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Chapter 1

Introduction

This thesis explores a range of discourse phenomena in Wangurri, a language of North East Arnhem Land. This mainly quantitative study is based on data from a corpus of Wangurri texts. In this preliminary analysis of Wangurri, we see that discourse/pragmatic context exerts a considerable influence on sentence grammar, and certain morphosyntactic features of the language serve multiple functions in reference and focus.

The discourse clitics, -ma and -nha are of particular interest in this study. These clitics pervade texts in Yolŋu languages. They attach to almost any part of speech, and their distribution is not explained by any process inside of the sentence. Researchers in related languages have suggested various functions for these clitics in emphasis, discourse structure and reference, though none of these accounts have offered comprehensive, situated analysis of focus or reference in Yolŋu languages. As yet, no analysis of discourse cliticisation has been offered for the Dhaŋju language subgroup, of which Wangurri is a member.

Another interesting feature of Wangurri discourse is the range of demonstrative functions beyond spatial and temporal deixis. Linguists working in other Australian languages have documented complex systems of demonstrative reference, including sequence and recognition (Evans, Cutfield?).

In reference, a speaker often exploits the discourse context in order to achieve comprehensibility and efficiency in communication, (Grice 1975; Huang 2000). It is widely agreed that entities which are in some way identifiable to a hearer (from the text itself, by inference, from the physical setting, or from shared knowledge/beliefs), will not require as much introduction as entities which are ‘newer’ (Givón 1983; Chafe 1994).
Different languages employ different forms and structures to refer to entities in the discourse, for example, zero anaphora, demonstrative pronouns, switch reference, dislocation, etc. In this thesis, the analysis of one Wangurri text allows the quantification of the relationship between the mentions of certain referents throughout the discourse, and the extensive range of referring expressions available to the speaker (following Givón 1983). Generally, discourse clitics on nominal referents occur when the referent is perceived to be less accessible to the hearer. The situation is somewhat more complicated in the case of demonstrative reference, where morphologically complex phrases are less predictable in their distribution according to recency of last mention, potential ambiguity, etc. It is also apparent that sociocultural rules in reference are largely independent of the usual accessibility factors in reference - especially in reference to deceased people, and character introduction (Garde 2002).

The manner in which referents are coded throughout a text is simultaneously determined by issues of clarity, economy, sociocultural factors, structure and salience. Beyond the patterns of reference in a language, certain (marked) references may signal to the audience some shift or boundary in the discourse structure as it takes shape (Fox 1987a). A range of related techniques in focus may also be in operation. In this way, a speaker can fine-tune the discourse coherence, and the desired semantic or contrastive prominence in any given context. This paper describes some of the patterns behind Wangurri speakers' use of forms and structures in reference and focus.

Though the interface of syntax and pragmatics is an area of ongoing debate, grammatical descriptions of languages have generally recognised certain linguistic phenomena as "discourse-driven" (eg: anaphora, deixis, etc.). However, certain features (eg: word-order, discourse clitics, prosody) have commonly fallen outside the scope of traditional grammar, or been overlooked as performative or stylistic freedoms. The aim of this paper is to advance the study of these complex discourse processes in Wangurri. The results offer some preliminary insights into the dynamics of narrative in Wangurri, the tracking of nominal participants throughout, semantic and contrastive focus operations, and the maintenance of action continuity.
1.1 Language & Texts

Wangurri is a Yolŋu language, a member of the Pama-Nyungan family of Australian languages. It is a suffixing language, and displays typically flexible word order. The Wangurri split-case system resembles that of other languages in the North Eastern Arnhem region - pronouns inflect in a nominative-accusative system, whereas nouns inflect in an ergative-absolutive system. Verbal suffixes reflect tense, aspect and modality. (McLellan 1989)

Of the Yolŋu languages, Wangurri is part of the Dharu language group; neighbouring language families include Dhuwal (eg: Djambarrpuynu, Djapu), Dhuwala (eg: Gupapuyŋu, Gumatj) and Djaju (Warramiri, Mandatja). Census data (2006) records 47 speakers of Wangurri in the home.1 Speakers are spread around the communities of Galiwin’ku, Yirrkala, Ramingining, Dhälinybuy and outlying homelands; Wangurri is traditionally based in the East North-Eastern (Dharu) region of Yolŋu lands (van der Wal 1992:14). There exist numerous contemporary descriptions of these languages (Morphy 1983; McLellan 1989; Wilkinson 1991; van der Wal 1992), and a number of other papers offer additional insight into Yolŋu languages.

The text corpus for this research was recorded in the 1980’s by Dr Marilyn McLellan in preparation for her description of Wangurri grammar, particularly focussing on tense, aspect and mood in Wangurri. These recordings took place on Elcho Island. I have worked with Marilyn’s transcriptions of these tapes, and I have largely relied on her gloss and free translations for my analysis. There are some inconsistencies in these glosses, and the interlinearisation of two texts (Fat Fish & Cake) is less comprehensive. However, I have left the data largely unchanged, as consultation and re-analysis is beyond the scope

---

1 It should be noted that another 56 respondents offered the non-specific language family “Dharu” as the first language, and it is highly likely that some of these would be Wangurri speakers (along with speakers of Galpu and Golumala, according to the classifications used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics). An earlier estimate documented 150 speakers of Wangurri. (Black 1983)
of this project, and I am confident that McLellan’s grammatical analyses/glosses are sufficient for this investigation.

The sample of four texts considered in this study consists of one exhortative narrative (Funeral text), one procedural narrative (Cycad Nut), one fable (Fat Fish), and one short report (Cake text). The genre labelling of these texts here is tentative, pending more precise genre analysis in Yolŋu languages. The longest text, the Funeral, was spoken by Gunydirryirr, and was recorded soon after the unexpected death of the narrator’s younger brother. Though the audience consisted only of Marilyn and the speaker’s sister, Gunydirryirr addresses members of the wider community at various stages throughout the narrative as she exhorts them to uphold the Wangurri customs of language and law - Gunydirryirr perceived that the language recording may serve as a tool of transmission for a greater (Wangurri) audience. Recorded on the same day by the same speaker, Gunydirryirr, the Cycad Nut text is a procedural narrative of a prototypical cycad nut gatherer, and how she gathers food. However this narrative also has exhortative or mythical elements, as the cycad nut holds high totemic significance for the Wangurri clan - the language surrounding this food is intimately connected with Wangurri clan identity and language survival. The Cake text is a very short report by Ganyinurru about how she baked a cake with her relatives, to take to her parents. The Fat Fish fable tells the story of a pond of self-sufficient and happy fish, whose existence was fundamentally altered when a white hand came to scatter food for them. This fable was spoken by Badaltja, and though the origins of this fable (and its recording circa 1982?) are unknown, it does present as a formulaic and well-known story.

2 The orthography used in the transcriptions and adopted here in this paper is the accepted orthography in Yolŋu languages, following Lowe (1960)

ŋ velar nasal
ā long vowel
ŋḏṯḻ retroflex consonants
ʼ glottal stop

The glosses used in the text and in examples throughout this paper use the following abbreviations: 1-1st person, 2-2nd person; 3-3rd person; ABL-Ablative; ABS- Absolutive; ACC-Accusative; ADJ-Adjective; ADV-Adverbial; ALL-Allative; ANA-Anaphoric reference; ASSOC- Associative; CAUS-Causative; Comp-Complement; Conj-Conjunction; Cont-Continuous; Contr-Contrafactual; DAT-Dative; DEM-Demonstrative; D-Discourse clitic; Du-Dual; EMPH-Emphatic; ERG-Ergative; Ex-Exclusive pronoun; F-Finite; H/Hab-Habitual; IMP-Imperative; IMPF-Imperfective; In-Inclusive; INCH-Inchoative; INSTR-Instrumental; Irr-Irrealis; KIN-PROP-Kinship; LOC-Locative; N-Noun; Neg-Negative; NEU-Neutral Verb; NOM-Nominative; NOML-Nominaliser; OR-Originative; P-Perfective; PER-Periative; PL-Plural; PRO-Pronoun; POSS-Possession; Pred-Predicate; REDUP-Reduplication; Rel Cl-Relative Clause; REFLX-Reflexive; Sg-Singular; TEMP-Temporal; V-Verb; VBL-Verbaliser
Linguists have observed that there is a good degree of variation between texts, genres and speakers in the distribution of discourse clitics, and other discourse features in Yolŋu languages (Tchekhoff & Zorc 1983; McEllan 1989; van der Wal 1992). Unfortunately, thorough discourse analyses of each of these texts is beyond the scope of this study. The challenge here is to identify the range of reference and focus options available to the speakers, and to determine some key factors in the speakers’ choices. These elementary findings in Wangurri are relevant to other Yolŋu languages, as discourse clitics and features find equivalents in related languages of the region.

1.2 Outline
In chapter two of this paper, I present a summary of the literature and research relevant to this project. This section includes particular approaches taken by Australianists in this field, and their respective case languages and findings. Chapter three proceeds to a quantitative analysis of reference in the Givónian tradition – tracking nominal referents throughout the Funeral text. Chapter four investigates focus techniques in Wangurri, to further describe the grammaticalisation of discourse in reference and focus. In conclusion, I present a summary of findings, along with avenues for future research.
Chapter 2

Reference & Focus in Discourse: Literature

As linguists become increasingly interested in the interface of traditional grammar and pragmatics, it is an unfortunate fact that there exists little consensus on the vocabulary used to describe this area of language research. Perhaps one explanation for the terminological and methodological divergence is the sheer diversity of phenomena attributable to discourse/pragmatic factors in languages around the world. The challenge of this literature review is to isolate points of agreement in the literature, and identify methodologies that best match the Wangurri discourse data. A broad historical overview of developments in this field will be a most useful approach to the theoretical literature. Following from this, I present a summary of relevant empirical evidence in discourse analysis cross-linguistically. This subsection includes a summary of results in discourse analysis, with special attention to Australian Indigenous languages. I conclude this chapter with a summary of the theories and methods which will be of most import in subsequent analysis chapters, with some consideration to the practical limitations of the present investigation. In emphasising the most useful approaches for this particular study, this literature review will also uncover areas for future research in Wangurri and related languages.

