fig) they were ‘nibbling’ at him.

**Karan*ngin**


**Karn**


**Kulangij**

vc. *-wa*, to turn around, about face, repent. *Wa kulangij burkuwan-dungarri*. They don’t turn around (or repent). see *kalangi*, to turn over. *Kulangan*. To turn.

**Kulmiji**

n. said to be a ‘meat prayer’, asking Wanjina for meat.

**Kuwakun**

n. bad news, news of the dead. see *kuwan*, news of the dead. (cf *wulan wunir*, good news.)

**Kuwan**

vc. *-nguli*, *-wu*, news of the dead. *Kuwa bundungulini*. News of the dead they gave them. *Kuwa bundoni*. They (hit) them with news of the dead. see *kuwakun*, news of the dead. (*kuwakun* appears to be the word most commonly used).

**Kuwararan**


**Majawa**

vc. *-wu* to meet, to collide (of speech); *majawa barwinyirri*, we keep jamming their speech; *majawa*, used of meeting, coming in the opposite direction.

**Malangkur**

n. death song. see *malungkur*, to sing to death.

**Malungkur**

vc. to sing to death; *malungkur budmanangka*, they sing him to death.

**Mananbada**

n. eloquent one. see *manambarra*, elder.

**Miyingkan**

n. said to have been a Worrorra dialect, ‘back to front’ language, once spoken at the Barker river.
I.3. Speech genre

mulay vc. to seduce; mulay umanganangka, he seduced her; wulan mulay wungumarn-angka, I seduced her with words. see mulay, wrong marriage.

nangad n. Ngarinyin dialect (known as kangaroo dialect).

nangkunangku-nangka n. actor, guard, orderly (eg. in charge of initiand’s camp); ngin nangkunangku-nangka nginyirri, I was acting; nangkunangku bada nyingkeyirri, don’t be clownish (in ceremonies one may climb a pole and talk in a manner similar to having a hare-lip).

narrrey inter. swear word meaning big hole (child’s word, nadej).

ngalarn n. magic singing, special song, death or secret love song, to put a hoodoo on; -uma-, -ma-, -anjju-, to sing; ngalarnkalu ngamanangka, I do magic to him (I sing him); ngalayrn bundumanngarri, they sing them; ngalayrn irriman, taboo song he takes him (he sings him).

ngalayrn vc. to cast a spell; ngalayrn nganduman, they do magic to me (they sing me to death). see: ngalarn, special song.

ngarnkad vc. innocent, nothing against, to find no fault, to justify; ngarnkad angumarawun, Innocent I take him (I find no fault with him); ngarnkad admarawun, we take him as innocent; ngarnkad anyid-marawunyirri, we (excl) find no fault in him; ngarnkad amarawun, he finds no fault in him (used of the tide going out and leaving no water); (wondo) ngarnkad uma (the tide, the sea) has no water (no fault), (may also be used of one who witnesses an incident but does not take part); ngarnkad ngamanangka ari jirri, justify I do him this man (I justify this man); ngaarnggaad-di, justification; ngaarnggaad yawun, justification time (trial time); anjanmangkan ngaarnggaad ama, (lit) when trial he does (when is his trial).

ngong vc. ‘dog’ language; kanangkurr ngong iyonyirri, the ‘dog’ language he will be speaking to him.

ngurul n. message. ngurul wayj angebun, I send a message (lit) stick I send him (a message stick).

nguyawin n. (di) evil speech, to swear; nguyawin anginayi, I swear at him. cf. -iya-, curse, swear.

nyambalngeebada n. inquisitor, interrogator (eg. a policeman).

nyanja vc. -ela- to interrogate; nyanja ijelanyirringarri, they hold him questioning. cf. nyambalneebada, an interrogator.

nyewanbi n. messenger (said to be connected with the circumcision).
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nyidmun n. speech of a ‘hare lip’ person or imitation of one, also used of a solid object.

nyinakulawada n. first love (she-first-love), love song.

-orime- vi. sob story; wulan borimeyirri, tell him a sob story; irani boriyennangka, you tell a sob-story to your father; wulan orimengkara, he told a sob-story to me; wula woriye di, a sob story; worimiye di anjuwingkara, he made himself to me a sob-story; worimiye di amarera, he told me a sob-story; nyorimeyengkara, she made herself poor to me.

umaringkindi n. rumour. wanden ka wunkengi wandu ru umarinkinyirri, It wasn’t true (it was only a rumour); wandu bolod umbanyirri, that (word) was only spreading around; umarinki di, the rumour; ru umarinkinyirri, only rumours. see wimarinkiyirri, rumour.

-uwadu- vi. counsel; anduwaduwini, he took counsel with them; andanawadunerri, he was discussing it with them (counselling them he was); wunguwaduwininangka, I counsel him (I discuss it with him); uwadunngarri, (lit) he states it (he holds to the law); wulan nyina uwaduni, he held him to the word.

wajangkabiri n. to do with the death song (possibly the deceitful thing).

wala’nangka n. messenger (wulan, word; -nangka, pertaining to); pertaining to the message.

werr vc. to compose, to consecrate, to devote to; werrnangka, a composer; werr wuroniyali, he made a song for him (he composed a song); werra arrwun, we praise him; werra wonyinangka, he composed the song for her (consecrated it, put it on one side for her).

wilimaramara n. fearful news.

wimarinkiyirri vi. rumours. bura wimarinkiyirri, there will be rumours. bura wimarinkiyirri malani ku, there will be rumours of war. kalumun wimaringkinerri, there were rumours. see umaringkin di, rumour.

wiyid n. worms (idiom: lies); wiyid duli nyindaawiri, don’t put worms on me (don’t put lies over me). see wiyud, lies, worms. (jikal, liar.)

wiyud n. lies, worms; wiyud jirri, he is a liar; wiyud jow nyinjininganyirri, you heap up worms (you heap up lies). see wiyid, worms.

wulangkanay n. back to front talk, crooked talk. wula wulangkanay wula nганbini, ‘crooked’ words he struck me with. aa di wiję ngala wulangkanay ngala wula kurwinyire, ah, that different, that ‘raving’ talk that you two talk wrong that (may also mean incredible, doubtful).
I.4. Onomatopoeic words and ‘noise’

wunangajaye n. witness, testimony. see anangajaye, to bear witness.
wurruman n. bad talk, coarse speech. (cf. nguyawin, evil speech; jadi, swear; -iya-, to curse.)
wurrwalunyirri vc. to counsel; wurrwalunyirri biyingkangarringa, they took counsel; wurwaluni, they discussed it; wurwalunngarri, council. see wure, to judge.
wurwude vi. to counsel. wurwudengka, they took counsel together (disputed, talked it over, made arrangements). banduwurrun wurwedengka budmarerri, they reasoned with themselves, saying. see wurwalunyirri, to counsel; wure, to judge.
yadkaya vc. to persuade. see mayanbiye, to persuade.
yalan n. widow’s language, rambad speech. yalan wungendani, I called out (threw out) widow’s language. yalan wurendani, she made him talk widow’s language.
yirnbal mod. cursed.
yoriyori n. ancient story. yoriyori birri babarra bundamunda, tell us one of the ancient stories. (cf. barrabarra, story.)

I.4. Onomatopoeic words and ‘noise’

awuba vc. roar. Awuba e. He roars. Awuba mi. It roars (eg. of the see).
barl n. crackling noise.
barlbarl vc. -yi-, cracking. Barlbarl bidinyi. They were cracking (they were nervous). see barl, crackling noise.
bininga! inter. crack him! Yinda kadayj amara. The spear cracked (or rattled). Note: Used also as a signal noise when one wishes to attract attention.
bobey vc. -ma-, signal. Bobey budmara. Signal they did, signal call (bobey can be independent of auxiliary).
buduruwa vc. -a-, to snore. Bururuwa ngangka. I went snoring.
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bumbulwa  vc. -wa-, -ebu-, -wu-, bumbulwa angebun, I throw down with a loud noise. *Bumbulwa iruwinininya.* He cast it down. (cf *bumba*, to cast down.)

dal  vc. to crack. *Darl ama.* He cracked (of a whip), (said quickly for emphasis).

dalkud  vc. -a-, -ma-, hunting noise (for hunting kangaroos). *Dalkud ngaya.* I make a noise to frighten a kangaroo (by cracking a stick). *Dalkud ngima.* I shall bang (or smash). *Dalkud eyirri.* He was kangaroo crying.

dandarwa  n. jingles. *Dandarwa doba.* To clatter along jingling (eg. hobble chains hitting the stones as the horse jumps along).

darak  vc. -ma-, -a-, -minde-, to go in, to enter, also a knock to attract attention. *Darak ngama.* I knock it. *Darak ngarriryu.* Go in we will (let us go in). *Wondu darak murrwanilu.* The sea came in. *Wa darak ngankangi.* I didn’t go in.

dawun  vc. -nguli-, to bang. *Dawun angulini.* Hit (with a stone), I gave it a bang. *Dawun mungulungara.* I give it a bang.

debudebu  vc. -a-, crack. *Debudebu angkerri.* Cracking he was going (he was cracking things as he went, noisy walking). see *deba*, to crack.

derak  vc. -ma-, hiccough, sound to attract attention. *Derak ngama.* Hiccough I do. (cf *irkili*, hiccough.)

dimbalan  n. noise like the snap of a finger, also squelch.

dingadinga  n. (onomatopoeic word), bell, the dinging noise of the bell. *Dingidingi.* Similar to English ‘ding-a-ling’, or ‘ding-dong’.

doba  vc. -a-. *Doba angkerri.* He clatters along. *Alinga doba ayirri.* He is still alive (lit) he is still clattering along.

dow  vc. -ma-, to crack, to fire, sound of a whip. *Dow burrkumerinya.* Don’t crack it. *Dow arrwini.* We banged it.

dowdow  vc. -ma-, bang!, to bump, booming noise (eg. of raging sea). *Wondu dowdow muma.* The sea is raging. *Dowdow budmarulindu.* They bumped them.

du:l  vc. -wu-, to knock.


dunduba  n. noise, drawn-out noise, humming. see *dundubunja*, cooing.
I.4. Onomatopoeic words and ‘noise’

**dundubunya**

**dundul**
vc. -ma-, whirling noise like a boomerang. *Dundul amara*. He made a noise like a whirling boomerang.

**dunmud**
vc. -a-, to bang. (cf duk, to break.)

**irakay**
vc. -yi-, to roar. *Ngawan di irakay we*. The water roars. *Ngawan di irrikaywa we*. The water is roaring.

**irkalij**
vc. -ma-, to belch. see irrkalij, to belch.

**irkili**

**iroriwa**
vc. chirping, squawking, talking. *Iroriwa ngiyirri*. I’m chirping or talking (bird speaking).

**janangkud**
vc. to bump with the hands, to clap with cupped hands.

**jangajanga**
n. chain (onomatopoeic word from the sound the chain makes). *Janjangaanangka*. Policeman (in the early days a chain around the neck was the only humane way of taking a prisoner (white or black) in the bush. It left the prisoner’s hands free. And he could walk unimpeded).

**janjaajanjowala**
n. the noise a kangaroo makes to his mate. see jingjing, call of a kangaroo.

**jejejakal**
vc. -yi-, splash. *Jejejakal bidinyi*. They were splashed. see jabulkad, to splash.

**jilyilwa**

**jingjing**
n. noise made by kangaroos.

**jirira**
vc. sizzling. see jilila, sizzling.

**juwalak**
vc. -yi-, chattering of birds, twittering.

**kaba**
vc. -a-, -yi-, to cough, to asp, to clear the throat. *Kaba nge*. I cough. *Kaba ngama*. I clear my throat. *Kaba bi*. Cough it up. *Di amini kabe irangkerri andu jinda emi ngalalara*. (lit) then altogether coughing he was this fellow what-you-ma-call-him, *ngalalara* (this fellow *ngalalara* was coughing very much).