---

3 The division between the ‘theoretical’ and the ‘empirical’ in no way represents the manner in which discourse analysis/theory has developed. The purpose of this abstraction is twofold: 1. to provide the reader with a succinct introduction to the ideas and terms as they are used historically, and in this study; and 2. to place the cross-linguistic data and respective methodologies parallel, to show the origins of hypotheses and directions in this present analysis of Wangurri.
2.1 Directions in Discourse - Theory & Method

Prior to the 1960's, linguistics had largely limited itself to the analysis of language inside of the sentence (Linde 1997:5). Grammarians had tacitly assumed that the text beyond the sentence consisted of an unsystematic, irrelevant jumble of speech performance.\(^4\) It was sufficient to discuss the ‘subject’ of a sentence in purely structuralist terms, or with reference to semantic role (eg: ‘agent’). Harris (1951; 1952) conducted an early discourse study in the structuralist tradition, pioneering some distributional methods in the analysis of morphemes across a whole text. In mainstream linguistic analysis, it was gradually becoming more evident that certain elements of language contained within a sentence could not be sufficiently explained without reference to something outside of that sentence (Linde 1997:5).

In the 1960’s, the study of speech and performative acts gained some validity in linguistics. Philosophical theories of communication in social context offered foundational contributions to the field of sociolinguistics (Austin 1962; Searle 1969). Specialists in neighbouring disciplines pursued other interests in discourse: from the analysis of folklore, Propp (1958) had made some progress into the “morphology” of the story genre, and anthropology had also brought some insight to structures of myth and folklore (Colby 1966). Even though these pursuits in discourse were still quite removed from the study of sentence grammar, there was emerging in linguistics a new open-mindedness to discourse context, structure and interaction. These contributions to discourse analysis continue to exert a strong influence over current theory and definition in discourse analysis.\(^5\)

Linguists following in the structuralist tradition took a slightly different route to arrive at the analysis of discourse. Labov first presented empirical evidence for the social conditioning of language in his work on phonetic variation in English on Martha’s Vineyard (Labov, 1963).\(^6\) It appears that Labov may have stumbled upon the problem of discourse out of curiosity, perhaps expecting that conditions governing syntactic variables may be isolated

---

\(^4\) First Saussure (1966:17-18) and later Chomsky (Chomsky, 1965:3) had affirmed that real linguistics should concern itself with the underlying, abstract system (\textit{langue}), over against its performance (\textit{parole}).

\(^5\) Though this particular interest was somewhat peripheral to received linguistics of this period, its effect should not be underestimated. For a good overview of developments in discourse analysis since Austin and Searle, see the introductory chapter, \textit{What is discourse?} in (Schiffrin 1988)

\(^6\) Labov brought a range of (sociolinguistic) questions beyond linguistic and cognitive competence to his analyses - including synchronic variation and diachronic change, heterogeneity and the “speech community”.
by analysis of the level above the clause/sentence, in the same way that morphology informs phonology (Labov, 1972a:195). The attention to form pervades Labov’s treatment of discourse - minimal units and segments within narrative are not only characterised by the interactional effect on the audience, or temporal orientation, but explicitly by grammatical phenomena.\(^7\) Perhaps the most abiding contribution of Labov’s subsequent work is his quantitative methodology - in each analysis, Labov counts and stratifies the use of typical constructions within narrative, anticipating,

“free variation can often be constrained by statements about the probability of application in one environment or the other, and that these quantitative constraints can be used to describe the system of the community and the validity of the rules written.” (Labov, 1987)

Gradually, linguists were also moving towards discourse-functional notions of ‘topic’, though generally still identified as a single (subject) constituent of the clause (Halliday 1967). It is widely accepted that some part(s) of the information in the sentence is resumed in the discourse - either from an earlier mention, from shared knowledge, experience, or from the discourse-external world. Adding to this, the speaker introduces some new information: a participant, an event, in any case a new relation. This binary terminology of ‘givenness’ still holds in discussions of the pragmatics of reference, though the underlying ideas have been extensively elaborated.\(^8\) The table below approximates the evolution of terminology in ‘givenness’ as developed by some key practitioners.\(^9\)

---

\(^7\) For example, the narrative coda may be marked by obviate deixis (that, there, those), contrasting the end of the narrative in the remote past, with the present time, “and that was that.” (Labov & Waletzky, 1967:36). Note also the range of evaluative devices in narrative: intensifiers (quantifiers, gesture, expressive phonology), comparators (negatives, futures, modals, questions and imperatives, superlatives), correlatives (simultaneous events, appended participles and progressives) and explications (Labov, 1972:378).

\(^8\) As we shall see - the binary opposition is replaced with various clines, or implicational hierarchies (Givón 1983; Gundel et al. 1993).

\(^9\) Note the problems inherent in approximating academic definitions and debates in a simple table. For example, the term ‘theme’ is used in one context almost synonymously with other terms in the ‘old’ column, but in another context in quite a different sense (the unit of discourse into which groups of clauses may be grouped by proposition/semantics - see Givón, 1983:7f, Chafe, 1979, etc.) The attempt at simple, graphic representation is nonetheless worthwhile, given the importance of these terms in this study.
Table 1: Binary terminology of ‘givenness’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLD INFORMATION</th>
<th>NEW INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Grammar</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague School</td>
<td>topic</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halliday (1967)</td>
<td>topic</td>
<td>comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafe (1967:28)</td>
<td>theme</td>
<td>rheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafe (1987)</td>
<td>given</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopper (1979)</td>
<td>background</td>
<td>foreground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ground</td>
<td>figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafe (1987)</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>semi-active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all of its diversity, discourse analysis gained momentum in the 1970’s. However, its development was still separate to the conventional, idealist approach, as exemplified by Chomsky, which is not so concerned about probabilities or the language system of a community. The generative grammar was mostly concerned with generalised or simple rules in production of well-formed sentences.

In the 1980’s, Functional Grammar brought pragmatic conditioning environments closer to received grammar. Chomsky (1980) himself suggests that stress and presupposition may fall within grammatical competence, effectively conceding that information structure may indeed be part of the grammar. Levinson (1983:373) went further, suggesting,

“perhaps the most interesting [kinds of interaction between conversational structure and syntax] lie in the area subsumed by the (rather unclear) notion of topic, for many of the syntactic processes called movement rules seem to have the function of indicating how information in the clause relates to what has been talked about before... Perhaps the great bulk of the derivational machinery in the syntax of natural languages can be functionally explained by reference to the specialized conversational jobs that many sentence structures seem to be designated to perform.”

In this context, Givón (1983) identified three related platforms of discourse continuity: thematic continuity, action continuity, and topic continuity. In the case of topicality, Givón observed the non-discrete entity of subject/topic. His examples of “recalcitrant

---

10 Givón (1983) mentions that thematic, action and topic continuity may be implicationally linked, though the exact nature of the relationship is not described explicitly. “Thematic continuity is the overall matrix for all other continuities in the discourse. It is hardest to specify, yet it is clearly and demonstrably there.” (Givón 1983:8)
data” (Givón 1983:5-6) are illustrative of the problem of multiple ‘topics’, the grammaticalisation of subject (1.) and the apparent topicality of direct object (2.)

1.
   a. L-dislocation: John, we saw him yesterday.
   b. R-dislocation: We saw him yesterday, John.
   c. Simplex: We saw John yesterday.

2.
   a. John gave the book to Mary.
   b. John gave Mary the book.

Beyond the phenomena of dislocation and dative shift, the potential realisation of topical subjects as ∅, unstressed pronoun, stressed pronoun, definite NP or dislocated NP had important implications for ‘topicality’ - each specimen apparently performed different discourse functions based on the immediately surrounding text. Givón posited a multi-point scale of ‘topicality’. In this model, the linguist can determine what grammatical possibilities exist for referential expressions, and what factors may determine their use in discourse. In Givón’s account, the key factors in referent coding include the recency of last mention, the presence of potential interferents, and the persistence of the topic in discourse following. The ‘topic continuity hierarchy’ was an elaboration of the binary opposition of ‘given’ or ‘new’ information (and single respective constituents in the clause). Subsequent theory and research has largely affirmed Givón’s basic principle of iconicity that “the more disruptive, surprising, discontinuous or hard to process a topic is, the more coding material must be assigned to it.” (Givón 1983:18). This “coding material” may involve zero anaphora, phonological stress, morphological marking, syntactic prominence (eg: L/R dislocation), or other linguistic techniques in tracking a referent through a discourse.  

The principles of topic continuity explain much of the reference data, yet exceptions to the theory are manifest. In situations where a referent is highly accessible to the hearer, the speaker may yet choose an inordinately full referring expression, for example, a noun phrase. Conversely, a referent which is apparently inaccessible, either lapsed from the preceding discourse, or surrounded by potential interference, may be (re)activated with a more minimal expression (eg: pronoun). Fox’s (1987b) principle of morpho-syntactic

11 More details of the methodology and Givón’s hierarchy of topic continuity will be provided in chapter three.
markedness and discourse structure explains much of this residue. Fox (Fox 1987a:113) reports,

> “in my expository texts, fully 38% (204/541) of the full NPs had their referents mentioned in the immediately preceding clause, so it is not simple distance that triggers the use of one anaphoric device over the other. Rather, it is the rhetorical organisation of that distance that determines whether a pronoun or a full NP is appropriate.”

Fox’s general principle states that the more marked referring expressions are used around discourse boundaries. This methodology essentially recognises the hierarchical structure of discourse by applying analytical techniques suitable to the text type, rather than measuring the accessibility from linear clauses.

The term ‘coherence’ may represent more holistically how the discourse hangs together as a hierarchical structure. It is possible that the ‘thematic paragraph’, as postulated by Givón, is actually the central discourse unit of Fox’s analysis. In Givón’s macro unit of discourse,

> “chains of clauses are combined into larger thematic units...(it) is (the) most immediately relevant level of discourse within which one can begin to discuss the complex process of continuity in discourse.” (Givón 1983:7)

Pending this theoretical discussion, where appropriate, I will replace ‘continuity’ with ‘coherence’.

---

12 Fox uses methods of analysis which are suitable to the text type: Conversation Analysis for conversational discourse, Rhetorical Structure Analysis and Narrative Structure Analysis for Narratives of different kinds. (Fox 1987a)

13 This term is also used in Halliday & Hasan (1976), where the discourse is defined by the semantic relationships underlying the text; the interpretative link between two parts within the text is of greater interest than the rule-governed distribution of items (eg: pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions). This kind of semantic cohesion is subtly different to the use I reserve for ‘cohesion’ - which is closer to the trackable topic continuity of Givón, with recognition that discourse structure is not simply linear / continuous.