**kad**
n. crunching noise (eg. when walking on gravel).
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kadayj  vc. -ngulu-, -inga-, -ma-, -uma-, cracking, snapping noise. Kadayj-nangka. A ‘clicker’ (pertaining to clicking, used of a camera). Kadaj-bij angalungarerrri. He was giving it a click (he was photographing it). Kadaj winjaangingajirri. Don’t knock it (don’t click it). I crack. (my joints crack). Kadaj umara. It cracked (lit) it takes cracking. Kadaj

kadkad n. sound of crunching gravel underfoot. see -kad, crunching noise.

kajid vc. -inga-, to spear. Kajid iningara. He speared him, to hit something with a resounding noise.

kajud vc. to pierce the bone, also the noise ‘thud’ of hitting the bone, eg. when a spear hits a kangaroo and usually hits the bone.

kak inter. the cry of the night curlew, kak-kak-kak-kak.

kak vc. -ma-, cough, to clear the throat. Kak ngama. I cough. Kak buma. Cough (imper.).

kalkadad vc. -ma-, to be noisy. Kalkadad nyinkumerri. Don’t be noisy.

kalkadara vc. -a-, to rattle (eg. firesticks in marriage ceremony).


ke vc. -wu-, to reign over (lit) thunder and lightning calling out (storms or wet seasons are equivalent to years). Ke nyironyirri. She is reigning (lit) it called out to her (for years).

ke vc. call to a person who is out of sight. Ke bungoy-nya. Let me yell out to them. Ke ama. He calls. (ke is also used for lightning or thunder rolling out). see ke. To reign over. see ay! call.

komba vc. -a-, I go husky (of voice).

kudaj mod. hard, clicking. Kudaj biji andungulinyirringarri. Clicking he was giving them (taking photographs).

kudak vc. -ma-, to laugh. Kudak amara. He laughed. Kudak-kudak. The call of the night jar. (cf, yeji, jerray, ayeron, to laugh.)

kudulkudul n. clapping (of hands).

kukuku n. noise, thundering, rumbling (eg. a jet plane, or thunder).

kuwidbid n. the call of the night curlew.

lakuda vc. to clap. lakuda o:n, he claps him; lakuja adinerri, they were clapping him. see lokuja, clapping sound.

lejaj vc. to fiddle with, noise of someone fiddling; nyangki lejej inyerrri? who was fiddling with it?. see lijara, to meddle.

libuldun inter. noise made by treading on a loose stone.
I.4. Onomatopoeic words and ‘noise’

likara vc. to rattle; likara nyaringkanerri we were rattling stones, (eg. a loose boulder as one jumps on to it); likarwa nyaringkanerri we rattled through (roughly pushed our way through the undergrowth). see lejurwa, rattling.

liranba vc. rattle; liranba bidiyirri, they were rattling. cf. likara, to rattle.

lirin vc. to squeak, to screech; lirin umerri, It is squeaking; lirin wenyerri, it is screeching; lirin kudma, you (pl) are screeching; liralir wi it is screeching; lirin-majerri, place name of the Drysdale river, where the full tide moves two stones against each other.

lirwa vc. squeak. see lirin, to squeak, to screech.

lokuja inter. the sound made by clapping the hands on the thighs (in singing). see lakuda, to clap. cf. mandorka, to beat time.

low vc. to splash; low wulungulangara, she gave it a splash; low winyiylalu, It splashed; lowlow budmara, they were splashing; low iningan, said to be noise made in sexual intercourse (lit) he put it splash; low be ngarringaka nyangan, you are a splashing man (a liar); Nglowngarin name of a sex cave on the Glenelg River. cf. jabulkad, to splash.

luran vc. rattle. see likara, to rattle.

malangongo n. echo. malangongo umban, It echoed (lit) echoing it fell.

malawulawud n. the noise of it (eg. the wind). cf. manangunangkurr, sound of the wind.

-manana inter. affected cough (like a hesitant speaker thinking of the next word): nyinungulu-mana. I’ll give you, hem (cough, hm).

manangunangkur n. sound of the wind, force of, rage of, of every way, all directions; anangunangkurr, his force. see mawuleku, noise of the wind.

mangkalarr vc. to belch, to burp. see makalarr; to burp.

mawuleku n. noise of the wind (lit) leg of the wind. cf. manangunangkurr, sound, force of the wind.

meme n. kid, lamb, and the bleat of the goat or sheep.

mimbul vc. to twitter; mimbul mimbul moni, the twittering noise (sound made with the lips).

mo: vc. howl of a dog (drawn out howl); mo:jedmanda mindi place name meaning, the dog howling place; mo:mo: nyirringarri, when she was howling; mo: amarerri, he continued to howl.

mondoki vc. to clap on the thighs. see do:k, to clap. cf. mandorka, to beat time.

mulangongo n. echo.
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**mundurwa** vc. rumbling.

**ngada** vc. to yawn; *ngada nga*, I yawn (lit) yawning I go.

**ngaljira** vc. to bark (fig) to shout; *ngaljira nganbini*, ‘he barked at me’ (he was angry with me, he spoke roughly to me). see: *ngarl*, to bark.

**ngariba** vc. whoosh; *ngariba winyi*, It went whoosh (or it whooshed) (eg. an explosion).

**ngarij** vc. to pant, to sigh; *ngarij ngama*, I pant. cf. *ngebad*, to sigh.

**ngarl** vc. to bark, also a hunting cry; *ngarl ama*, he barks; *ngarl idan ngarl*, they came making the hunting cry.

**ngayarrngayarr** n. the cry of the white cockatoo; *balnged ngayarrngayarr ama*, the white cockatoo calls ‘ngayarrngayarr’.

**ngey** vc. to sigh. see *ngebad*, to sigh.

**ngoj** vc. to sigh; *ngoj webini* he sighed (lit) he sent a sigh. (cf. *ngebad*, to sikh.) see *ngoy*, to breathe.

**ngokngok** vc. to croak; *ngokngok ngok ama*, he croaks (mythology indicates that the drone-pipe or didgeridoo was an imitation of the noise made by frogs).

**ngulkul** vc. to whimper, to groan; *ngulkul nyumara*, she is whimpering; *anja ngulkul nyumewiyirri?* why is she whimpering?; *ngulkul ngama*, I groan. see *ngulngul*, to whimper.

**ngulngul** vc. to grizzle, to whimper; *ngulngul bada*, a whimperer, a grizzler; *ngulngul eyirri*, he is grizzling all the time; *anjaku ngulngul nyindiyirri*, for what are you grizzling. see *ngulkul*, to whimper.

**ngur** vc. to growl; *ngur ama*, he growls.

**nyalud** vc. noise, scream; *yilaka nyalud burkume*, the children did not make a noise.

**nyan-nyan** n. dull noise; *nyan-nyan*, no life. see *nyan-, indistinct. cf. *nyanini*, murmur.

**nyula** vc. to roar; *nyula nyinyi*, she roared (of a bullroarer, or cl.ii object).

**nyungkula** vc. to roar; *nyungkula nyenyi*, she roared (hummed like a bull-roarer); *nyungkulai nyenyi*, the bees droned; *nyungkulangi wayirri*, (the plane) is roaring. cf. *nyula*, to roar.

**ungkuyu** vc. to whistle; *ungkuyu ngandoni*, whistle me he did. cf. *wuc*, to whistle.

**wa** inter. noise (of water).

**wa:** inter. a noise (hunting call).
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**warngun** n. exclamation; by jingo, well, anyway. *warngun arwawarwarerrri*, well! we never gave it a thought; *warngun anguminda*, anyway I’ll take it. *warngun jandijandu kurkeyirri*, by jingo, don’t try any funny business. *warngun wula nyinkumerri*, don’t try and talk. *Ng-warngun munganilu*, somehow I came to it. *warngun jerera mad-mangerinangka*, by jingo we were afraid of it. *wangun wawarerri*, well! he did not know. *warngun daruk idmindani*, anyway they put it on him (without any arrangement).

**wo** inter. the buzz of the little honey bee.

**wowa** vc. to hum; *wowa angkerriwalu*, humming he was coming along; *wowa* the hum of bees; *wowa ayirri*, he was humming; *wowa biyirri*, they were humming.

**wu:n** vc. to whistle; *wu:n bo*, you whistle (him).

**wungkay** vc. to whistle. *wungkay ando:ni*, he whistled them. see *wu:n*, to whistle.

**wurr (wurrrr)** inter. *whirrr* (long trilled ‘r’ sound of whirling stick).

**wuyinba** vc. to whistle. *wuyinba wiminderri*, he took it whistling.

I.5. Unclassified language related terms

**angumbarangarri** vi. he was called after him. *Angangumban*. I am called after him. *Nyungumban*. She is named after her. *Angumbaranggarriku*. He takes his name. *Nyungumbanggarriku*. I am called after his name. *Nyungungumba*. I take her name. (cf *ngulal*, to name after.)

**ayamiji** mod. dumb, one who refrains from talking. *damakun*, be silent. see *amada*, dumb.

**ayamirimiriji** mod. dumb. *Nyamamariji*. She is dumb. see *ayamiji*, dumb.

**bananuk** vc. -yi-, quiet. *Bananuk irrenyi*. Quiet he was (quiet he became) ba-nanug may, let him be quiet (be still).

**bolod** vc. -wa-, to spread. *Bolod umban*. It is spread. *Wulan bulod umbani*, it was rumoured (lit) the word was spread. *Bolod wudmanga*. They got the rumour. *Bararu malani mindi bura mayu di bulod baruru bura may*. There shall be wars and rumours of wars. *Ngabun bolod umbanyirri*. The waters were spreading (flood waters). cf *bala*, to spread.

**budkuru** vc. -ma-, fail to say. *Budkuruktenangka*. They failed to call him (they could not have called him).
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**burwingka** vi. they were ‘tipped off’. Kalimbarij andoni. He gave them ‘the tip’ (notified them of what was going on). Kalimbarij ngadoni. You gave us the hint.

da vc. to count. Da winningara. He counted. see wa, to count.


dindarl vc. to spark, to start. Way angumanga yali erri buradangarri buno dindarl andoninya. I hunted out one kangaroo (and) he started them all off over there. Dindarl wungon. I make it spark, I spark it off (conversation, argument, trouble). Bulumana dindarl bungon. I start the cattle off (of a bullock stampede). Dindarl biji woninya. It started it off. see jindarl, to start.


dud vc. To cut. -kun. One who cannot talk, means one who has had his talk cut off.

iyamanja n. fasting, one who does not talk. see emindjiye, to fast.

iyuru vi. to tempt. Bindiyuran. They tempt them. Bindiyurunerrri. They tempted them. see -uyuru-, to tempt.


jajal vc. give no chance to, harass. Jajal jambinyirriwalu. You don’t give me a chance to come (you are annoying me). see jajerri, to bother, to harass. (cf -alengka-, to bother, pester.)

-jaju- vi. to cheat. Wajajunerri. (death) he was cheating, half dead.

jakngali vc. -ele-, -yi-, play, joke, to have fun. Jakngali angelan. I hold him in fun.


 jalua vc. -wu-, to interrupt. see jalu, to interrupt.

jalurwa vc. interrupt. see jalu, to interrupt.
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**janangkad** vc. -a-, to evade, to escape (from danger). *Janangkad angka.* He escaped. *Janangkad nyarrwingkerri.* We dodge each other. *Danangkad-bada.* A back-answer fellow (probably one who dodges the issue in answering in another way. see *janangarr.*)

**janbeka** vc. -ela-, to stir up. *Janbeka inelangkanerri bekala bilimba bilimba-moneringanya kona amniyu ela bari nyire.* You were stirring him up (just) when he was settling down, then he really got angry.

**jankulililu** vc. to force to hurry. *Jankulililu jirwalu.* Don’t force me (don’t hurry me). see -ulili-, to force to hurry.


**jimililbini** vc. -a-, eavesdropping. *Jimililbini ngandarani bekala bilimba bilimba-moneringanya kona amniyu ela bari nyire.* They were eavesdropping to me.

**jirri** quant. *jirri, jirri,* to count (not actually counting, but more as: that one, that one, that one).

**jirngri** vc. -uma-, to pour into. *Wulan jirori nganmanga.* He poured words into me (advice).

**juruwin** vc. -wu-, to tempt. *Juruwin inonya.* You (pl) tempt him (some-times heard as *druwin.*). see -ujuru, to tempt.