14 Circumstantial evidence for this correlation may be found in Fox’s claim that a more general unit of analysis (rejecting ‘topicality’ or ‘continuity’) may yield more powerful results. On the surface, this claim may seem strange, as Fox’s principle of morpho-syntactic markedness and discourse structure really only explains the choice of ‘marked’ referring expressions around certain boundaries in the discourse. The claim is better substantiated when it is understood to mean that the ‘discourse unit’ corresponds to the ‘thematic paragraph’ - which should also imply thematic, topic/participant and/or action continuity.
A cognitive perspective on reference and focus can also be traced through the last three decades. This approach investigates the state of a referent or proposition in a hearer’s mind, rather than in the isolated discourse/text itself. Prince (1981) noted three types of ‘givenness’: predictability/recoverability (based on the hearer’s expectations about linguistic forms and sentence structure); saliency (the presence of the thing/entity in the hearer’s consciousness at the time of the utterance); and shared knowledge (presumed by the speaker to be known or inferred by the hearer). Between ‘given’ and ‘new’, Chafe (1987:72) introduced an intermediate status of mental activation, ‘semiactive’, where the referent may be ‘new’ yet imminently retrievable to the hearer.

In the 1990’s, theorists presented some detailed distinctions in discourse - especially a clearer elucidation of reference and focus as separate yet related operations. Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski (1993) place six states of mental activation along a ‘Givenness Hierarchy’ to describe the acceptability of certain referring expressions. They are essentially concerned with assessing the psychological status of a referent in the hearer’s consciousness, and observing which referring expressions are compatible in that instance. Though this analysis follows more directly in the cognitive tradition of Prince (1981), Chafe (1987), and Clark (1992), the model is in broad agreement with Givón’s own restatement of gestalt psychology. More explicit reference is suited to less activated referents, and simpler reference is suited to activated (“in focus”) referents.

It is particularly noticeable that in their discussion of givenness, Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski use “in focus” to describe the most activated (‘old’) referents, encoded by the most minimal anaphoric expressions (eg: ∅/unstressed pronoun). This is in contrast to the common usage of ‘focus’ as the ‘new’ information (see table 1.). In explanation of this overlap in terminology, Gundel (1999) described three different kinds of focus under discussion in the literature, in explanation of this overlap in terminology. “In focus” (Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski 1993) referred to psychological focus (Gundel 1999:294): “an entity is in psychological focus if the attention of both speech participants can be assumed to be focused on it because of its salience at a given point in the discourse...similar to the backward-looking center of centering theory.” In addition to psychological focus, Gundel (1999) distinguishes two other kinds of focus: semantic focus, and contrastive focus. These two types correlate more directly with the common usage, where semantic focus refers to “that part of a sentence that is prosodically (and sometimes also syntactically) more prominent” - it may actually be assigned the prominence because it is the ‘new’ part of the sentence. In using contrastive focus, the
speaker may deliberately bring a constituent into prominence because he/she “doesn’t think the addressee’s attention is focused on a particular entity and for one reason or another would like it to be, because a new topic is being introduced or reintroduced (topic shift), or because one constituent (topic or semantic focus) is being contrasted, explicitly or implicitly with something else.” (Gundel, 1999:299).

Gundel’s (1999) three types of focus are related yet independent. They often appear in complementary roles in the sentence, for example, when the ‘given’ constituent is in psychological focus (e.g: unstressed pronoun), the remaining ‘new’ part of the sentence shows semantic focus (e.g: pitch prominence). Alternatively, there may be overlap of focussing functions on constituents. For example, an activated referent (e.g: unstressed pronoun) may also receive semantic or contrastive focus (e.g: pitch prominence). It is precisely in this kind of discussion that the complementarity of topic continuity and focus relations is most evident.

This interface of grammar and pragmatics has become known as the study of Information Structure.\footnote{This term is taken from Halliday’s (1967) discussion of ‘theme’; Lambrecht also references Chafe’s (1976) ‘information packaging’, and Vallduví’s (1990) ‘informatics’.} In this area, Lambrecht (1994) is interested in the speaker’s choice of one well-formed sentence over another, given a particular discourse context. Lambrecht (1994:28) argues that at some levels, “…syntactic form may be said to correlate directly with discourse function, hence cannot be fully understood without reference to it…the existence of a logical link between form and function is undeniable.” According to Lambrecht (1994:6), there are four independent but interrelated sets of categories in information structure:

1. propositional information (presupposition & assertion);
2. identifiability and activation of referents;
3. topic (pragmatic relation of aboutness);
4. focus relations (the informative element, where the assertion differs from the presupposition).

Lambrecht acknowledges that the study of information structure does not offer the kind of predictive precision one may expect of other idealist grammatical accounts. Certain grammatical features find pragmatic motivations; the challenge is to identify the patterns in their composition and interpretation. Lambrecht takes well-formed ‘allosentences’ in a variety of languages, finding the pragmatic conditions to explain the contrasting sentence
features. The analysis blends formal/generative grammar with a more functional approach, and takes into account morphology, prosody, syntax, and semantics.

Results in information structure studies indicate that accessibility, topic, and focus relations do not find one-to-one correlations with the various grammatical techniques. In other words, the grammatical phenomena are multi-functional, and various pragmatic functions may be realised by multiple forms/structures. One may question the form-function circularity of such an argument; Lambrecht’s approach to this problem is to posit an unmarked circumstance (eg: phrase structure, default prosody), and contrast the marked data to identify the pragmatic conditions. Lambrecht concludes that though the formal realisations may be similar, referent activation and focus function independently in the sentence at the speaker’s discretion. In spite of the differences in terminology, it seems that there is broad consensus about the separate processes in activation and focus (Givón 1983; Chafe 1987:77; Gundel 1999)

Particular grammatical categories in natural language serve multiple functions both in syntax and pragmatics - an example of this would be the demonstrative form. Himmelmann (1996) identified four categories of demonstratives cross-linguistically. Demonstratives may have a discourse deictic use in referring to propositions or speech events. Situational demonstratives relate some entity present in the discourse situation to some deictic centre - proximal, medial, distal (Himmelmann 1996:224). These situational uses of demonstratives are widely accounted for in traditional grammars. Less commonly included, but equally as common, is the recognitional use of demonstratives (Himmelmann 1996:206). In this situation, the referent is identified by specific, shared knowledge (often low accessibility or descriptive information). Demonstratives also have

16 This study is separate to the pragmatic subdomain of semantics; loosely speaking, “while conversational pragmatics is concerned with the question of why one and the same sentence form may express two or more meanings, discourse pragmatics is concerned with the question of why one and the same meaning may be expressed by two or more sentence forms.” (Lambrecht 1994:5)

17 Givón (1983) does not argue the independence of topic continuity and focus relations, he assumes it. Gundel’s (1999) classification of ‘psychological focus’ corresponds here with Lambrecht’s ‘activation’; Lambrecht’s ‘focus’ is Gundel’s ‘semantic’/‘contrastive’ focus. Chafe’s earlier comment was in terms of ‘contrastiveness’ (eg: stress) independent of ‘activation cost’ (Chafe 1987).

18 Note that Lambrecht also distinguishes this kind of ‘lexical pragmatics’ from the study of information structure, the subject of which is - the structure of the sentence within the discourse, and the speaker’s choice of one structure in preference to another. (Lambrecht 1994:5, 7)

19 Note this use of demonstratives is widely attested in Australian languages (Himmelmann 1996:232) Cutfield See also the discussion below.
a known tracking/anaphoric use (mainly in conversational discourse), following partipants through the discourse. Thus the two main interactional goals in the use of demonstratives are: 1. to “introduce” a referent in the universe of discourse; or 2. to “single out” a referent among already established referents in the discourse or shared knowledge. (Himmelmann 1996:227)

In addition to context-dependent demonstrative reference, certain pronouns are situational in their use. First and second person pronouns are readily interpreted by the hearer, because of the immediacy of the referent entities to discourse situation (speaker & audience, respectively). The contextual availability of the reference means that this kind of reference is not as sensitive to textual obstacles to comprehension (eg: referential distance, competing referents, etc.) It is for this reason that some analyses of reference (eg: Givón 1983) exclude physical/temporal expressions, and 1/2 person pronouns.

Another field of text-external reference is what Clark (1992:6) identified as participants’ “common ground”, referring to mutual knowledge, mutual beliefs, mutual assumptions and other mutual attitudes. There is widespread agreement about the importance of this factor in reference, but little consensus about its effect in information structure, reference tracking, etc. Givón (1983:10) notes the existence of ‘permanent’, ‘generic’ entries in the speakers’/hearers’ “discourse file”, including proper names, kinship terms, features of the universe, etc. These are actually “much less predictable” than other definite topics in terms of their position within the thematic paragraph”, and thus present interesting exceptions to the rules governing topic distribution of less permanent/unique information. (Givón 1983:10)

Perhaps the most encompassing contribution to the study of reference and anaphora, has been developed in recent years by Yan Huang (2000). In revisiting Gricean and neo-Gricean pragmatic theory, Huang contends that other models of reference (and focus) can be understood most simply by the Q[uality], I[nformativeness], and M[anner] principles of pragmatics. This current theory is important for us to bear in mind, however in taking such a broad (pragmatic) approach to the data, the linguist may compromise some of the predictive facility of continuity models (eg: Givón), hierarchy models (eg: Fox), and cognitive models (eg: Gundel et al., Lambrecht).

In this subsection, we have seen how theorists have approached questions in discourse from different perspectives, often using overlapping terminology. Some have used as their starting point the discourse/pragmatic context, and then observed the grammatical
tendencies in that environment (Givón 1983; Gundel et al. 1993). Others have first observed surface phenomena and then matched the discourse context and pragmatic motivations (Lambrecht 1994). Both of these strategies are of use for the analysis of Wangurri - firstly, the case study of topic continuity following Givón (1983) and others; secondly, the survey of discourse clitics - distribution, environment, and complementary focusing techniques.

2.2 Empirical Findings in Reference & Focus

Findings in natural languages reveal the complexity and range of discourse devices used in reference tracking, discourse cohesion, and semantic/contrastive focus. In this section, I present a small sample of these findings, with particular attention to Yolŋu languages related to Wangurri.

These case studies are simultaneously illustrative and instructive. To a great degree, the principles in the preceding section are developed in analysis and supported by data; it is also clear from these findings that in approaching discourse analysis, the linguist should keep an open mind about what discourse pragmatic factors may underlie grammatical phenomena in natural language.

2.2.1 Reference Phenomena

Studies in reference tracking (including papers in the volume edited by Givón, 1983) have shown the extent to which different languages employ different forms and structures to reflect the accessibility of referents in discourse, according to the hierarchy posited by Givón himself. Methodologically, this topic continuity model still offers the linguist the easiest access to the more obscure cognitive status, perception, and presupposition underlying speakers’ choices in reference and cohesion. By extension though, the accessibility/activation hierarchies are broadly attested cross-linguistically.

The averages generated by Givón’s measures of linear, nominal topic continuity commonly obscure the frequent exceptions to the principle of iconicity - where highly accessible referents receive markedly full referring expressions, and visa versa. Fox’s morpho-syntactic markedness principle is demonstrated in her analysis of nominal reference in English conversation and written narrative. Her study of word-order inversion in Tagalog allows greater generalisation in the rule of discourse structure and its influence over grammar, even beyond the scope of anaphora. In Tagalog, marked word-order inversion + ay particle occurs around episode breaks, and there is complementary incidence of unmarked, (non-inverted) phrases in non-initial slots. This phenomenon is also discussed
in relation to earlier hypotheses about Tagalog word-order inversion + ay. Previous analysis had associated the inversion + ay structure with agent roles as evidenced by case ergativity: the inversion + ay signals lowered agent topicality (in other words the marked structure appears when there is a less continuous referent in the agent role.). Fox finds this ergative/agentive explanation to be statistically deficient; the inversion + ay structure correlates more directly with the beginning of episodes in Tagalog (a slot also associated with lowered agent topicality). Information structure in word-order inversion and the ay particle is shown to be multifunctional, as indicator of agentivity, topic continuity, and discourse structure.

A similar finding of multifunctionality is presented in Stirling’s (2001) analysis of Amele, where switch-reference markers are not exclusively used in same/different subject environments. Stirling notes particular triggers for non-canonical different subject (DS) markers in Amele, especially “thematic breaks”. These include temporal or aspectual shifts, location shifts (or shifts from motion verbs to locatives), actuality and tense shifts, and discourse structure boundaries (eg: recapitulation clauses).

In Garrwa, overt clause linkage is not obligatory, but the presence of disjunction ngala (‘but’) between clauses signals some significant textual interactional meaning (Mushin 2005). “All nonsubordinated ngala-linked clauses expressed a shift in referent from the previous clause” (Mushin 2005:14), yet 80% of the subjects in the linked clause were ellipted (despite being ‘new’). Beyond topic continuity, ngala also signals some shift in narrative perspective, and so perspective in narrative structure provides a more comprehensive explanation for clause linkage strategies in Garrwa. Mushin (2005:26) concludes,

“linguistic phenomena normally associated with other aspects of narrative text structure (like temporal organisation and topic continuity) are also sensitive to the perspective structure of the text, and indeed may depend on our conceptual capacity to recognise subjective and objective contexts.”

In Javanese, Myhill (1997:246, 248) has found that sociocultural factors play a significant role in the speaker’s choice of referring expression. Javanese has two third person pronouns; the use of these referring expressions is informed by social class, inclusion, and empathy between participants. The -di pronoun is used in narrative clauses (temporal sequencing), the -dhewele pronoun is used in evaluative clauses, and “takes as its antecedent not the last person focused on, but the last person focused on
subjectively.” (Myhill 1997:237) This vast and elaborate set of factors in culture and perspective exert a direct influence over pronominal reference and topic coherence.

In their study of a Djinba (Yolŋu) language, Bickerdike, Campbell and Stirling (2005) found that in a Ganalbingu hunting narrative, more complex referring expressions were generally applied to referents which were less accessible, following Givón’s (1983) theory. Some exceptions to this principle are explained by the “referential indeterminacy” which is also found to be characteristic of other Australian languages (Garde 2002:181),

“a situation whereby the first mention of a referent does not provide the hearer with full recognition of the identity of the participant, and is often therefore indeterminate until further referential descriptors are later given ... Personal given names are not normally used to address, refer to, or identify an individual. The suspension of referent identity can extend for quite a period of text.” (Garde, 2002:182)

In Ganalbingu, there is some evidence to indicate that human and non-human entities receive different referential coding - basic and emphatic forms are more frequently applied to human referents, whereas complex referring expressions (eg: DEM+N, DET+PL+DEM+N+PRO) are more frequently applied to inanimate/non-human entities (Bickerdike, Campbell & Stirling 2005:25). Bickerdike et. al. also note that the occurrence of emphatic and complex expressions in the hunting narrative was quite low; findings between languages and texts may differ greatly depending on the number of main protagonists in texts, and their animacy (Bickerdike et al. 2005:26). In Kala Lagaw Ya (Stirling in preparation-b) and Mayali (Kim, Stirling & Evans 2001), there was also some correlation between the type of expression and the type of referent, in terms of ‘character’ or ‘prop’.

Narrative structure analysis further shows that reference in the Ganalbingu text is sensitive to episodic breaks. Orientation clauses (O) situate each episode, and subsequent developments in the episode (NC - narrative clauses) are often marked by the discourse/emphasis suffix -ani (generally on the verb). In addition to this, the main protagonists in new episodes were usually (re)introduced with complex or emphatic nominal referring expressions within first the couple of clauses. In two cases where complex or emphatic expressions did not introduce the main protagonist (first person referents), Bickerdike et. al. find that perspective, evaluative clauses seem to “focus” the audience’s attention in this circumstance.
Some of these interactions between discourse/pragmatic factors and discourse phenomena are represented graphically below.

Table 2: factors influencing discourse phenomena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Discourse Phenomena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>referential distance</td>
<td>referring expression/construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential interference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topic persistence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>episode breaks</td>
<td>marked referring expressions (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word-order inversion + ay particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tagalog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complex/emphatic introduction of main protagonist (Ganalbingu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highlight episodes</td>
<td>double reference (Kala Lagaw Ya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thematic breaks</td>
<td>non-canonical switch reference markers (Amele)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal/aspectual shifts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location shifts</td>
<td>third person pronouns -di and -dhewele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clause linkage ngala &amp; S ellipsis (Garnwa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjectivity / evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency / animacy</td>
<td>referring expressions (Ganbalbingu, Mayali, Kala Lagaw Ya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural indeterminacy</td>
<td>referential minimisation (Bininj Gun-wok)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linguists have noted a number of complicating factors in analysis of referential systems of Australian languages: demonstratives, split case systems, noun class markers in anaphora, and double reference (Heath 1984; Himmelmann 1996; Stirling in preparation-b). Several comprehensive grammars stand out for their attention to discourse-functional detail in the context of (morpho-)syntactic analysis: Gupapuyŋu (van der Wal 1992); Kuuk Thaayorre (Gaby 2006); Nunggubuyu (Heath 1984).

2.2.2 Focus Phenomena

The understanding of discourse clitics in Wangurri and related Yolŋu languages has to a great degree mirrored the macro traditions in linguistic thought. In the 1960’s, Beulah Lowe’s influential work in Gupapuyŋu broadly classified the cognate clitics (-nydja, -nha, and -dhi) as ‘emphasis’ and ‘style’ (Lowe 1960). Linguists have since suggested quite specific functions for the range of discourse suffixes in Yolŋu dialects. Buchanan (1978) and Ross (1980’s?) conclude that discourse suffixes in Djambarrpuyŋu and Gumatŋ
(respectively) are used by the speaker to signal inception and termination, beginnings and endings within the discourse. Ross’s (1980’s) paper is actually a tagmemic description of four main techniques in Gumatj emphasis, including suffixation, intonation, repetition and word order.

Tchekhoff and Zorc (1983) instead propose that the -nydjja suffix in Djambarrpuyŋu marks opposition/specification of a referent, and the -nha suffix is used as sequence marker (usually on verbs). Further, they propose that these suffixes act as switch reference markers, -nydjja for different subject, and -nha as same subject. This theory is furnished with useful examples, though this specific function is retracted in more recent studies of Djambarrpuyŋu, Gupapuyŋu (Wilkinson 1991; van der Wal 1992), and Ganalbingu (Bickerdike et al. 2005). Waters (1989), Morphy (1983) and Heath (1984) variously record contrastive or anaphoric functions. There are two points of agreement in this literature: the clitics function as focus/emphasis.

Though the distribution and function of emphatic suffixes on nominal expressions (particularly -ma) are not discussed in any detail by Bickerdike et. al., it is apparent from this reference tracking analysis that emphatic demonstratives, pronouns and nouns are not particularly sensitive to measures of referential distance, competition from other referents, or the persistence of the referent in subsequent text.

2.3 Approach to Wangurri

Given the limitations of this study, I am interested in the pattern of participant identification in the Wangurri texts - statistical regularities of nominal usage, and the correlation of contextual characteristics with functional / cognitive concepts (‘given’ / ‘new’). (Stirling in preparation-a:4) Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of this study to offer detailed narrative structure analysis, though this is certainly an avenue for future research into reference (and discourse clitics) in Wangurri.
In approaching the Wangurri data, I have first sought a discourse methodology which accounts for some of the key factors governing the speaker’s choice of referring expression. Givón’s (1983) theory and methodology of topic continuity is arguably the most enduring contribution to discourse theory of nominal reference. In comparison to the more “nebulous” realisations of thematic and action continuity, Givón identifies topic continuity as the most concrete expression of reference, as nominal constituents are most conveniently tracked through the discourse. He hypothesises that the key (quantifiable) factors determining the choice of referring expression are recency of last mention, the potential for ambiguity or confusion with other referents, and the persistence or importance of the referent. It is sufficient to mention here that from Givón’s first principles, we might expect the simplest expressions (eg: PRO, DEM, etc.) to encode referents which are readily accessible in the text, and more morphologically complex expressions (eg: PRO N, DEM-D, PN, etc.) to encode referents which are less readily accessible. Subsequent work has elaborated and developed this model of accessibility, and will later prove useful to explain further discourse data in Wangurri.

Following an overview of referring expressions in Wangurri, a section on methodology includes more detail on Givón’s methodology, and the approach taken to this data. The quantitative results will be compared with the hypothesis of accessibility, and the final discussion section demonstrates by example a range of discourse process(es) beyond topic continuity at work in Wangurri, including referential minimisation, maximisation and focus.

---

A term borrowed from Givón (1983:12).
3.1 Range of Referring Expressions

Wangurri employs a wide range of referring expressions, and the Funeral text is a good example of the complexity of many of these options and their combinations. The following list shows elements of the basic nominal group in Wangurri. Each of these options will in turn be described in more detail (and with examples).