**kalakadad** vc. -ma-, to be inquisitive. *Kalkadad nyinkumerri.* Don’t be inquisitive.

**kalumbarij** vc. -wu-, to cover or spread (eg. a rumour). *Wula kalumbarij bur-wingka.* The word went around them.


**kardba** vc. to sing. *Kardba nge.* I repeatedly sing (-ba, frequentative). see *karn,* to sing.

**kare** vc. stop, prevent, forbid. *Karewundali di.* That is peaceful. *Karewa nyarrwingkangarri.* We were peaceful amongst ourselves. *Kare angoni.* I forbade him. *Kare bundaawi.* Don’t prevent them. see *karra,* to stop, to protect.

**kawade** n. garrulous, a loquacious individual.

**konakeka** quant. like this one (of an article or a word).
Appendix I. A lexicon of language related terms

kow  vc. -wu-, to hound, to goad. Kow ngadonyirri. They are hounding us. Kow irrun. They hounded him. Kow ngandonyirri. They are hounding me. Kow jankoyirri. Don’t hound me. Kow nyarwingkerri. We hounded each other.

kumonkumon  vc. -yi-, silence, silent, quiet. Kumonkumon bidiyi. They were silent. Kumonkumon inyi. He was silent. (cf gun, to keep silent). Kulmanud. Silent.

kumuk  vc. -wu-, silent. Kumuk wo:. Be silent. Kumuk wuro. You (pl) be silent. (cf gun, to keep silent.)

langkarad  vc. to turn off (the track): langkarad je wirriwoni they turned off again; wanden di langkarad nyenyi, he turned off the truth (deviated from the truth); langkarad wonindu, he withdrew from them. see kalard, to turn off.

lemanada  vc. sh!, listen!: lemanda nge, sh! I hear something; lemanda be, listen! (to what you are told); lemandalemanda andumindani, he listened to them (repetition possibly denoting intently listening); lemanda angunindani, I heard him talking. cf. nguru, to hear, to listen.

lerej  vc. to slip; ni ngenangka lerej umbanira, It slipped from my mind; wulan wa lerej wungkuwarenu, don’t let the word slip. cf. badaj, to slip through.

madmaladma  vc. -a- to grasp, to fumble (in the dark); madmaladma mangerri, we were fumbling; mangamaladma ngiyirri, I was fumbling about the place; wulan ungumaladmanyirri, I’m fumbling about for the word.

malngun  n. its name. see alngun, his name.

-malud-  vi. to cheat. see -maladka-, to cheat.

-malumaluwi-  vi. to defend; angumalumaluwun, I witness for him. see amalamala, to defend.

-mamandara-  vi. to tease; anjaamamaamandarerri, don’t tease him; bumamandare, tease him (imper); jankumamandererri. Don’t tease me.

marwarl  vc. to be quiet, not a nuisance; marwarl ada buma, you sit down and don’t be a nuisance. cf. bandar, to be quiet; kumonkumon, silent.

min  vc. to point, to signal; min angoni, I pointed to him (eg. a signal to stop); min o:n, he signals him to stop (to emphasise by pointing).

minjumangangarri vi. you called it, you named it.

-miyambu-  vi. to rebuke, to prevent; angumiyambun, I prevent him (used of comfort, to prevent or stop from weeping). see amiyambun, rebuke.

mungalalman  vi. to be named after. see -ngulal-, to be named after.
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-najo-

vi. to imitate; badnajon, we copy them; anganajon. copy him.

nganga

vc. to deceive, to withhold, to be mean to; nganga nganbini, he was mean to me; diku wa nganga jankuw, because you did not withhold from me; wa nganga ngankuw, he did not refuse me; nganga nganbun, you withheld from me. (cf. amunamuna, to withhold.)

-ngulal-

vi. to name after; nyungulalma, named after her; angulalman, he is called after him; nganngulalma, he called me after this fellow; nyinungulalma, he will be called after you.

nunuwin

vc. -yi- to signal, to wave; nunuwwin bidinyinangka, they beckoned to him.

nyalngun

n. her name. nyalngun nyirriyaakaalu, what did I call her name? (lit) her name where did it come from?

nyunguwa

vc. to direct at, to point to; nyuwa ngandani, he was coming straight for me (pointed at me); dambun nyunguwa mungani, I pointed to the place; wuran nyungu wa nyinayirri, don’t run into a tree; aw kunjal nyunguwa wi nyinayirri, where are you pointing to (heading for, rushing to); nyunguwe. Of something running out to a point (eg. a jetty).

-o:njui-

vi. to tempt; jankonjuwi, don’t tempt me; onjuwingka, he was tempted, tried; wonjuwin, temptation; buronjonjuwingkerri, they tried themselves out.

-olya-

vi. to name as a place to camp, rendezvous; wungolyanyi dambun, I called the name of the place (next camping place); wurwolyara, they called it; wuraxyanerri, they both name it; wolyani, he named it.

-rungku-

vi. to spoil. angarungkunyirri, I am spoiling him. anjaarungkunyirri, don’t spoil it (imper). angangarungkuni, ‘I have spoiled it’. wa ankunyarungkuni, ‘I did not spoil it’. mungaringkunyirri, ‘it spoils it (spoils the place)’.

-ulalma-

vi. to name, to take the name of; angulalman, he took his name; angulalman, I took his name; angkunugulelni, he did not take his name; ankamulelma, I did not take his name. cf. -ngulal-, to name after; angumbarangarri, to name after.

umamungan

vi. it is dead and gone (used also of an old argument). see aman, dead.

umayambu

vi. prevent, rebuke. see amayambun, to rebuke.
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umemendara vi. to annoy; angumemendaran, I annoy him; nganemendaran, he annoys me; amamendaran, he annoys him; wa angumemendara, he does not annoy him.

wajajun vi. to cheat, (idiom) to cheat death; wajajunyirri, he is at the point of death (he is cheating death); ngin wungajajunyirri, I am at the point of death; burajajunyirri, they are at the point of death; ajajun-bada, a deceiver (to feign, to trick). see -aju-, to pretend.

-waju- vi. to fool. anjaaawajuwiri, don’t fool him; jankaawajuwiri, do not fool me; anjaku janajunjirri? why are you fooling me? see -ajo- and -aju-, to pretend.

walawarwad vc. to confuse. walawarwad bidinyi, they were confused; walawarwad nginyi, I was confused; walawarwad nginyerri, I am getting confused; jadan nguru wankuninda warwarwad ali kanda, I didn’t hear properly it was all confused at the time.

walimaj vc. to make nice, to make clear; walimaj ngimani nyele, let me explain again (let me make it nice again); walimaj wurakalu jadan, explain it to me; walimij bo:ra, make it nice to me; wulan walimij ngiya-mannngale, put the words in front of me; walimij wurakalu jadan, (lit) smooth it properly (explain it to me); walimij nyironi, sweeten her (be nice to her); walimij wula janbi, explain it to me; jimbali walimij nyungoni, he polished her; wongay walimij nyungoni, he was nice to the woman.

warnkarannga vc. to atone for. warnkaran-nangka, expiate, atone. see warnkara, guilty.

-wawa- vi. opposed, opposite; burangkanyirri wawa, back to back; jambawawa (or jambawara), you are opposed to me; nyinbawawanyirri, I am opposed to you; jajadwawa, side by-side; anjaku awawanyirri, why is he against him?; wa angkuwawa, he is not against him; burangkanawa, they are opposed.

wawaja vc. -yi- to pretend, to make believe; wawaja bidiyirri, they are imitations; wawaja nginyerri, I was pretending; yinda wawaja bidinyi, imitation spears; wawaja bada. An imposter.

weliwa vc. -wu- to swing around. wulan barabara weliwa wonerri, he swung the story round (swung the conversation round).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wembad</td>
<td><strong>vc.</strong> <em>wu</em>- to break, to cease (e.g., singing a song): <em>kan wembad nyirriwani</em>, they broke off the song; <em>wembad wini nyanyawini</em>, we broke off (we stopped); <em>wembad aaku</em>, for the purpose of breaking; <em>wembad biji murwiningarri</em>, when they had broken it up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wiliwud</td>
<td><strong>mod.</strong> crooked, complicated (of kink in timber, of not keeping to one thought): <em>wili wiliwud</em>, It is crooked; <em>nyaliwiliwud</em>, she is crooked; <em>aliwiliwud</em>, he is crooked; <em>wiliwiliwudkarangiri</em>, it is too complicated; <em>wulan wiliwiliwud-bada nyinkeyirri</em>, don’t talk crookedly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wingka</td>
<td><strong>vi.</strong> to pester. <em>wiji nyirwingkanyirri nyina?</em> do they pester her (for coitus)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wiriwire</td>
<td><strong>vc.</strong> to write, writing; <em>wiriwire umbiingkandu</em>, to be written down; <em>wiriwire wandakule winingayengka</em>, (lit) writing this-first it was put (this declaration was made); <em>wiriwire awingkangarri</em>, he was written down (his name was put on the roll); <em>wiriwire birwingkangarriku</em>, they were enrolled (their names were put on the roll).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wolye</td>
<td><strong>vc.</strong> to name the place for camping; <em>kunyal wolyengka?</em> where was it named for a camp?; <em>mindiyali walyengka amara</em>, he named the place for camping; <em>Mowanjam wolyara</em>, he named Mowanjam for a camping site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wondimi</td>
<td><strong>inter.</strong> what’s-its-name. cf. <em>umbun</em>, what-you-ma-call it; <em>emi</em> thing-a-ma-bob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worlarl</td>
<td><strong>vc.</strong> to raid, to challenge; <em>worlarl banyawini</em>, we raid them; <em>worlarl oni</em>, he challenged him (rushed at); <em>worlarl idaneriwalu</em>, they were both advancing on (charging) him. cf. <em>jara</em>, to raid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wulay</td>
<td><strong>inter.</strong> oh, my word. see <em>wula</em>, to speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wunareriwunyirri</td>
<td><strong>inter.</strong> talk about! see <em>waruna</em>, talk about!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wunkajuwiye</td>
<td><strong>vi.</strong> deceit. <em>wunkajuwinangka</em>, pertaining to deceit; <em>onjuwi</em>, a deceitful man. see -aju-, to pretend, to deceive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-yirimbiri-</td>
<td><strong>vi.</strong> to tease. <em>anjaayirimbiri</em>, don’t tease him, don’t annoy him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yodiyodan</td>
<td><strong>vc.</strong> to trick. <em>gadan anganjun</em>, I make him a fool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yowalul</td>
<td><strong>vc.</strong> to cover, to spread over; <em>yowalul winyi</em>, It was covered; <em>balangkara yowalul winyalu</em>, they covered the area; <em>werumba yolalul winyalu</em>, the flood covered the area; <em>wulan andoni yowul andiningara</em>, he covered them with words (advice).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yulud</td>
<td><strong>vc.</strong> to force down. <em>yulud andumandalidi</em>, he forced them down (may mean he forced his opinion on them, bowed them to his will). (cf. <em>yulu</em>, to bend.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*yuluk*  
vc. to scorn. *yuluk angumarn*, I despise him (I criticise him). *ari yuluk amarengka wayj ebingka bururura*, he was scorned and thrown out, cast out by the men. cf. see *yiluk*, to scorn.

*yulukba*  
vc. to scold. *yulukba bijelengkerri*, they scold each other.

*yuwun*  
vi. to stir up, to tempt. *bindiyuwunerrri*, they were stirring them up.
Appendix J. Coate (1966) in MMAX2: coding scheme and querying

J.1. Introduction

This appendix details the program and methods used in section 5.3 to investigate the form and functions of framing constructions and defenestrated clauses in the text ‘The Rai and the third eye’ (Coate, 1966) (and the texts in appendices D and E). MMAX2 (Müller, 2005; Müller and Strube, 2006) is a flexible XML-based annotation program that allows for the marking and querying of variables and relations in a text at multiple levels of analysis.¹

J.2. The coding scheme

J.2.1. Markable levels

The mark up of the Rai text consists of four levels, labelled ‘coref’, ‘word’, ‘clause’ and ‘attr’, roughly corresponding to the units of morphemes, words, clauses and framing constructions, respectively. Between markables on each of these levels correlations can be calculated.

In addition, for each protagonist in the story, the individual references were marked, resulting in a representation as in figure J.1 for each, tracking the number of references to the respective protagonist over the story.

J.2.2. Markables

At the ‘coref’ level the properties in figure J.2 are marked (not all of these are relevant for every token). Most properties have not played a role in the analysis in this study, but the form of the nominal construction (np_form), the order of the elements in the nominal construction (np_order) and the presence vs. absence of a long form are analysed in chapter 5.

¹The program is issued under a freeware licence and is available for download from: https://www.mmax2.net.
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**Figure J.1.:** Referent tracking
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**Figure J.2.:** Coreference
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At the ‘word’ level, the markables in figure J.3 are distinguished (again, not all of these apply to every token). This level includes perspective categories as well as emphasis. I also coded the specific inflecting verb (ivc) used in a complex verb construction.

At the ‘clause’ level, I marked up the properties in figure J.4: whether a clause is a main clause, a subordinate clause or a fragment, if the clause represents part of a framing construction and the sentence type (declarative, interrogative, command, other). (Illocution occurs on both word and clause level to account for illocution ‘conversion’, e.g. formally declarative sentences used as a command.)

The level ‘attr’, i.e. ‘attribution’, marks whether the sentence represents a non-attributed clause, a framing construction, defenestration or an attributed element directly following a
framing construction. It also shows the specific meaning of the attribution (i.e. reported speech, reported thought, indeterminate between reported speech and reported thought, reported intentionality, causation-intention or naming).

J.3. Querying with mmaxql

For finding frequencies and correlations between the markables the query language MMAXQL was used (Müller, 2005).

J.3.1. Checking for consistency

Several queries were performed to check the consistency of the coded document and to find potential errors. For example, the MMAXQL query (1) finds all markables for which the variable ‘np_form’ on the level ‘coref’ has the value ‘bound_pn’ (i.e. all elements containing bound pronouns) and the variable ‘tense’ on the level ‘word’ has the value ‘none’ (i.e. all tenseless words). This set should be empty: all inflecting verbs with bound pronouns should also carry tense.\(^2\)

\[
(1) \text{display during (coref (np_form=\{bound_pn\}), word (tense=\{none\}))};
\]

J.3.2. Definitions

In order to investigate markables over multiple levels, MMAXQL provides the possibility of defining variables consisting of several combinations of markables. Example (2) specifies the variable $\text{fedClRepInt}$ (the dollar sign $\$\$ is required for user specified variables in MMAXQL), representing the framed clauses of framing constructions of reported intentionality.

\(^2\)Inflecting nouns, i.e. inalienably possessed nominals or ‘adjectival’ nominals were counted as ‘n’ on the level ‘coref’, not as ‘bound_pn’.
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(2) let $fedClRepInt = during (clause (framing_construction=framed), attr (attr_function=intention));

The command in (3) defines $fedClRepST as the set of framed clauses not occurring in framing constructions of reported intentionality or naming, which includes reported speech, reported thought and ambiguous framed clauses.

(3) let $fedClRepST = during (clause (framing_construction=framed), attr (!attr_function=intention or !attr_function=naming));

The following command finds all markables at clause level occurring in defenestrated clauses:

(4) a. statistics during (word, $fedClRepST);
    b. statistics during (word, $fedClRepInt);
    c. statistics during (word, clause (framing_construction=defenestrated));

J.3.3. Queries

The figures in table 4.9 on page 156 were calculated by obtaining the total of clause types (statistics clause;) and querying the number of tuples at clause level for which ‘modal value’ is not none: statistics contains (clause, word (!modal_value=none));.

All instances of evaluative lexis were obtained using the query statistics contains (clause, word (modal_value=eval_lesis));

Interjections were found with the query statistics contains (clause, word (modal_value=inter));

Instance of mood were found by the queries statistics contains (clause, word (modal_value=prt)); + statistics contains (clause, word (modal_value=-karra));

The figures in table 5.2 on page 189 were calculated using the query statistics contains (attr, clause (cause_type=sub); and by substracting the number of defenestrated clauses found with the query statistics attr;

Table 5.3 lists the most frequent referential devices in Coate (1966), grouped by their occurrence in non-attributed sentences (MMAXQL query: statistics during (coref, clause (framing_construction=none));), framed clauses (query: statistics during (coref, clause (framing_construction=framed)) and framing clauses (query: statistics during (coref, clause (framing_construction=framing)));)

MAXXQL queries statistics during (coref (coref_class=initial), clause (framing_construction=none));, with none replaced for framed and framing, respectively, render the frequencies for the third and fourth columns in 5.4.
MAXXQL queries display during (coref (long_form=yes), clause (framing_construction=none)); and display during (coref (np_form=n_am), clause (framing_construction=none));, with none replaced for framed and framing, respectively, find the frequencies represented in the third and fourth columns in 5.5.
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K.1. Part one

K.1.1. Introduction

There are many reasons for putting language on paper. In many places in the world writing is
a way of keeping and sharing stories. It can help keeping connections with the words, stories
and languages of people who are no longer with us. But also, it makes it possible to write
down names of people, places or organisations in language.

If people want to do that they have to agree on a particular way of writing. Deciding on
how to write a language is a hard task and there are many things to consider. In this small
book I want to show some of the ideas that linguists use for writing language. I want show
some of the most important problems people have had elsewhere when making alphabets and
some of their solutions. Most importantly, I want to show the ways in which people who have
written the Ungarinyin language in the past and talk about what you reckon is the best way
to write language now.

In the first part of this little book we will first look at some things to think about for making
an alphabet. In the second part we will look at the alphabet Ngarinyin people agreed on at
a meeting at Wanalirri school at Gibb River Station in 1997 and look at the other ways of
writing some people such as Mr. Howard Coate and Alan Rumsey have used. In the third part
we will look at the most important problems with the alphabets people have used for writing
Ungarinyin and some possible solutions. I hope that showing these problems will be helpful
for Ngarinyin people in deciding on how to write your language.

Writing has been developed over many centuries and by different peoples in different coun-
tries. I hope this little book will show some of the knowledge that has been built by people who
have made alphabets in the past and that that knowledge will be helpful to you for deciding
on how to write the Ungarinyin language.
K.1.2. What is an alphabet?

Writing just means making a sign or drawing on paper, rock, paperbark, sand or any other material and agreeing that that sign stands for language. This can be done in many ways. For example, we can make a sign or drawing and decide that it stands for a whole word, so that always when we use that sign, it means that word. In many countries people have used such a way of writing but because they needed a different sign or drawing for every word they had to use a lot of drawings. That made learning all of them very hard.

In some countries people decided that was alright. But other people started looking for ways to write smaller parts of words so that they could use those signs that stood for these parts of words for parts in other words that sounded the same or meant the same thing. Many centuries ago people in Central-Asia found out that if you know which sounds a language has, you can make a sign or drawing for each sound in a word and if you write those signs together the sounds they stand for form a word. This way of writing is what we now call an alphabet. Other peoples started using alphabets for their languages and changed the signs, making them better drawings and better for writing their language.

There are many different signs people all over the world use for writing their language: In China people use a way that is like writing one sign for one word. For example, 王 means ‘person’. In Bulgaria people took the signs that people living in Greece used and changed them to fit the sounds of their languages better, for example they made more letters, such as м which meant ‘sh’, a sound that the Greek language didn’t have. Cherokee Indians in North-America looked at the way people wrote English and changed the meaning of these letters for writing their language again. For example, ḥ means ‘i’.

English and many languages in Europe, Africa and America use the Latin alphabet which was made for writing the Latin language in Italy. The Latin speakers used an alphabet they had learned from people living in Greece, who spoke Greek. The Greek speakers had learned the letters to write their language from people living in Asia and they changed them a little bit. After the Latin speakers, people in many countries learned the Latin alphabet and sometimes changed it a little bit to write their own language with.

But the Latin alphabet was made for Latin so when people used it for a different language they had to change it a little bit. Because many people from many different languages use the Latin alphabet, the Latin alphabet stands for many different sounds. The sound that speakers of one language write as ‘a’ can be very different from the sound other people use ‘a’ for. Speakers of different languages that use the Latin alphabet can agree that a sign stands for a completely different sound than the speakers of another language. For example, Basque people in Spain write the ‘x’ for a sound that English speaking people write as ‘s’. Speakers of the Polish language in Poland write ‘w’ for a sound that English speaking people write as ‘v’ or ‘f’.
When we know how to write English it can be confusing to see the same sign used in another language. For example, the alphabet Ngarinyin people agreed on at Wanalirri school is based on the Latin alphabet, just as English and people may think that a letter in that alphabet stands for the same sound in English. But, for example, ‘k’ in that alphabet stands for a ‘g’ sound in English.
K.1.3. What is a letter?

Making an alphabet is a big job, whether it is based on the Latin alphabet or not. First of all, we have to know which sounds there are in a language. Then we have to decide which letters we are going to use for writing these sounds. A letter is a sign or drawing about which we agree that it stands for a sound in the language.

Answering the question how many sounds a language has is hard. Most of the time different speakers of a language speak a bit differently. Also, usually words sound a bit different when we say them loud or when we say them really slowly. If we would have to use different letters for every speaker and for every way of saying a word we would need so many letters it would be very hard to learn or use the alphabet.

Linguists use a rule for determining the sounds of a language that says that a sound is a separate sound in the language if by using that sound we get a different word. This means that if we have two words which almost sound the same but are different with only one sound, we know that that sound is a separate sound in the language. For example, Ungarinyin has a word *ada* ‘sit’ and a word *aka* ‘no, not so’. These words only differ by one sound, ‘d’ as in the English ‘door’ and ‘k’ as the first sound in the English word ‘garden’. Because by using the sounds ‘d’ and ‘k’ we get different words, we know these are different sounds in Ungarinyin. This means we need to make letters for these sounds.

On the other hand, the English sounds ‘b’ and ‘p’ as in ‘best’ and ‘pest’ are not different sounds in Ungarinyin. There are no words in the Ungarinyin language that differ just by these sounds.

The people who have written the Ungarinyin language over the years have had to answer the question how many different sounds there are in the language. They mostly agreed. The alphabet Ngarinyin people voted for at Wanalirri school and that we will look at in the second part of this little book says the Ungarinyin language has 26 different sounds. This means that the Ngarinyin people at Wanalirri school said the Ungarinyin language has 26 different sounds.
K.1.4. How do linguists make an alphabet?

There are a few steps people go through when making an alphabet. First, we need to determine which sounds a language has. Then we need to decide which signs we want to use for writing down the language, which letters we want to use and which letters we need. Finally, we need to use the alphabet to see if there are words that have sounds that can be written in more than one way.

Generally, people want an alphabet to be as easy to learn and use as possible. This way, most people can learn how to use the alphabet properly. And that means that the language will be written in the same way by most people.

There are three rules which make an alphabet easy to learn and use:

- Always use one letter for one sound
- Use as few letters as possible
- Always use the same letter for the same sound

The first rule means that we want a letter for all sounds of the language. ‘A letter’ can be more than one sign in an alphabet, for example we can call ‘ng’ one letter, which always stands for one separate sound. But this means we cannot use the combination of ‘n’ and ‘g’ for different sounds because that would be confusing.

The second rule means that we want to make as few letters as possible. Sometimes sounds at the beginning of a word or before certain other letters sound a bit differently. For example, in Ungarinyin a sound that is pronounced ‘rr’ in the middle or at the beginning of a word sometimes sounds like ‘rd’ at the end of a word.

The third rule means that always when we use the same sound in different words, we expect it to be written with the same letter. But many languages such as English use more than one letter for the same sound, as we will see on the next page.