- pronouns; (eg: ŋaya, 1SgNOM; ŋanapiliŋgu, 1PlExDAT ‘our’)
- nouns; (eg: bilma, ‘clapsticks’; dhāwu, ‘story’; yapa, ‘sister’)
- demonstratives; (eg: dhaŋu, ‘this’)
- small group of non-inflecting adjectives (eg: buwayaktji, ‘clever’)
- number (eg: burpar, ‘two’; four dhanal, ‘four of them’)
- embedded clauses (eg: dhaŋu [banha bäpa-wuy burrpur-wuy] djamarrkuli, ‘these children [that are of two fathers]’)

In addition to these basic options, at least two particular morphemes are involved in nominal reference.

- bilanya, discourse/reference marker
- -ya, anaphoric marker

Two discourse clitics in Wangurri also attach to nominal constituents. It should be noted that these clitics attach to words of almost any class or function in the Wangurri texts, excluding only modal particles and some conjunctions. The abovementioned ANAphoric suffix (-ya) may also occur with the discourse particles -ma or -nha.

- -ma/-m
- -nha/-n/-a,

The zero morpheme represents another option for reference in Wangurri - subject and object arguments may be deleted. The very common distribution of the zero anaphor must unfortunately be overlooked in this analysis, pending further investigation into argument structure and syntax of Wangurri (see section 3.1.7).

---

21 For the purposes of this study, the adjectives, classifiers, and number will be considered together under the category Augmented NP - see section below.
The reference features listed above are described in more detail below.

3.1.1 Pronouns

Wangurri comprises a full set of first, second and third person pronouns in singular and plural, with the first and second person pronouns also having a dual. The first person plural pronoun also has inclusive and exclusive forms to refer to the audience in the first person group.22 Another set of pronouns (glossed reflexive or emphatic in McLellan’s texts) may be used in a reciprocal environment with the basic form of the pronoun, or alone.

Pronouns may function as head of a nominal group, or as possessive pronoun in a noun phrase headed by another noun (eg: N, PN, N-KIN, etc). Pronouns inflect in a nominative-accusative system (transitive and intransitive clauses): NOMinative; ACCusative; DATive; ALLative; ABLative; LOCative; PERlative; ASSOCIative; ORiginative. This full case marking complements the free word order displayed by Wangurri, and will be found on many other parts of speech also. Possession is always expressed in the DATive case. Dative possessive pronouns feature prominently in the Funeral text, generally relating to possessed language, law and kin; example 1. below offers one such specimen.

1. Yukuyuku’miŋuŋ anapiliŋu banha yutjuwaŋa, njarru
yukuyuku’-minŋ anapiliŋu banha yutjuwaŋa njarru
younger_sibling-kin-prop pro that young but
n-Suff pro pro_refl
bukmak nhan gayŋa bayŋŋ layathanam rom nhanbay.
bukmak nhan gayŋa bayŋŋ layathan-ma rom nhan -bay
everyone 3SgNOMCont. Hab hold -Emph culture 3SgNOM-emph
n pro vpt Vbpt vt-D n pro_refl

Our little brother was the youngest, but he holds all the law himself. (Funeral 4.017)

Notice also from example 1. the sentence-final reflexive pronoun. The gloss has been borrowed from McLellan’s grammar of Wangurri, however this suffixed pronoun does also function without the respective basic pronoun, in some emphatic capacity, as in sentence-final position in example 2.

22 Paradigms presented in this section are borrowed from the McLellan’s (1989) analysis, with examples and elaborations of my own. (1989)
2. Nhumam ŋ arru gayŋa bokman yāna ga romma
nhuma -ma ŋ arru gayŋa bokman yana ga rom -ma
2DuNom -Emph must Cont. create still and culture -Emph
pro -D vpt-irr vpt vt-neu adv conj n -D
dhuwan ŋ anapiliŋuway.
dhuwan ŋ anapilingu -bay
that 1PlExDat -emph
dem pro -pro_refl

You (men) must still keep creating our own law. (Funeral 4.012)

Example 2. also offers an instance of a sentence initial subject (nominative) pronoun with a discourse clitic (D, -ma) attached.

3.1.2 Nouns

Nouns in Wangurri may function as head a nominal group, or as classifiers (by compounding or suffixing) of a nominal head. Listed below are the case markings applied to nouns according to the participant or circumstantial roles in a process. Nouns generally inflect in an ergative-absolutive system. In some cases, the suffixes are different according to the attribute +/- Human, so I have listed the two sets in the brackets respectively. It is common for accusative to apply to object nouns, as an expression of animacy of the referent.

Table 3: Nominal Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>+ Human</th>
<th>- Human</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERGative</td>
<td>-dhu</td>
<td>-dhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMinative</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCusative</td>
<td>-nha</td>
<td>-nha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATive</td>
<td>-gu</td>
<td>-gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLative</td>
<td>-guļi</td>
<td>-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLative</td>
<td>-guru</td>
<td>-ŋuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCative</td>
<td>-gura</td>
<td>-ŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERlative</td>
<td>-gurumuru</td>
<td>-muru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCiative</td>
<td>-guruy</td>
<td>-buy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORiginative</td>
<td>-guŋ</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRumental</td>
<td>-dhu</td>
<td>-dhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPoral</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-dhu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to basic nouns like *yapa* 'sister', *wāwa* 'brother', and *ŋaŋdi* 'mother', Wangurri utilises a proprietary suffix -'miŋu in kinship, as in example 4.

4. Ga Yurrwim ŋunha gayŋa məlkkurrnharra nyena ŋanapilingu ga Yurrwi-ma ŋunha gayŋa məlkkurr-nharrna nyena ŋanapilingu and Yurrwi-Emph that Cont. head-Priv sit oun(1PIExDat)
conj PN-disc Dem vpt n-priv vi pro

*yukuyuku*'-miŋu warra.
yukuyuku -'miŋu warra
younger_sibling-kinship-proprietive many people
n -N-KIN adj

*And there at Yurrwi, four of our younger brothers are living (Funeral 4.029)*

### 3.1.3 Demonstratives

The four demonstratives in Wangurri have a wide range of functions. They are also marked for case: (Object marked with ABSolute): ERGative; NOMinative; ACCusative; DATive; ALLative; ABLative; LOCative; PERlative; ASSOCiative; ORiginative; TEMPoral.

As spatial/temporal deictics, there is a four way distinction, summarised below (McLellan 1989:125). In this function, the demonstratives may be specifying the head of a nominal group and relating it to the proximity of the speaker by location or possession.

- *dhanu* – objects/locations in the vicinity of the speaker;
- *dhuwan* – objects/locations in the vicinity of the receiver;
- *ŋunha* – location some distance from the speaker;
- *banha* – textual deictic used for items with a known prior reference, either from the text itself or from shared knowledge. Banha and its temporal form *bayirŋ* are also used as conjunctions in subordinate clauses / relative pronoun ?

Demonstratives in Wangurri can stand alone, or in a nominal group, though the distinction between adnominal or pronominal is often problematic. McLellan (1989:125) notes that a demonstrative may even function as a determiner of a pronoun; in Gupapuyŋu, van der Wal (1992) identifies this as a focussing technique.
The most common manifestation of this technique in Wangurri is ŋunha + 3PRO.

5. Ga manikaylim ŋunhuŋ nhawun nhän
ga manikay-li-ma ŋunhuŋ nhawun nhän
and song-All-Emph that-Agent like 3SgNOM
conj n-Allative-D dem adv pro
ŋarakawalkal, ŋarakawalkal song_leader
n
He was the song leader for the songs. (Funeral 4.018)

In the funeral text, the demonstrative dhaŋu alongside a pronoun (1PRO) may also define the carrier of an attribute in a relational clause – though this function needs further exploration in other texts.

6. Ga rakaranharamim nhän bitjan, "Dhaŋu ŋaya ǹänarr
ga rakara-nhara-mi-ma nhän bitjan dhaŋu ŋaya ǹänarr
and tell -noml -Reflex -Emph he, she, it do_thus this I language
conj vt -noml -rflx -disc pro pro-vb dem pro n
warkmi; Yän warkmi ŋaya dhaŋu,"
wark -mi yän wark -mi ŋaya dhaŋu
work -having language work -having I this
n -noml n n -noml pro dem

And she said to herself, "I am a language worker; a language worker am I." (Funeral 4.077)

7. Dhaŋu nhangu gayilinydjil barrku.
dhaŋu nhangu gayilinydjil barrku
this his head far away
conj pro n vi

His head was far away. (Idiom: He was very clever.) (Funeral 4.052)

The non-configurational nature of Wangurri sometimes gives rise to some ambiguity in demonstrative reference. To some extent, the case system compensates for this potential ambiguity (as in example 5. above). In example 8., we see that the demonstrative may be functioning as a proximal (temporal) deictic as reflected in the free translation, or more generally as a paragraph-initial discourse marker. Alternately, the demonstrative may
appear co-referentially with the object referent (dhäwu, ‘story’) referent, as in example 9. the fronted demonstrative dhaŋu is the object of the verb garrun, ‘say’.23

8.  
Dhaŋum ṅaya gayŋa dhäwu rakaram, wänganyguruy.  
dhaŋu -ma ṅaya gayŋa dhäwu rakaram wängany -guruy  
this -Emph I Cont. story tell one -Assoc+-Hu  
dem -disc pro vpt n vtr num -assoc  

Now I am going to tell you a story about one person. (Funeral 4.074)  

9.  
Dhaŋu ṅaya gayŋa yana garrun.  
dhaŋu ṅaya gayŋa yana garrun  
this I Cont. still say  
dem pro vpt adv v  

I am still saying this (Funeral 4.006)  

Banha often functions as a relative pronoun, with or without other modifying or embedded elements (eg: RelCl, ADJ, etc.), as in examples 10. and 11.  

10.  
Yukuyuku’miŋu ŋanapilingu banha yutjuwala, ŋarru  
yukuyuku-miŋu ŋanapilingu banha yutjuwala ŋarru  
younger_sibling-kin-prop our(1PlExDat) that young but  
n-Suff pro dem adj conj  
bukmak nhan gayŋa baijiŋ ŋayathanam rom nhanbay.  
bukmak nhan gayŋa baijiŋ ŋayathan-ma rom nhan -bay  
everyone 3SgNOMCont. Hab hold -Emph culture 3SgNOM-emph  
n pro vpt Vbpt vt-D n pro_refl  

Our little brother was the youngest, but he holds all the law himself. (Funeral 4.017)  

11.  
ŋunha warra banha  
ŋunha warra banha  
that many people that  
Dem adj dem  
nyena gayŋa Miliŋinbi, four dhanal ŋunha.  
nyena gayŋa Miliŋinbi four dhanal ŋunha  
sit Cont. Miliŋinbi four they (pl) that  
vi vpt Prop-n num pro Dem  

Those people living over there at Milingimbi, four of them there, (Funeral 4.022)  

---

23 The effect of the clitic -ma on this initial demonstrative is unclear - the discussion is resumed in sections 3.4.1.3 below, and chapter 4.
3.1.4 Nominal Modifiers: Adjectives, Quantifiers

Wangany ‘one’ and burpar ‘two’ occur in the Funeral text as indefinite pronouns, as in example 8. above, and 12. below. When modifying a head noun/pronoun, they behave like other Wangurri adjectives (example 10. above). There are actually very few cases of noun modification (ADJ/QUANT) in the Funeral text.

12.
Dhaŋu gayŋa burpar nyena.
dhaŋu gayŋa burpar nyena
this Cont. two sit
dem vpt QUANT vi

Two are living there. (Funeral 4.027)

3.1.5 Anaphoric Reference

Bilanya (REF) has a range of discourse functions in structure and reference. A sample of examples is included below to demonstrate its range of uses. It is commonly associated with the ANAphoric suffix -ya.

13.
Bilanya-ya.
bilanya -ya
thus-Ana
ref -clitic

And that’s a fact! (Guny_4.015)

14.
Bilanyaya linygu nhawun yawungu ñanapiliny guñnharruman.
bilanya-ya linygu nhawun yawungu ñanapiliny guñnharruman
thus-Ana finished like recently us (1PIExAcc) leave
ref -clitic adv adv vpt pro vit

Like that, (he) left us recently. ("left us" is a euphemism for "died") (Guny_4.086)

It is remarkable here that the -ya suffix attached to bilanya is the only explicit coding of the younger brother referent in example 14.

3.1.6 Discourse Clitics

These are commonly termed ‘suffixes’ in the analyses of Yolŋu languages, however the freedom with which these clitics may attach to words of almost any class leads me to prefer the label ‘clitics’.24 As documented in chapter 2, there are very close equivalents in related Yolŋu languages. More detail on the distribution of -ma and -nha is included in chapter four. In the funeral text, 72% of the occurrences of -ma are instances of N-D.

24 Following also van der Wal (1992).
PRO-D or DEM-D. Though in other texts -nha does attach to nominal referents, this is hardly seen in the Funeral text and so this clitic is excluded from this analysis.

Where the data is sufficient, words with -ma are documented as a separate reference options in the Givónian analysis, because I am interested in their distribution as a function of discourse cohesion. The accusative case (-nha/-ny) poses an interesting challenge as it may function to give prominence to some items (McLellan 1989:132), yet contrasts with the discourse clitic -nha/-n. Again, the paucity of data and exclusion of this clitic in the Givónian analysis avoids this issue.

3.1.7 Zero
Several examples here illustrate the prolific zero morpheme, but also the problems in its analysis. In example 15. below, the sentence initial demonstrative appears as the fronted object of the first clause (4.006); note the subsequent clause (4.007) may lack subject and direct object arguments.25

15.  
Dhaŋu  ngaŋ  gayŋa  yana garrun.  
dhaŋu ngaŋ gayŋa yana garrun  
this  I  Cont.  still  say  
dem  pro  vpt  adv  v

I am still saying this (Funeral 4.006)

Rakaram yalalaŋuwu  djamarrkuĮ'wu.  
rakaram yalala -ŋu -ku  djamarrkuį -ku  
tell  later  -Noml  -dat  children-dat  
vtr  adv  -noml  -case  n  -case

telling (it) for the children to come. (Funeral 4.007)

Similarly in example 16., in order to posit zero argument(s), more should be known about the argument structure of the initial verb/phrase.

16.  
Dhawaŋtthuman,  ŋanapu  ŋarru  marrparaŋdjin.  
dhawatthun ma-a  ŋanapu  ŋarru  marrparaŋ tji  -n  
emerge-Neu-Caus-Foc  we  (1PIExNom)  will  peace-Inchoative-Foc  
vi  -Caus -Clitic  pro  vpt-irr  n-Inch  -Clitic

(When they) bring it out into the open, we will be at peace. (Guny_4.031)

25 Note the relation of the neighbouring verbs across the perceived clause break, ‘garrun’ say, ‘rakaram’ tell - further analysis is needed into these common constructions and verbal relations.
Example 17. below illustrates the obscurity of the deceased referent in the clause -bilanya-ya (REF ANA) refer either to the singer/song leader, or to the preceding proposition. Another possibility for reference to the deceased person in this segment, is the initial demonstrative banha, which elsewhere in the text is commonly referring to the deceased person, but is translated freely here as a temporal deictic.

17. Ga banha ŋäṯjil bilanyamiyu djulktuwan, bilanya linygu ga banha ŋäṯjil bilanya -mi-dhu djulktuwan bilanya linygu and that before thus -having-Temp went_ahead thus finished conj dem temp ref -noml -temp vit-P ref adv
gakal ga bilanyayu linygu ġalkarra ga manikaywu, ḋe? gakal ga bilanya-ya linygu ġalkarra ga manikay-ku ḋe skill and thus-Ana finished ceremonial_law and song -dat tag_ques n conj ref -clitic adv n conj n -case tag

And then, before that time, a highly skilled singer and song leader went ahead (died), see? (Funeral 4.085)

We will return to a fuller discussion of this kind of referential indeterminacy in a subsequent discussion (section 3.4.2). At this stage, the consistent identification of zero anaphora in a Givónian analysis is dependent on other unknowns in Wangurri grammar, and so must unfortunately be overlooked.

3.2 Methodology

In the typical Givónian analysis, the linguist identifies key references in a discourse – often noting such features as grammatical role, or limiting the study to subject noun phrases or third person referents. Quantitative measures are then applied in order to track these referents through the discourse. Referential distance (RD) is calculated by counting the number of clauses since the previous mention of a given referent – 20 being the maximum value for long absences or first mentions, 1 being the minimum value for a referent present in the preceding clause. Another measure of the availability of a referent to the listener, is the presence of other referents which may introduce ambiguity or interference. Though different measures have been applied to this Potential Interference (PI), Givón counts the number of semantically or grammatically compatible referents in the preceding five clauses. In addition to these considerations of textual availability, Givón introduces a third measure – that of topic persistence (TP) – where the mentions of a referent in subsequent, consecutive clauses are counted, as an approximation of the prominence of that topic. Others have varied this measure to allow for interruptions and narrative
detours (Stirling in preparation-a:17-18). In these more liberal analyses, the linguist may count the number of mentions of the referent throughout the whole text, or its recurrence in a given set of succeeding clauses.

In agreement with principles of gestalt psychology and iconicity, Givón assumes that what is continuing is more predictable, and what is predictable is easier to process (1983:12). By correlating the form of the referring expression with the measures of continuity, Givón posits a hierarchy to govern the speaker’s choice of referring expression.

![Hierarchy Diagram]

Most accessible/continuous
- zero anaphora
- PRO
- R-dislocated DEF-NP’s
- neutral-ordered DEF-NP’s
- L-dislocated DEF-NP’s
- Y-moved NP’s (contrastive topicalisation)
- cleft/focus constructions
- referential indefinite NP’s

Least accessible/discontinuous

As this hierarchy shows, the more readily accessible referent will be coded with a less complex referring device, and the more obscure or discontinuous referent will be coded with a fuller referring device. Along this continuum, languages use a different selection of coding points – syntactic devices such as word order, morphology, intonation or their possible combinations. Givón allows for coding variations, such as a numeral “one” to affect contrasts such as those of importance (1983:26-27), and the complimentary distribution of word order and topic-marking or (in)definitising morphemes (1983:33-34). Though these morphosyntactic subsystems, and the relationship between reference and thematic prominence receive little attention in the early work of Givón and others, they are the inspiration for further investigation in reference and grammar.

Certain features in languages have also posed particular challenges to the quantitative methodology. On one level, it is significant that certain syntactic complexities in Australian languages challenge basic linear measurements of topic continuity. These variations might be expected if relations of topic continuity are indeed understood to be in a
hierarchical relationship with other systems of continuity: action and theme. This possibility will be resumed in the subsequent discussion section, and in chapter four. In the ensuing analysis of the Funeral text, I have included nominal referents in subject and object roles, excluding temporal or spatial expressions, (including place names.) Though the results shown in table 1. exclude first and second person pronouns, I have included these referents in a more liberal count for subsequent discussion surrounding cliticisation.

Table 4 offers a sample of the reference tracking method as it is applied to the Funeral text. References within clauses (eg: Dhuwa and Yirritja within the reference #22 to children) are counted as separate. Table 4 also shows how possessive (Dative) pronouns are included in the broader analysis (reference #23 - clan, see also section 3.4.1.1), though the first and second person pronouns will be excluded from the Givónian analysis (Table 5).

Table 4: Sample Givónian measurements: participant, form & key factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause #</th>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.008</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>dhanal</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.009</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>dhuwalitjana-ya</td>
<td>DEM-ANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.009</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>yumurrku-yu ŋanapilinguru</td>
<td>N PRO  PN PL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.009</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>clan</td>
<td>ŋanapilinguru</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.009</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dhuwa moiety</td>
<td>dhuwa-yu warra-yu</td>
<td>PN PL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yirritja moiety</td>
<td>yirritja-yu</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recall from chapter two that Givón posited the thematic paragraph, with constituent thematic>action>topic continuities.

Some uncertainty surrounds the use of demonstratives, but the case markings lend enough certainty to this analysis of which demonstratives function as situational deictics, and which demonstratives function as nominal reference in the discourse.

Most first and second pronouns in this text are actually possessive (dative) pronouns. These are listed twice in the more liberal analysis: 1. with the possessed noun, and 2. as a separate reference (to the possessor).
There are several excerpts of reported speech in the Funeral text, and these have been included in the Givónian analysis. Reported speech is often introduced quite clearly in the text, however the closing boundaries of reported speech sections are difficult or impossible to distinguish from the written text alone. The inclusion of reported speech also offers more reference data, and it seems that in this particular text, issues of deixis in reported speech do not interfere too much with the relevant measures.29

3.3 Results: A Distributional Analysis of Referring Expressions

The aggregate results of the Givónian analysis are in broad agreement with Givón’s principle of accessibility. A summary of the options in reference are here placed on the scale from most accessible, to least accessible; the options are listed here according to (backward looking) referential distance.30

Most accessible/continuous

1. PRO
2. ANA
3. DEM
4. DEM N
5. N/PN/N-KIN
6. INDEF/QUANT/ADJ NP

Least accessible/discontinuous

The results tabulated below are the average counts in the Givónian analysis of the funeral text. The reference options are numbered, and ordered from the least average referential distance figure, through to the greatest. As mentioned above, this list of 6 main reference classes and 14 subclasses is a simplified list: where similar types of referring expressions have been grouped together, and more optional/variable features of nominal expressions have been overlooked.