The three rules might not always work together. For example, the first two rules may lead to different things. The first rule means we want a letter for every sound and that means a lot of letters. The second rule says that it is better to keep as few letters as possible. In some cases this means that we have to make choices between the rules. For example, in the Ungarinyin language the sound at the beginning of the word *karnangkurr* ‘dog’ always sounds like a ‘g’ sound in English at the beginning of a word and most of the times within a word as well. But when this sound comes at the end of the word, such as *marduk* ‘walk’, it sounds like the last sound in the English word ‘dark’. Of course we can write these sounds differently, but when the sound always sounds like this at the end of the word, we can also say that this is the same sound, so the same letter but it is pronounced differently at the end of the word. In this case
the second rule ‘use as few letters as possible’ wins from the other two rules. But deciding between all these different rules and sounds can take a long time.

If we want to be really clear about sounds, for example to help kids pronounce language, it may also be better to use more letters.

There are also other things that may be important. In the old days people used a lot of different language and different people made the words sound a little bit differently. Maybe some people made words sound real long, or a bit light. If we want to show that in how we write language, we might decide that we do not want to write words in the same way all the time because some people make them sound different. If we know what letter means what sound we can still read this language.
K.1.5. Spelling rules

Most alphabets are not perfect and it is not always simple to decide which letter should be used for writing a word. Spelling rules are rules for writing the right letter when it is not clear which letter should be used. The letters of the alphabet English and a lot of other languages use were made for another language, Latin, that used to be spoken in Italy and other parts of Europe. That means that the letters of the alphabet English now uses were actually made to for the sounds of the Latin language, which are different from English. The English alphabet does not fit the sounds of the English language in a way that one letter stands for one sound. This is the main reason why English like many other languages needs some spelling rules telling when which letter should be used.

An example is the letter ‘c’ when it’s used to write the English language. In Latin ‘c’ always stood for a sound as the first sound in the word ‘crisis’. In English it can stand for this sound but it may also sound like an ‘s’ sound, as in ‘service’. For knowing how the ‘c’ should be pronounced, English uses the rule that when ‘c’ is followed by some letters, such as ‘i’, it sounds as ‘s’ and when it is followed by other letters, such as ‘u’, it sounds like ‘k’. Because of that rule we know how to pronounce a word such as ‘circus’.

Another example: in English there are many cases in which people write a word one way and pronounce it another way. Such as the ‘s’ in ‘housing’, which sounds like ‘z’. Still, people want to write housing with an ‘s’ to show that it comes from the word ‘house’.

Spelling rules can cause a lot of confusion. Some people think, for example, that the ‘s’ in ‘housing’ sounds different from the ‘z’ in ‘magazine’ because people write them differently. Actually, they sound the same, the letters ‘s’ and ‘z’ are just different ways of writing. The ‘s’ in ‘housing’ is there because of the spelling rule saying that words that come from another word should be written the word they come from. Having different ways of writing the same sound makes an alphabet harder to learn and makes people think words should be pronounced differently. But sometimes it is necessary to use a spelling rule.

When we make a spelling rule we need to think about more than just a sound of a language. In case of the two English examples above, it is helpful to know in which letters after ‘c’ make it sound like ‘k’ and which make it sound like ‘s’. For the second example, it is necessary to know how the word ‘house’ and the word ‘housing’ are related. We need to know that ‘house’ is the main word ‘housing’ comes from and that the ending ‘sing’ in ‘housing’ is a word part that can be added to some words. For that we need to understand something more about the language.

Learning and writing an alphabet means learning more about the sounds of a language.

The alphabet Ngarinyin people voted for at Wanalirri school in 1997 is also based on the Latin alphabet. Ungarinyin has many sounds that Latin doesn’t have and that English doesn’t
have. Because of that it may be necessary to make some spelling rules as well.
K.2. Part two

K.2.1. The Wanalirri school alphabet

In 1997 Ngarinyin people held a meeting at Wanalirri school at Gibb river station to decide on how to write the Ungarinyin language. In this part we will look at the alphabet they decided was the best. I will call this the Wanalirri school alphabet.

The alphabet contains a few letters that stand for almost the same sound as in English but many stand for sounds that the Ungarinyin language has that English has not. But there still are a few problems with the Wanalirri school alphabet that need to be solved.

But even if we maybe want to change some things in the Wanalirri school alphabet, it gives a good idea about which sounds there are in the Ungarinyin language.

In this part we will first look at the whole Wanalirri school alphabet. Then we will look at the letters that are the same in the English alphabet and the ones that are different. Finally, we will look at a few different groups of sounds and show how they are made and how other people have written these sounds. At the end of this part we will look at a few other ways of writing the Ungarinyin language people have used and a sound in the language that the Wanalirri school alphabet doesn’t have.
K.2.2. The alphabet

This is the whole Wanalirri school alphabet. I have added some examples and underlined the letters for which they are an example. Some of the same words occur in different spellings in the examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aamaarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>aamaarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ay</td>
<td>Wongay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Burruru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Darr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd</td>
<td>Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Eeja/iija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Engen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td>Juweebarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ngarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Juwiibarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>Yorr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Karnangkurr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Amaarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rl</td>
<td>Wurlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ly</td>
<td>Balya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Narnburr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rn</td>
<td>Narnburr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny</td>
<td>Ngarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>Ngurr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Wongay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oy</td>
<td>Wodoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rr</td>
<td>Rarrki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Rambarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>Burruru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>Wungkurr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K. Warndij wurlana narnburnda

K.2.3. Letters that are the same as in the English alphabet

There are quite a lot of sounds in the Wanalarri school alphabet that are (almost) the same as in English. These are the ones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>amalarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>bururu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>darr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>eeja/iija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>engen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td>juweebarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ngarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>yorr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>karnangkurr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>amalarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>narnburr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ngurr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>wongay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>rambarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>wungkurr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K.2.4. Letters that are different from English

There are also some letters in the Wanalirri school alphabet that have different sounds from the ones they have in English, even though some letters look the same as in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aamalarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ay</td>
<td>wongay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd</td>
<td>marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>juwiibarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>karnangkurr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rl</td>
<td>wurlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ly</td>
<td>balya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rn</td>
<td>narnburr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny</td>
<td>Ngarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oy</td>
<td>wodoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rr</td>
<td>rarrki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>burruru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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K.2.5. Vowels

The sounds below are made by opening the mouth and moving the jaw up or down and moving the tongue to the front or the back at the same time. These sounds can be sung with one long breath and when saying these sounds the mouth is never closed. Linguists call these sounds vowels.

The Wanalirri school alphabet has 10 vowels. These are the ones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aamalarr, mamaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>amalarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ay</td>
<td>wongay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>engen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td>juweebarn/juwiiibarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ngarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>juwiibarn/juweebarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>wongay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oy</td>
<td>wodoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>bururu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paper with the Wanalirri school alphabet is not completely clear about the vowels ‘ee’ and ‘ii’. On the paper it says ‘ee’ is like the *ee* in feet and ‘ea’ is like the *ea* in ‘easily’. But Ungarinyin does not have different sounds for these letters, so there is no sound that sounds a bit more like the English ‘ee’ and one sound that sounds more like the English ‘ea’.

Maybe the meeting at Wanalirri school wanted to say that sometimes the fourth sound in ‘juweebarn’ sounds a bit longer and sometimes a bit shorter and that a long sound can be written with ‘ii’ and a short sound with ‘ee’. But this is a question that needs to be discussed more.

As the table shows, the difference between ‘aa’ and ‘a’ is maybe not always clear too. In English some people pronounce the sound written with ‘a’ real long, and sometimes people pronounce it short. To be real clear about when it is long and short we can write the long ‘a’ as ‘aa’ and the short one as ‘a’.

Writing vowels is often the hardest part of writing language because many people make vowels sound different all the time.
K.2.6. Simple consonants

Vowels are one way of making language sounds. When a sound is made with the mouth closed or when part of the mouth is closed off with the tongue or the lips linguists call this sound a consonant. In Ungarinyin, almost all words are made with a vowel, then a consonant, then a vowel and so on, or first a consonant, then a vowel, then a consonant and so on.

The sounds below are the first group of consonants we will look at. They all represent one sound. In the next page we will look at two other groups of consonants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>burruru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>darr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>yorr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>karnangkurr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>aamalarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>narnburr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ngurr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rr</td>
<td>rarrki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>rambarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>wungkurr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K.2.7. Complex consonants: curled tongue sounds

The following consonants in Ungarinyin, English speakers find very hard to hear, but Ngarinyin people hear the difference between these sounds and the ones on the page before this one very well. The sounds have in common that they sound a bit like some of the sounds on page 13 but they are said with the tongue curled up to the top of the mouth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rd</td>
<td>marduk/wungkurr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rl</td>
<td>wurlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rn</td>
<td>narnburr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>rambarr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Wanalirri school alphabet all these sounds are written with a ‘r’ and a letter which sound like the ‘uncurled’ way of pronouncing this sound.

K.2.8. Complex consonants: glide sounds

Glide sounds are made by placing your tongue somewhere on the top part of your mouth and then moving it down. These are the glide sounds the Ungarinyin language has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>eeja/iija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ly</td>
<td>balya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny</td>
<td>Ngarinyin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K.2.9. Some other ways of writing people have used to write the Ungarinyin language

The table below shows two other alphabets for Ungarinyin, the ones that Alan Rumsey and Mr. Howard Coate used. They are mostly similar to the Wanalirri school alphabet, but some things are a bit different. You may decide that you like some of their choices more than the Wanalirri school alphabet or not. But to be able to read some of the stories of the old people that they wrote down in language it is useful to know these alphabets as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a/aa</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>amalar ‘his forehead’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>bururu ‘men’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>darr ‘to stand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>marduk ‘to walk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>dj</td>
<td>dj</td>
<td>ija ‘dad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>engen ‘his arm’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i/ee/ii</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ngaringin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>yorr ‘to sit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>karnangkurr ‘dog’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>langkan ‘throat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rl</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>wurran ‘to talk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ly</td>
<td>lj</td>
<td>lj</td>
<td>balya ‘to go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>marduk ‘to walk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>nak ‘to listen’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rn</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>narnburr ‘paperbark’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny</td>
<td>nj</td>
<td>nj</td>
<td>nyingan ‘you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>ngayak ‘to ask’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>wongay ‘woman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rr</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>yarra ‘nest’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>urrki ‘stone’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>buk ‘to appear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>wungkurr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K.1.: A comparison of Ungarinyin alphabets

There are some differences between the Wanalirri school alphabet and the alphabets of Howard Coate and Alan Rumsey that are not so important: for example Alan Rumsey and Howard Coate write the sound that is written as ‘ng’ in the Wanalirri school alphabet as ‘η’. They choose different letter for this sound, but the sounds for both letters are the same.

One more important difference are the letters for which the Wanalirri school alphabet has more letters than Howard Coate or Alan Rumsey, such as ‘i’, ‘ee’ and ‘ii’ in the Wanalirri school alphabet, which Howard Coate and Alan Rumsey write with a single letter ‘i’. In order
to really know what sound we mean when we write ‘i’, ‘ee’ or ‘ii’ I think it will be good to decide if we really need these letters or not.

K.2.10. Sounds not in the Wanalirri school alphabet

The alphabet we looked at in this part does not include the last sound of the word *merley/merrey* ‘oh!’.

Just like ‘ay’ in *wungay* ‘woman’ we might just write this as a combination of ‘e’ and ‘y’, as *merrey* ‘oh!’ is written here.
K.3. Part three: Discussion

K.3.1. Choices

In part two we already saw that some of the letters in the Wanalirri school alphabet were quite different from the letters some other people have used to write the Ungarinyin language. In this part we will look at some of the main problems.

K.3.2. ‘ee’ or ‘ii’?

The Wanalirri school alphabet part fits the Ungarinyin language quite well. There is only one sound that is written with three different letters in the alphabet: ‘i’, ‘ee’ and ‘ii’. Because there are these different letters for the same sound, we can write the Ungarinyin word for ‘bowerbird’ in three different ways: as juwibarn, juweebarn or juwiibarn. Most linguists would choose only one letter for this.
K.3.3. ‘k’ or ‘g’?