29 For a fuller discussion of this question of reported speech, I refer the reader to (Bickerdike et al. 2005)

30 Recall that zero anaphora (∅) also belongs somewhere on this scale - almost certainly in the uppermost slot, ahead of pronominal reference.
Table 5: Quantitative distribution of Wangurri reference options in Funeral text. (141 incidences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option #</th>
<th>Reference Option</th>
<th>Number of Incidences</th>
<th>Average Referential Distance (RD)</th>
<th>Average Potential Interference (PI)</th>
<th>Average Topic Persistence (TP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a.</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b.</td>
<td>PRO-REFLX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a.</td>
<td>REF (ANA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b.</td>
<td>DEM ANA (dhaŋu/ dhuwal)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a.</td>
<td>DEM (dhaŋu)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b.</td>
<td>DEM (banha)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a.</td>
<td>DEM D N (dhaŋu)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b.</td>
<td>DEM N (dhaŋu)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a.</td>
<td>N (PRO)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c.</td>
<td>DEM D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b.</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c.</td>
<td>N D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d.</td>
<td>N-KIN (PRO)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>INDEF (N) / QUANT (N) / ADJ N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Discussion

3.4.1 Referential Distance

There are a number of observations to be made about these 14 options and the respective measurements. The steady cline of referential distance (RD) measurements and the correlating types of reference options suggest that the recency of last mention is a key factor in the speaker's choice of referring expression in this text. In very many cases, the other measurements of potential interference (PI) and topic persistence (TP) offer further insight into accessibility in Wangurri.

Discourse clitics add morphological complexity to referring expressions in Wangurri, and the assignment of discourse clitics is more or less in agreement with Givón's hierarchy of continuity; in most cases, the basic referring form (without D) is used in reference to more readily accessible referents, whereas the cliticised form is chosen in environments of...
greater referential distance. A discussion of this process is included in the sections below.

3.4.1.1 Pronouns

In the funeral text, the only instances of PRO D involved first and second person pronouns. From other texts in the Wangurri corpus, we know that the discourse clitics can and do attach to third person pronouns, but there may be a number of explanations for the fact that this does not occur in the Funeral text. Out of the 83 pronoun references (including first and second person pronouns), only 15 of these pronouns are third person. This relatively low use of third person pronoun is consistent with two factors in Wangurri: firstly, the existence of a prolific zero anaphor, and secondly, the extensive use of the demonstrative pronoun, both for animate and inanimate reference. The table below includes the first and second person references in order to contrast the pronoun counts with and without the discourse clitic.

Table 6: Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Reference Option</th>
<th>Number of Incidences</th>
<th>Average Referential Distance</th>
<th>Average Potential Interference</th>
<th>Average Topic Persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>PRO (3 person ONLY)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c</td>
<td>PRO (1, 2 &amp; 3 person)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.d</td>
<td>PRO D (1 &amp; 2 person)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of things to note here. Firstly, the discourse clitic is added to referents which are less accessible to the speaker on every count: distance (average RD = 7 clauses since last mention, compared with 3.86); ambiguity (PI = .63, more than twice the interference present for PRO without D); and prominence (TP = .88, lower than options a. & c. without the clitic). These preliminary results suggest that Wangurri discourse clitics may be highly sensitive to the accessibility/continuity of pronominal referents.

3.4.1.2 Anaphoric Reference

As may be expected, the minimal reference of bilanya and -ya are used with referents of high accessibility. The higher TP measurement for expressions with bilanya may indicate some function in adding prominence or focus to a constituent. Like references including demonstrative expressions (3.4.1.3), anaphoric reference is also used in situations of
relatively high potential interference. This is reminiscent of Himmelmann’s anaphoric demonstrative - serving to single out a referent from competing (activated) referents.

3.4.1.3 Demonstratives

From the measures of Potential Interference and Topic Persistence, we can observe that Wangurri demonstratives frequently occur in referring environments where there is higher potential interference (PI=.59, compared with a lower average in expressions without demonstratives, PI=0.39). Referring expressions including demonstratives also tend to occur in environments where there is lower topic persistence (the referent of demonstrative expressions is on average continuous for .53 clauses following the reference, nearly half the measure of subsequent topic persistence for referents coded without demonstratives, TP=.97).

Table 7: Comparison of PI & TP: expressions with/without demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Potential Interference</th>
<th>Average Topic Persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM expressions</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.b, 3.a, 3.b, 4.a, 4.b, 3.c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressions without DEM</td>
<td>0.39 (.37)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.a, 1.b, 2.a, 5.a, 5.b, 5.c, 5.d, 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures suggest that demonstrative expressions in the funeral text are commonly used to single out a referent. The greater backward referential distance, and the lower consecutive topic persistence seem to support the theory that the demonstratives track particular referents through the entire discourse, or are used to identify referents in the hearer’s specific, shared knowledge. These functions correspond with Himmelmann’s (1996) ‘tracking’ and ‘recognitional’ uses of demonstratives.

Of the four demonstratives, dhaŋu does also function commonly as a discourse deictic, referring to the text itself. In the funeral text, there is some ambiguity surrounding the reference of this demonstrative in the discourse deictic function – dhaŋu occurs alone in reference either to the story/text, or to the law which the speaker has introduced and which features so prominently in this substantial text. The distinction between the recognitional (in this case cultural) reference, or discourse deictic reference may be

31 Recall that situational deictics (eg: demonstratives of space/time) were excluded from this quantitative analysis, following Givón (1983).
arbitrary – it is clear that the story/text, and the language/culture/law expounded by the speaker are semantically linked.

The addition of clitics to demonstratives in the Wangurri text is more complex. This discussion will use as a basis for discussion Himmelmann’s (1996) classification of demonstratives.

Table 8: Distribution of demonstrative reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option #</th>
<th>Reference Option</th>
<th>Number of Instances</th>
<th>Average Referential Distance</th>
<th>Average Potential Interference</th>
<th>Average Topic Persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>DEM (dhaŋu)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b</td>
<td>DEM (banha)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>DEM D N (dhaŋu)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>DEM N (dhaŋu)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c</td>
<td>DEM D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 8, we can observe a number of anomalies - firstly, a morphologically more complex form (DEM D N), occurs with a lower average referential distance figure, than its simpler realisations (DEM N and DEM D). The clitic in option 4.a does seem to occur in environments with higher potential interference and higher topic persistence than options #4.b and #3.c, but these figures are still lower than option #3.b - where the dhaŋu demonstrative occurring alone. Demonstratives (with and without clitics) in Wangurri appear to function in discourse cohesion and focus, rather than linear topic continuity.

More evidence is found for this position in the consistency with which certain demonstrative references are used of certain referents (or types) of references - eg: text (dhaŋu), deceased people (banha). When attached to demonstratives in this funeral text, the choice of demonstrative and clitic relates primarily to the referent and its thematic prominence in the text. Of the 36 references to the semantic domain of language, law or speech act, 25 of these include the demonstrative dhaŋu. These phenomena will also be discussed in sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 below; culturally-motivated processes in referential minimisation/magnification offer some explanation for these anomalies in measurements and distribution of demonstrative reference.
In the Funeral text, there are no instances of ŋunha+D. This is perhaps complementary to the observation that the third person pronoun in the Funeral text does not take the discourse clitic, and that together the ŋunha and 3PRO automatically focuses the referent; we will return to this discussion of demonstratives in thematic/semantic focus relations in chapter four.

In this text, demonstratives offer a middle-order reference option for the Wangurri speaker, however the Givónian analysis offers limited explanations for the distribution of demonstratives (and DEM+D) in Wangurri reference.

3.4.1.4 Nouns
The results in nominal reference are in support of Givón’s principle of iconicity - the average referential distance from last mention is 10.95 for nouns. The D clitic is added to nouns with a greater average referential distance, and this is yet another indication that the D clitic on nominals is used in (re-)activation and/or focus. The proprietary kin suffix is also applied to less accessible referents (as measured by RD=15.29).

3.4.1.5 Augmented Nouns
There were few incidences of adjective and quantifiers, and so in the table they are included in the figures (RD=15.8, PI=0.2, TP=2.6) with indefinite reference (reference option #6).

3.4.1.6 Indefinite Reference
The high referential distance measurement for indefinite reference (wangany ‘one’) is also in agreement with Givón’s own hierarchy of accessibility, and also Gundel, Hedberg, Zacharski’s (1993) givenness hierarchy, where the least activated or identifiable referent may be coded by an indefinite reference. The referential distance for indefinite pronouns is 18.75, and the topic persistence is also unsurprisingly high, given the frequency with which this reference option is used in introducing referents (TP=2.6). This leads us to a discussion of sociocultural influence over reference, in minimisation and magnification.

3.4.2 Referential Minimisation
It is apparent from the analysis of accessibility in the Funeral text, that Wangurri speakers often frame reference in a way which requires maximum inference by the hearer. In situations where the distance since last mention is high, the speaker may yet choose a minimal referring expression. In the following example, it is unclear from the context what exactly is living at Dhäliny. The subsequent clause (4.027) introduces “two”; from subsequent clauses it seems that these references may be to the speaker’s other brothers.
18.
Bilanya bitjan ŋunha Dhälinyŋa gayŋa nyena.
bilanya bitjan ŋunha Dhäliny -ŋa gayŋa nyena
thus do_thus that Dhäliny -Loc Cont. sit
ref pro-vb Dem prop-n -locative vpt vi

Always there at Dhäliny, it is living. (Funeral 4.026)

Dhauŋu gayŋa burrpar nyena.
dhauŋu gayŋa burrpar nyena
this Cont. two sit
dem vpt num vi

Two are living there. (Funeral 4.027)

Another minimal reference occurs several clauses later (Example 19., Funeral 4.030). It is possible that the indefinite reference in example 18. (4.026) is an appeal to the speaker’s shared knowledge of the place, Dhäliny, and associated law or custom (or ownership of these customs/laws). At this point, it would be inappropriate to speculate too much about the reason for the referential minimisation, except to say that the minimal reference in 4.026 may be an instance of indefinite introduction of character(s), or a veiled reference to some shared cultural knowledge. Similar phenomena have been noted in other Australian languages, and the terminology is taken from Garde. (2002)

19.
Nhätha dhanal ŋarru ŋunhuŋ rom warraṯthun,
hätha dhanal ŋarru ŋunhuŋ rom warraṯthun
when they (Pl) will that-Temp culture collect
adv pro vpt-irr dem n v
warrŋulkum dhanalinguway,
warrŋul -ku- -ma dhanalingu -bay
outside -Caus- -Emph their (3PlDat) -emph
adv -Caus- -disc pro -pro_refl
rarrrkum dhanalinguway banhaya ŋayaŋu
rarrrkum dhanalingu -bay banha -ya ŋayaŋu
reveal their, (3PlDat)-emph which -Ana inner_being
vtr pro -pro_refl conj -clitic n
djäl, bilanya?
djäl bilanya
desire thus
n ref

When will they take up that law, bring themselves into the open, reveal themselves, which their inner beings desire. (Funeral 4.030)
I refer the reader to the following sections of the text (Appendix A: Funeral) for some more extended examples of Referential Minimisation.