In the Wanalirri school alphabet the first sound as in *kanda* ‘here’ is written as ‘k’. This sound is similar to the sound that is written as ‘g’ in English, for example in ‘goanna’.

Why could we not just write ‘g’ as in English for this sound? I think we can do that too, but there is one smart reason for why ‘k’ is sometimes easier than ‘g’. The reason is that the Ungarinyin language has combinations of sounds that English doesn’t have. When we write ‘ng’ in English we (almost) always know that it stands for a sound as the first sound in, for example, Ngarinyin (although in English that sound is never used at the beginning of a word). English does not allow the combination of a ‘n’ sound as in ‘night’ before an English ‘g’. Ungarinyin can do this. That means that if we write the first sound in *kanda* ‘here’ as ‘g’, we won’t know how to pronounce the combination of letters ‘ng’: it could be ‘n’ as in *onarr* ‘bone’ followed by ‘k’ as in *kanda* ‘here’, or ‘ng’ as in *Ngarinyin*.

There are possible other solutions: The Bardi alphabet uses a spelling rule for the difference between ‘k’ and ‘g’. When the Bardi people write their language they use a ‘g’ instead of a ‘k’ most of the time, but they use a ‘k’ only for the combination ‘nk’. That means that in the Bardi alphabet ‘ng’ always means the ‘ng’ as in *kandanga* ‘right here’ and ‘nk’ always means ‘n’ and ‘k’ as in *ngankume* ‘I don’t talk or do’. But it also means that the same sound has two different letters in Bardi (‘g’ and ‘k’), which makes the alphabet harder to learn and the chance of mistakes and confusion higher. Also, people might think that because they are different letters ‘g’ and ‘k’ sound different in Bardi, but they stand for the same sound.

In some writings, Alan Rumsey uses ‘g’ for the sound written in the Wanalirri school alphabet with ‘k’ but writes a dot between ‘n’ and ‘g’ if the ‘n’ needs to be pronounced as ‘n’, such as in *ngankume* ‘I don’t talk or do’, which he sometimes writes *ngan.gume*. 
K.3.4. ‘u’ or ‘oo’?

In the Wanalarri school alphabet the sound as in *wunggurr* is written ‘u’, but in some other Aboriginal languages people have chosen to write this sound as ‘oo’, because that is the way in which English writes this sound.

I think writing this sound as ‘u’ in Ungarinyin is just as good as writing ‘oo’, maybe better because it is shorter. But the only thing we need to think of when using ‘u’ in Ungarinyin is that it can be confusing for people who already know how to write English. They might pronounce letters like ‘u’ the wrong way.

K.3.5. ‘rr’ at the end of a word

The question of how to write the last sound as in *karnangkurr* ‘dog’ or *wungkurr* ‘rainbow serpent’ is another problem for writing Ungarinyin. Most speakers do not pronounce the ‘rr’ sound in Ungarinyin at the end of the word, making it sound as ‘rd’. In the Wanalarri school spelling people have used a spelling rule for these words: even though people write ‘rr’ at the end of the word, it is pronounced as ‘rd’.

The most important reason for doing that is that when a word is made longer, for example *karnangkurrawalu* ‘from the dog’ the last sound of *karnangkurr* is same as the ‘rr’ in *burruru* ‘men’.
Appendix K. Warndij wurlan narnburra

K.3.6. The Wanarirri school alphabet with some small changes

Based on all the things we talked about in this little book, the best alphabet I can think of for Ungarinyin is this one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
<td>maamaa ‘sacred’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>aamalarr ‘his forehead’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>burru ‘men’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>darr ‘to stand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd</td>
<td>marduk ‘to walk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>ija ‘dad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>engen ‘his arm’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ngarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>yorr ‘to sit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>karnangkurr ‘dog’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>langkan ‘throat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rl</td>
<td>wurlan ‘to talk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ly</td>
<td>balyaa ‘to go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>marduk ‘to walk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>nak ‘to listen’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rn</td>
<td>narnburr ‘paperbark’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny</td>
<td>nyingan ‘you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ngayak ‘to ask’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>wongay ‘woman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rr</td>
<td>yorra ‘nest’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>rarrki ‘stone’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>buk ‘to appear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>wungkurr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This alphabet is very similar to the Wanarirri school alphabet and to Alan Rumsey’s alphabet as well, but some things are different. For example, it has only one letter ‘i’ for the three letters that the Wanarirri school alphabet has (‘i’, ‘ee’ and ‘ii’) and it has ‘aa’, which the Wanarirri school has but not many linguists have used it much. The best way to see if this alphabet is useful for the Ngarinyin community is to try it.
K.3.7. Spelling rule

‘rd’ sounds at the end of a word are mostly written ‘rr’. When ‘rr’ is written at the end of a word it sounds like ‘rd’. When ‘rr’ is followed by an ending starting with a consonant, such as ‘b’ (ngurrba ‘hit repeatedly’), ‘d’ (narrburda ‘on paperbark’), ‘j’ (onarrju ‘out of the bone’) or ‘k’ karnangkurrkurde ‘with a dog’, ‘rr’ also sounds as ‘rd’. When ‘rr’ is followed by an ending beginning with a vowel, ‘rr’ sounds like ‘rr’, wungkurrawalu ‘from the wungkurr’.

Making a word longer with the ending -awalu ‘from’ is a test. When a word with a ‘rd’ sound at the end is made longer with the ending -awalu ‘from’ and the last sound is still pronounced as ‘rd’, the word should always be written with ‘rd’.

K.3.8. Final thought

There is not just one way to write language. The best way for finding an alphabet that is really useful is to try to write language as much as possible and to look at the sounds and letters that you find difficult. The alphabets linguists have used to write Ungarinyin so far are useful for linguists: by using these alphabets they know which sounds belong to which letters. But these alphabets are not necessarily the best way to write language for the Ngarinyin community. I think the Wanalirri school alphabet and the small changes to that alphabet that I proposed on the previous page are a good combination of the linguist’s way and a community way of writing language, but it is up to you to decide if you want to use it and how you want to use it. I hope the description in this little book helps you to make these decisions and to write language.

If you have any questions or comments, call me on 0458203556 or send me an email at stephan.spronck@anu.edu.au or s.spronck@versatel.nl.

Beja,
Dujuk (Stephan)
Appendix L. Recordings used in this study

The following recordings were made in Derby, Wyndham and the Aboriginal communities Mowanjum, Mt. Barnett and Dodnun along the Gibb River road. The speakers are indicated by their initials, as listed on page 5 of chapter 1 and the names of the files are cited as indicated there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code of the recording</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>090722PNET</td>
<td></td>
<td>PN translating the consent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090723PNUN</td>
<td></td>
<td>PN elicitation of sentences with ‘I want to know’ and a story about ‘how language would start’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090729PNMN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transcription and translation of the story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090804JUES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090812JENGPD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090812JENGPDc</td>
<td>6:21</td>
<td>Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090812JENGPDc</td>
<td>4:34</td>
<td>Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090812JENGPDg</td>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090812JENGPDi</td>
<td>8:32</td>
<td>Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090812JENGPDk</td>
<td>5:03</td>
<td>Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090812JENGPDl</td>
<td>2:17</td>
<td>Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090813AJMJSMPD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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090813AJMJSMPDa 2:11 Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task
090813AJMJSMPDc 3:46 Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task
090813AJMJSMPDe 14:22 Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task
090813AJMJSMPDg 5:09 Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task
090813AJMJSMPDh 15:36 Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task
090813AJMJSMPDk 9:24 Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task
090813AJMJSMPDm 2:55 Recording of the ‘Family problems’ narrative picture task
091003PNUN 44:57 Paddy Neowarra discussing varieties of Ungarinyin and mother in law language

100721-01NGUS 0:30:03 Pansy talking in Ungarinyin and English about dialectal differences and numbers <5
100721-02NGUS 0:11:43 Slow dictation of the sentence ‘when God loves the child, he takes it to heaven’ (speaker has recently lost a grand-child)
100722-01NGUS 0:14:47 Talking about animal sounds (dogs) and reactions by humans
100722-02NGUS 0:14:04 Continuing talking about animal sounds (crow)
100722-03NGUS 0:03:40 The sentence “she looked on my head for lice” in several variations
100722-04NGUS 0:14:00 Talking about the verb *jirrkal*(wa) *y2i* and giving an example of a story in which the sentence ‘you lied’ can be used
100722-05NGUS 0:11:41 Sentences about hunting and fishing, Pansy acts out a dialogue between a couple about hunting and fishing
100722-06NGUS 0:10:48 Story about a husband and wife hunting/fishing and cooking food
100722-07NGUS 0:01:50 Continuation of hunting/eating story
100722-08NGUS 0:05:18 Continuation of hunting/eating story
100722-09NGUS 0:00:45 Continuation of hunting/eating story (repeating a previous sentence)

100722-10NGUS 0:08:24 Continuation of hunting/eating story: version of the story in which the man snuck off by himself

100722-11NGUS 0:05:36 Continuation of hunting/eating story: version of the story in which the man snuck off by himself, repetition and continuation

100722-12NGUS 0:24:18 Continuation of hunting story, going over some of the text from 100721 and telling about the time when Aboriginal people did not believe in god yet (good time, only some fights about women)

100722-13NGUS 0:02:21 Talking in English about men and women

100725-01AJUN 0:10:12 Talking about the picture task from last year

100725-02AJUN 0:20:06

100725-03AJUN 0:13:28

100725-04AJUN 0:03:07

100725-05AJUN 0:02:09

100725-06AJUN 0:03:54

100726-01AJUN 0:10:40 Alec describing how two health care mob women are arriving and talking to Mark at his place across from Matt’s place where were sitting

100726-02AJUN 0:22:26 Alec describing a scene in front of him (at about 200m) involving two women from the health services at the house (his house) opposite the one we are recording at (Matt’s house), then about the kids playing in front of us, cold/fire, bird sound (onomatopeia)

100726-03AJUN 0:03:17 Alec talking about going to Gibb river station (he didn’t go to Gibb river station today as he had planned because he was told there was nobody there) and about life at a station

100726-04AJUN 0:09:48 Alec: ‘I got nogud knee so I can’t dance’, hypothetically talking about going to the dance ground, clapping, wangka, tells his father is Miriwoong and his mother Ngarinyin, and talking about Miriwoong country and a bit about the language

100726-05AJUN 0:01:36 Alec talking about burrulu, kunduku, bungkuli di ’night time’
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording Code</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100726-06AJUN</td>
<td>0:08:15</td>
<td>Alec talking about <em>ngala</em> young people couldn’t eat according to the law and <em>yalan/jarrakun</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100809-01NGUN</td>
<td>0:21:55</td>
<td>Starting out with elicitation, then free speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100809-02NGUN</td>
<td>0:22:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100809-03NGUN</td>
<td>0:16:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100810-01NG</td>
<td>0:22:37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100810-02NG</td>
<td>0:15:46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100810-03NG</td>
<td>0:02:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100810-04NG</td>
<td>0:55:59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100810-05NG</td>
<td>0:10:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100811-01NGFS</td>
<td>0:06:15</td>
<td>Watching Shaun the Sheep E2 ‘Bathtime’ with Mama, Neya and Mikey, occasional descriptions in Ungarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100811-02NGFS</td>
<td>0:11:32</td>
<td>Watching Shaun the Sheep E2 ‘Bathtime’ with Mama, Neya and Mikey, occasional descriptions in Ungarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100811-03NGFS</td>
<td>0:22:28</td>
<td>Watching Shaun the Sheep episode ‘bathtime’ with Mama, Neya and Mikey, occasional descriptions in Ungarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100811-04NGPT</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Transcribing the Dodnun picture task, section g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100811-05NGPT</td>
<td>0:04:33</td>
<td>Transcribing the Dodnun picture task, section g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100811-06NGPT</td>
<td>0:04:10</td>
<td>Transcribing the Dodnun picture task, section g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100811-07NGPT</td>
<td>0:06:18</td>
<td>Transcribing the Dodnun picture task, section g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100811-08NGPT</td>
<td>0:49:43</td>
<td>Transcribing the Dodnun picture task, section g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-01NGFS</td>
<td>0:14:18</td>
<td>Watching Shaun the Sheep E9 ‘The bull’ with Mama and Neya, occasional descriptions in Ungarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-02NGFS</td>
<td>0:06:56</td>
<td>Watching Shaun the Sheep E9 ‘The bull’ with Mama and Neya, occasional descriptions in Ungarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-03NGPT</td>
<td>0:20:38</td>
<td>Transcribing the Dodnun picture task, section g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-04NGPT</td>
<td>0:04:54</td>
<td>Transcribing the Dodnun picture task, section g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-05NGPT</td>
<td>0:44:43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-06NGET</td>
<td>0:00:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-07NGET</td>
<td>0:08:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-08NGET</td>
<td>0:05:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-09NGET</td>
<td>0:04:37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812-10NGUN</td>
<td>0:02:50</td>
<td>Pansy summarising today’s work in language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100816-NGPT</td>
<td>0:00:42</td>
<td>Transcription Dodnun picture task, section h, wrapping up the session, repeating the last utterance of Scotty Martin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100817-01NGFS 0:13:11 Watching Shaun the Sheep E25 ‘The excursion’ with Mama, occasional descriptions in Ungarinyin
100817-02NGFN 0:26:21 Watching Shaun the Sheep E25 ‘The excursion’ with Mama, occasional descriptions in Ungarinyin
100817-03NGPT 0:09:20 Transcribing the Dodmun picture task, section h
100817-04NGPT 0:18:47 Transcribing the Dodmun picture task, section h
100817-05NGPT 0:06:34 Transcribing the Dodmun picture task, section h
100817-06NGPT 0:20:27 Transcribing the Dodmun picture task, section h
100817-07NGPT 0:16:53 Transcribing the Dodmun picture task, section h
100817-08NGPT 0:35:13 Transcribing the Dodmun picture task, section h
100817-09NG 0:06:18
100817-10NG 1:18:54
100817-11NG 0:17:03
100818-01NGPT 0:18:39
100818-02NGPT 1:03:13
100818-01NGFS 0:39:07 Watching Shaun the Sheep E25 ‘The excursion’ with Neya, occasional descriptions in Ungarinyin
100820-01NGFS 0:49:16
100820-02NGPT 0:00:42
100820-03NGPT 0:02:34
100820-04NGPT 0:09:42
100820-05NGPT 0:00:42
100820-06NGPT 0:14:45
100820-07NGPT 0:01:39
100820-08NGPT 0:18:21
100820-09NGPT 0:03:25 Narrative about how the kids don’t understand Ungarinyin anymore
100831-01NGUN 0:05:11
100831-02NGUS 0:09:38
100831-03NGMT 0:10:55
100831-04NGES 0:04:34
100831-05NGES 0:01:47
100831-06NGPT 0:08:35
100831-07NGPT 0:12:55
100831-08NGPT 0:05:55
100831-09NGPT 0:01:34 Talking about bad language and good language
100831-10NGUS 0:04:11 Talking about ‘empty’ and ‘angry’
100902-01NGES 0:06:52
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording ID</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100902-02NGMT</td>
<td>0:03:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100902-03NGMT</td>
<td>0:05:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100902-04NGMT</td>
<td>0:02:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100902-05NGMT</td>
<td>0:13:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100902-06NGES</td>
<td>0:08:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100902-07NGPT</td>
<td>0:01:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100902-08NGPT</td>
<td>0:01:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100902-09NGPT</td>
<td>0:02:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100902-10NGPT</td>
<td>0:00:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100902-11NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-01NGUN</td>
<td>0:05:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-02NGUN</td>
<td>0:01:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-03NGUN</td>
<td>0:01:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-04NGUN</td>
<td>0:03:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-05NGUN</td>
<td>0:01:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-06NGUN</td>
<td>0:01:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-07NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-08NGUT</td>
<td>0:00:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-09NGUN</td>
<td>0:01:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-10NGUT</td>
<td>0:00:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-11NGUN</td>
<td>0:01:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-12NGUT</td>
<td>0:01:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-13NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-14NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-15NGUN</td>
<td>0:02:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-16NGUN</td>
<td>0:01:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-17NGUN</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-18NGUN</td>
<td>0:03:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-19NGUN</td>
<td>0:05:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-20NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-21NGUN</td>
<td>0:09:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-22NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-23NGUN</td>
<td>0:01:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-24NGUN</td>
<td>0:12:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-25NGUN</td>
<td>0:05:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-26NGUN</td>
<td>0:02:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100903-27NGUT</td>
<td>0:00:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100903-28NGUN 0:01:33
100903-29NGUN 0:00:51
100903-30NGUN 0:10:54
100903-31NGUN 0:16:27
100903-32NGUN 0:02:11
100905-PNUS 0:33:14 Paddy talking about *yalan*, *jarrakun*. Includes *yalan* paradigms for ‘to go’.
100906-01NGFN 0:14:56 Watching Shaun the Sheep episodes ‘The broken tractor’ and ‘The excursion’ with Neya
100906-02NGET 0:02:37
100906-03NGET 0:00:20
100906-04NGET 0:00:28
100906-05NGET 0:00:15
100906-06NGET 0:00:28
100906-07NGET 0:05:09
100906-08NGET 0:00:43
100906-09NGET 0:00:10
100906-10NGET 0:00:55
100906-11NGET 0:03:11
100906-12NGET 0:04:11
100906-13NGET 0:03:02
100906-14NGET 0:17:56
100906-15NGET 0:04:52
100906-16NGET 0:00:42
100906-17NGET 0:00:35
100906-18NGET 0:01:46 = *karra*
100907-01NGET 0:01:57
100907-02NGET 0:11:18
100907-03NGET 0:10:58
100907-04NGET 0:00:14
100907-05NGET 0:04:17
100907-06NGET 0:01:54
100907-07NGET 0:00:16
100907-08NGPT 0:00:58
100907-09NGPT 0:02:50
100907-10NGET 0:13:12
100915-01NGMT 0:00:21
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100915-02NGMT</td>
<td>0:00:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100915-03NGMT</td>
<td>0:02:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100915-04NGMT</td>
<td>0:01:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100915-05NGUS</td>
<td>0:02:59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100915-06NGUS</td>
<td>0:14:52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talking about restrictions on speaking about men’s business and sacred business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100915-07NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100915-08NGMT</td>
<td>0:00:42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100915-09NGMT</td>
<td>0:02:59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100915-10NGUS</td>
<td>0:06:59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100915-11NGMT</td>
<td>0:01:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100916-01NGMT</td>
<td>0:00:39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100916-02NGMT</td>
<td>0:00:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100916-03NGMT</td>
<td>0:00:59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100916-04NGMT</td>
<td>0:00:29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100916-05NGMT</td>
<td>0:03:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100916-06NGMT</td>
<td>0:11:01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100916-07NGMT</td>
<td>0:00:43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100916-08NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100917-01NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100917-02NGPT</td>
<td>0:00:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100917-03NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100917-04NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100917-05NGES</td>
<td>0:04:37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100917-06NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100917-07NGUN</td>
<td>0:00:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101001-01DCES</td>
<td>0:44:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101001-02DCES</td>
<td>0:59:31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101001-03DCES</td>
<td>0:34:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101001-04DCPN</td>
<td>0:05:53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-01NG</td>
<td>0:00:36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pansy talking about travel to Dodnun in Ungarinyin (short story)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-02NG</td>
<td>0:02:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pansy talking about travel looking for rock paintings in Ungarinyin (story)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-03NG</td>
<td>0:02:07</td>
<td></td>
<td>English translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-04NG</td>
<td>0:00:52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing the story in 101011-02NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-05NG</td>
<td>0:01:20</td>
<td></td>
<td>English translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Code</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101011-06NG</td>
<td>0:00:43</td>
<td>English translation of 101011-01NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-07NG</td>
<td>0:02:30</td>
<td>Pansy talking about water animals (includes reference to one name in an unidentified language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-08NG</td>
<td>0:12:35</td>
<td>Pansy talking about the position of dialects, Nganaw, Ungarinyin, Wirraj, Woorla, Andajin, Wunambal etc. / Merrey-meley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-09NG</td>
<td>0:33:05</td>
<td>Pansy talking about ‘heavy’, ‘light’ and ‘fast’, the difference between the dialects / seasons / nurrun / transcription picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-10NG</td>
<td>0:01:04</td>
<td>English translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-11NG</td>
<td>0:02:59</td>
<td>Pansy talking about fishing in Ungarinyin (short story)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-12NG</td>
<td>0:01:30</td>
<td>Transcription Dodnum picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-13NG</td>
<td>0:15:48</td>
<td>Transcription Dodnum picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011-14NG</td>
<td>0:09:29</td>
<td>Transcription Dodnum picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-01NG</td>
<td>0:03:12</td>
<td>Talking about rambar and other relations in the old days and nowadays (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-02NG</td>
<td>0:02:37</td>
<td>Talking about joking and funny things (English) and tells a joke in Ungarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-03NG</td>
<td>0:14:30</td>
<td>Transcription Dodnum picture task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-04NG</td>
<td>0:03:58</td>
<td>‘really’ and lying in Ungarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-05NG</td>
<td>0:01:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-06NG</td>
<td>0:02:57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-07NG</td>
<td>0:00:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-08NG</td>
<td>0:00:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-09NG</td>
<td>0:00:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-10NG</td>
<td>0:10:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-11NG</td>
<td>0:03:39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-12NG</td>
<td>0:17:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-13NG</td>
<td>0:16:49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-14NG</td>
<td>0:01:42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-15NG</td>
<td>0:01:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-16NG</td>
<td>0:00:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101012-17NG</td>
<td>0:04:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101016-01SNMT</td>
<td>0:01:57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101016-02SNMT</td>
<td>0:00:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101016-03SNMT</td>
<td>0:00:35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101016-04SNMT</td>
<td>0:01:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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101016-05SNMT 0:01:24
101016-06SNMT 0:00:30
101016-07SNMT 0:01:58
101016-08SNMT 0:01:02
101018-01NGMT 0:00:15
101018-02NGMT 0:01:23
101018-03NGMT 0:01:41
101018-04NGMT 0:03:08
101018-05NGMT 0:00:30
101018-06NGMT 0:01:03
101018-07NGMT 0:11:13
101018-08NGMT 0:01:41
101018-09NGMT 0:04:07
101018-10NGUS 0:00:47
101018-11NGUS 0:00:22
101018-12NGUS 0:00:36
101018-13NGUS 0:00:18
101018-14NGMT 0:01:56
101018-15NGMT 0:00:03
101018-16NGMT 0:02:45
101018-17NGMT 0:00:26
101018-18NGMT 0:00:17
101018-19NGUN 0:01:15
101018-20NGUN 0:01:11
101019-01NGMT 0:00:46  Translating the Juwibarn story
101019-02NGMT 0:00:08  Translating the Juwibarn story (‘budmarnyira’)
101019-03NGMT 0:00:18  Translating the Juwibarn story
101019-04NGMT 0:00:36  Translating the Juwibarn story (‘mana’ MAKE SURE)
101019-05NGMT 0:01:01
101019-06NGMT 0:01:54
101019-07NGMT 0:00:52
101019-08NGMT 0:01:51
101019-09NGMT 0:04:22
101019-10NGMT 0:00:11
101019-11NGMT 0:01:23
101019-12NGMT 0:12:18
101019-13NGMT 0:00:37
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111024-03NGUN 0:00:27  Pansy Nulgit saying she’s talking about the narration in 111015-01PNNNKDDJEUD
111024-04NGUS 0:00:33  Pansy Nulgit mentioning different words for edible kangaroo parts
111024-05NGMN 0:00:48  Pansy Nulgit saying in English she’ll discuss 111015-01PNNNKDDJEUD
111024-06NGMN 0:00:50  Pansy Nulgit retelling the story in 111015-01PNNNKDDJEUD (about becoming an adult and hunting)
111024-07NGMN 0:01:12  Pansy Nulgit retelling the story in 111015-01PNNNKDDJEUD (about becoming an adult and hunting)
111024-08NGSNMN 0:00:50  Pansy Nulgit telling about hunting and slaughtering a kangaroo, Sally Nulgit translating
111025-01NGUN 0:00:33  During a transcription session of 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD, NG talks about the use of Yalan *baliya* rather than *burrurru* (‘men’)
111025-02NGUN 0:00:41  During a transcription session of 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD, NG talks about the use of avoidance language (*yalan*)
111025-03NGUN 0:01:00  During a transcription session of 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD, NG talks about names for different age phases for children
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111025-04NGUN 0:01:08 During a transcription session of 111015-02PNNKDDJEUD, NG talks about the use of avoidance language (yalan); men talking and women ‘sitting down quiet’

111027-NGUN 0:00:54 Pansy Nulgit talking about taboo food

111031-01NGUN 0:00:36 Pansy Nulgit saying there are two types of language; ‘big language’ and wurlan

111031-02NGUN 0:00:38 Pansy Nulgit continuing to describe avoidance language and ‘speaking taboos’

111031-03NGUN 0:00:33 Pansy Nulgit discussing widow’s language

111031-04NGUN 0:00:18 Pansy Nulgit discussing widow’s language, saying a widow would whisper

111031-05NGUN 0:00:50 Pansy Nulgit continuing to discuss widow’s language

111031-06NGUN 0:00:22 Neya Nulgit switches on the sound recorder during a transcription session

111031-07NGUN 0:00:45 Pansy Nulgit telling about lightning hitting a tree

111105-01PNJEDDNKUD 1:06:59 Paddy Neowarra further discussing different words in avoidance language (yalan) and other topics

111105-02PNJEDDNKUD 0:03:59 Paddy Neowarra leading the discussion about Ungarinyin dialects

111105-03PNJEDDNKMD 0:35:36 Discussing words about speech from the Coate and Elkin dictionary

111105-04PNJEDDNKMD 0:03:57 Discussing words about speech from the Coate and Elkin dictionary

111105-05PNJEDDNKMD 0:06:28 Discussing words about speech from the Coate and Elkin dictionary

111105-06PNJEDDNK 0:00:19 Discussing you people

111105-07PNJEDDNK 0:20:20 More discussion about avoidance language (yalan)

111106-01NGMN 0:01:34 Pansy Nulgit translates Jilgi Edwards’ contribution to 111015-02PNNKDDJEUD about looking for mussels and contrasts her terms with ‘heavy Ungarinyin’

111106-02NGUN 0:00:27 Pansy Nulgit further discussing food prompted by 111015-02PNNKDDJEUD

111106-03NGUN 0:00:32 Pansy Nulgit further discussing food prompted by 111015-02PNNKDDJEUD

111106-04NGUN 0:00:28 Pansy Nulgit further discussing food prompted by 111015-02PNNKDDJEUD
Pansy Nulgit talking about preparing breakfast in the old days, says she didn’t like bush damper

Pansy Nulgit discussing a recent trip to the coast

Pansy Nulgit further discussing food prompted by 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD

Pansy Nulgit discussing different types of food in the water, on land and in the tree

Pansy Nulgit explaining the meaning of *lijan* (‘digging stick’)

Transcription

Pansy Nulgit talking about getting food from the tree

Transcription

Pansy Nulgit talking about the difference between words in Ungarinyin and Wirraj

Pansy Nulgit discussing further types of bush food

Pansy Nulgit discussing further types of bush food

Translating a fragment from 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD ‘Why did we forget that bush food?’

Pansy and Sally Nulgit translating a fragment from 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD about digging for food

Pansy Nulgit rephrasing a passage from 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD about looking for food

Pansy Nulgit rephrasing a passage from 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD about looking for food, finding food (fowl) and getting full. Sally Nulgit helps with the translation.

Pansy Nulgit rephrasing a passage from 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD about looking for food. Sally Nulgit helps with the translation.

Pansy Nulgit mentioning the name of a tree with yellow flowers ‘kalwa’

Pansy Nulgit explaining that a man can’t say the name of his sister, nor can she mention his

Pansy Nulgit explaining that a man can’t say the name of his sister, nor can she mention his

English translation of 111018-02NGMN
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111108-04NGUN 0:00:34 Pansy Nulgit further discussing naming taboos
111108-05NGUN 0:01:39 Pansy Nulgit further discussing naming taboos, explains these are different from avoidance language (yalan)
111108-06NGMT 0:00:21 Pansy Nulgit rephrasing a passage from 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD
111108-07NGMN 0:00:26 Pansy Nulgit rephrasing a passage from 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD about looking for food
111108-08NGMN 0:00:17 Pansy Nulgit rephrasing a passage from 111015-02PNNNKDDJEUD about looking for food, personal talk in the background
111108-09NGSNUN 0:01:32 Pansy Nulgit telling about how crows announce people’s arrival etc. Sally helps with the translation.
111108-10NGUN 0:00:42 Pansy Nulgit telling about how crows announce people’s arrival etc.
111108-11NGUN 0:00:46 Pansy Nulgit telling about how crows announce people’s arrival etc.
111108-12NGUN 0:01:36 Pansy Nulgit telling about how birds give people signs. Sally Nulgit helps with translation
111108-13NGUN 0:00:18 Pansy Nulgit telling about how birds give people signs.
111108-14NGUN 0:00:13 Pansy Nulgit telling about how birds give people signs.
111108-15NGUN 0:00:26 Pansy Nulgit telling about how birds give people signs.
111108-16NGMN 0:01:37 Pansy Nulgit talking about birds making other noises on trees, making a hole in a tree to find sugerbag
111108-17NGUN 0:00:16 Pansy Nulgit saying that Nugget Gudud speaks Wirraj
111108-18NGMN 0:03:13 Pansy Nulgit saying ‘rarrki’ comes from Bunuba side. Discussing proper Ungarinyin words for stone.
111108-19NG 0:01:47 Pansy Nulgit discussing more types of stone
111114-01PNUD 0:49:23 Further discussion about speaking taboos
111114-02PNUD 0:09:23 Paddy Neowarra discussing more avoidance words (woman can’t say dela ‘dog’)
111114-03PNUD 0:03:28 Further discussion about avoidance language in relation to words from the Coate dictionary
111114-04PNUD 0:01:00 Further discussion about speaking taboos
111114-05PNUD 0:02:12 Different expressions for ‘have a look’
111114-06PNUD 0:09:42 Further discussion about avoidance language in relation to words from the Coate dictionary
111114-07PNUD 0:06:10 Paddy Neowarra discussing more avoidance words (woman can’t say ‘dela’)

120916PNUN
120917-01PNUN
120917-02PNUN
120917-03PNUN
120917-04PNUN
120917-05PNUN
120917-06PNUN
120917-07PNUN
120917-09PNUN
120917-10PNUN
120917-11PNUN
120917-12PNUN
120917-13PNUN
120917-14PNUN
120918-1NGUN
120918-2NGUN
120918-3NGUN
120918-4NGUN
120918-5NGUN
120918-6NGUN
120919-01NGPNU D Discussing avoidance relationships and mother-in-law words
120919-02NGPNU D Discussing avoidance relationships and mother-in-law words
120919-03NGPNU D Discussing avoidance relationships and mother-in-law words
120919-04NGPNU D 0:04:15 Discussing avoidance relationships and mother-in-law words
120919-05NGPNU D 0:02:42 Discussing avoidance relationships and mother-in-law words
120919-06NGUN 0:05:57 Discussing the different nations within Ngarinyin country, mostly in English, some narrative in Ungarinyin about the same topic
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120919-07NGUN 0:01:28 Summarising recording Coate 001660B_52.09-65.09; explaining that widows can’t talk straight out (mostly in Ungarinyin with a brief summary in English at the end)

120919-08NGPNUD 0:18:37 Discussing recording Coate 001660B_52.09-65.09 (and others) in English and Ungarinyin

120919-09NGPNUD 0:01:06 Discussing how PN and NG want to make a book in Ungarinyin with English glosses to teach the children

120919-10NGPNUD 0:11:08 Discussing a Coate recording (see notes) in Ungarinyin and English

120919-11NGPNUD 0:00:25 Discussing where the story in this Coate recording (see notes) comes from

120919-12NGPNUD 0:01:27 Discussing where the story in this Coate recording (see notes) comes from

120920-01PNNGUD 0:02:37 Discussing the first few minutes of Coate 1639A; a story about how the wanjina went around and put the animals on earth (mentioning many animals)

120920-02PNNGUD 0:00:15 Discussing a turtle that young people can’t eat

120920-03PNNGUD 0:00:53 Discussing the creation of the snake (aru), who realises he doesn’t have legs and can’t get out of the billabong on the steep rocks

120920-04PNNGUD 0:02:19 Discussing the different snakes on Ngarinyin country

120920-05PNNGUD 0:00:44 Discussing the expression di-di-di-di nad bi (‘go-go-go stop’) 

120920-06PNNGUD 0:00:21 Discussing the expression di-di-di-di nad bi (‘go-go-go stop’) 

120920-07PNNGUD 0:00:51 Discussing the expression di-di-di-di nad bi (‘go-go-go stop’) (describing the situation in which the expression is used)

120920-08PNNGUD 0:03:33 Discussing and exemplifying the four dialects of Ungarinyin

120920-09PNNGUD 0:00:37 Discussing how people used to find water and drink from a flat rock?

120920-10PNNGUD 0:00:58 Discussing how people used to find water

120920-11PNNGUD 0:00:46 Discussing how people used to find water (by observing the behaviour of animals, such as birds)

120920-12PNNGUD 0:00:49 Discussing how people used to find water at night
Discussing how people used to find water
Discussing how people used to find water on top of a boab tree
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (mostly snakes)
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (reptiles)
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (mostly birds)
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (birds and fish)
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (mostly birds)
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (trying to think of the name of a particular lizard without a tail). Some discussion in English about how to put it in the book.
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (fish and water animals)
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (water animals and fish), strange eating habits abroad (Ungarinyin and English)
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (large animals such as dingo’s etc.)
Talking about which animals people used to eat and which ones they didn’t (trying to think of the name of a particular lizard without a tail and talking about remaining large and small animals)
Discussing a large sacred Wanjina painting in a cave near the location of the second story in 1639A (Wanjinas and war)
Discussing a junba about the creation of animals (wurrunganyin) in response to the animal creation story
Discussion mostly in English about the animal junba
Discussing an akula junba, mostly in English
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording Code</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120920-29PNNGUD</td>
<td>0:02:21</td>
<td>Discussing people who can sing <em>junba</em>, recording songs and language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120922-1PNUN</td>
<td>0:01:03</td>
<td>Telling how some people drowned in a whirlpool near Bigge Island, Bungguni had warned them not to go but they didn’t listen (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120922-2PNUN</td>
<td>0:00:48</td>
<td>Telling how Albert Burungga (who was a <em>barnman</em>) warned people not to go canoeing on one occasion (in Wunambal and English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120922-3PNUN</td>
<td>0:02:33</td>
<td>Telling the canoeing/drowning story in Ungarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120922-4PNUN</td>
<td>0:04:34</td>
<td>Continuation of story about canoeing/drowning story, how the <em>wunggurr</em> swallowed those people and about Albert Burungga’s life story in Ungarinyin (and English translation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120922-5PNUN</td>
<td>0:01:48</td>
<td>Talking about ‘talking hollow logs’ in the water through which the <em>wunggurr</em> would warn people not to swim (<em>sound: abubu</em>) (in Ungarinyin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120922-6PNUN</td>
<td>0:03:27</td>
<td>Talking about how the old people to how when travelling on water with a current it was best to grab on to a hollow log and not to paddle too much or swim (In Ungarinyin and English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120922-7PNUN</td>
<td>0:04:20</td>
<td>Talking about a rock python swallowing a whole chicken at the old station in Ungarinyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120922-8PNUN</td>
<td>0:12:36</td>
<td>Talking about catching a freshwater crocodile, approaching it from below in the water (in Ungarinyin and English) and listening to the end of recording 1639A (recorder should have been switched off for this part )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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