Table 9: Sections of referential minimisation in the Funeral text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant(s)</th>
<th>Clause(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>4.027-4.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clever one (deceased younger brother)</td>
<td>4.032-4.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baṭawatja (Marilyn McLellan)</td>
<td>4.074-4.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another deceased person (? earlier)</td>
<td>4.085-4.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3 Referential Magnification

In contrast to the seemingly vague references documented above, there is a complementary process at work in the Wangurri Funeral text. The speaker introduces certain key themes of the text by using complex or emphatic noun phrases, even when the referent is highly accessible from the text, and highly activated in the hearer's mind (ie: in psychological focus, per Gundel 1999). The prime example of this is in the setting of the funeral text, where language/law is referred to repeatedly with full expressions. This magnification is best represented by the following table, where the references to this key theme are listed with their corresponding forms and measures of RD, PI and TP.

Table 10: Referential magnification in the Funeral text: 4.001-4.012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause #</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.001</td>
<td>law/language</td>
<td>dhanu-m</td>
<td>DEM-D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.001</td>
<td>law/language</td>
<td>wangany (nhawun) rom ężanapilingu djanaku yan-gu Wangurri-wu bāpurru-wu</td>
<td>INDEF ADV N PRO DEM N PN N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.001</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>djanaku yan-gu</td>
<td>DEM N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.002</td>
<td>law/language</td>
<td>dhanu-m banha rom</td>
<td>DEM-D DEM N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.002</td>
<td>law/language</td>
<td>ężanapilingu rom</td>
<td>PRO N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.004</td>
<td>law/language</td>
<td>dhanu-ya-m rom</td>
<td>DEM-ANA-D N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.004</td>
<td>law/language</td>
<td>dhanu-ya rom</td>
<td>DEM-ANA N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.006</td>
<td>speech act/law/language</td>
<td>dhanu</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause #</td>
<td>Participant Form</td>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.009</td>
<td>speech act/law/language</td>
<td>dhuwalitjana-ya</td>
<td>DEM-ANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.010</td>
<td>law/language</td>
<td>dhaŋu-ya rom banha nganapilingu</td>
<td>DEM-ANA N RELCL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.012</td>
<td>law/language</td>
<td>rom-ma dhuwan nganapilingu-way</td>
<td>N-D DEM PRO-REFLX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Summary

From this analysis, we can conclude that nominal reference in the Funeral text is influenced by three key factors in the discourse context - referential distance, potential interference, and topic persistence. Demonstratives are of special use to the speaker in singling out a referent in the context of potential interference, or low topic persistence. The proximal demonstrative *dhaŋu* is also of use in referential magnification (often with full noun phrases) - to establish a key theme in the discourse. Referential minimisation is also applied to the grammar of reference in this text - especially in reference to deceased participants and shared cultural knowledge. It is also common for the Wangurri speaker, when introducing a character, to suspend the referent identity for a period of text.
Chapter 4

Focus in Wangurri

It is apparent from existing literature on Yolŋu languages that these languages contain a rich system of focussing techniques. As observed in the results of the Givónian analysis, there are many situations in which a very highly accessible and continuous referent receives an expression which is disproportionately complex (eg: full NP, clitic, etc.) Theories in focus should contribute something to this conundrum. A quantitative distribution of the discourse clitics -ma and -nha offers some preliminary ideas for their multiple functions in discourse. Following this, I proceed to a discussion of the more marked incidences of these clitics, and associated morphosyntax. Complementary linguistic phenomena which seem to be motivated by focussing relations will be summarised and demonstrated (eg: demonstratives, fronting, and repetition). The aim of this chapter is to present some preliminary findings, highlighting further possibilities for corpus-based and field research. Conclusions to these discussions are also dependent on further analyses of Wangurri narrative (eg: genre, structure, repetition), syntax (eg: ellipsis, fronting), demonstrative uses and prosody.32

4.1 Clitic Focus

From chapter three, it is clear that on an aggregate level, discourse clitics on Wangurri nominal expressions occur on referents that are less continuous in the Funeral text. In other words, the clitic adds morphological complexity to referring expressions that are less accessible on Givón’s hierarchy of topic continuity - referents that are newer, or needing (re)activation. We have seen that Givón’s principle of iconicity and measures of

32 The limitations of this study are apparent - most obviously, the lack of prosodic analysis (which would require the recordings of the Wangurri corpus, and a good chunk of time in transcription). Add to that my own temporal, cultural and geographical removal from the discourse situations.
topic continuity offer some useful insight into the functions of discourse clitics and other complex reference phenomena in Wangurri. The binary legacy of ‘topic’ and ‘focus’ reminds us that as the clitics occur on referents that are often (but not exclusively) ‘newer’, they are quite probably involved in semantic/contrastive focusing functions.\textsuperscript{33}

4.1.1 -ma

In a count of 190 incidences of -ma in four texts, it was found that this clitic most commonly attaches to constituents in the nominal group (a tendency already observed in the reference tracking analysis of chapter 3). The pie chart below shows the average % distribution of the clitic over all four texts.

\begin{center}
\textbf{\% distribution of -ma (4 texts, 190 incidences)}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\pie{25/\textit{V}, 24/\textit{N/PN/N-KIN}, 18/\textit{DEM}, 17/\textit{PRO}, 16/\textit{other}}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

Once again, we encounter some issues in the application of averages to discourse phenomena, in this case across a corpus of different texts. Table 11. shows the variation between texts in the distribution of the clitic -ma. The three speakers are indicated in the brackets.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Text} & \textbf{\% Distribution of -ma} \\
\hline
\textit{Text A} & 25\% \\
\hline
\textit{Text B} & 24\% \\
\hline
\textit{Text C} & 18\% \\
\hline
\textit{Text D} & 17\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{33} In pursuing the study of focus in Wangurri, I am following the hunches of linguists who have worked for long periods of time in these languages, and theorists who see the operations of “activation” and “focus” as related but separate (Lambrecht 1994) As I have stated earlier, I do not expect this academic lead to offer all of the answers that a narrative structure analysis might, for example.
Table 11: Numerical distribution of -ma (4 texts, 190 incidences) - Part of Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT (Speaker)</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>N/PN/N-KIN</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funeral (Guny)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycad Nut (Guny)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat Fish (B)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cake (Gany)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though it has been noted that the use of clitics varies between Yolŋu language speakers, this table graphically represents the extent of this variation. Further, the variation is not merely between speakers - the greatest contrasts are found between the two texts spoken by Gunydjirryirr (‘Funeral’ and ‘Cycad Nut’). The frequency of the -ma clitic in the texts varies greatly: the Funeral text is the longest of the four texts, yet it contains a total of just 43 -ma clitics, compared with 110 instances of -ma in the Cycad Nut text. In the Funeral text, 72% of the -ma clitics occur on nominal referents (DEM, PRO, N), compared with just 52% in the Cycad Nut Text. Compare also the 68% of -ma clitics on nominal constituents in the Fat Fish text, but the surprisingly high count of -ma on a wide range of ‘other’ parts of speech (25%) - adverbs (x2), prepositions (x1), adjectives (x3), idiomatic expression (x1). When this is considered with the high proportion of -ma clitics attached to parts of speech associated with the predicate in the Cycad Nut and Cake Texts (well over a third).

It appears from these variations that the distribution of clitics is sensitive to the content, type or genre of the text. This is an important disclaimer to the following examples featuring -ma: it would be hasty to posit an ‘unmarked’ status of -ma on nominal constituents.

The clitic -ma adds general semantic focus to the item to which it is attached. This theory is in broad agreement with van der Wal’s (1992) finding in Gupapuyŋu. In the following example, it is attached to the demonstrative bearing reference to the cycad nut food (theme of the story), and the ylipili ‘bag’ - which is also of key significance as a prop, and also as a ‘shibboleth’ of the Wangurri clan.
1. Nhäma nhän ḋarru banhaŋ balayaŋ ṭathãa ḏingu, nhäma nhän ḋarru banhaŋ balayaŋ ṭathãa ḏingu, see-Neu he,she,it Irr which -Emph That-way -Ana food cycad vt pro vpt dem -disc deictic -clitic n n
g yilipim nhän ḋarru ḋarra banha gutjparrun. ga yilipi -ma nhän ḋarru ḋarra banha gutjparrun and bag -Emph he, she, it Irr go which carry conj n -disc pro vpt vi dem vt-neu

She will see that cycad food, and she will go carrying the bags. (Cycad Nut 1.006)

When -ma is attached to a verb, as happens frequently in the procedural text (Cycad Nut), it may signal a switch in the tense/mood/aspect from the previous clause. It seems that this occurrence is not so much associated with episode boundary as a shift in action continuity. This tendency is complementary with the SEQuence function of the -nha clitic on verbs, as observed by others (Tchekhoff & Zorc 1983; Bickerdike et al. 2005).

In Wangurri, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that -ma functions as a switch-reference marker. Though there are cases where subject switch (or maintenance) is signalled by the occurrence of either or both clitics (-ma and -nha), there are many instances of switch-reference in which the clitics do not occur. It is more likely that -ma (as in the case of tense/aspect/mood) serves to mark a “surprise” shift - either in referent or action.

4.1.2 -nha
The clitic -nha in the Wangurri texts is usually associated with the predicate - in 54% of cases on the verb itself, and in 16% of cases on related temporal or negative constituents. Below is the figure of (average) distribution, and table 12 contains the counts of -nha in the four texts.

Table 12: Numerical distribution of -nha (4 texts, 135 incidences) - Part of Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT (Speaker)</th>
<th>TEMP</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funeral (Guny)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycad Nut (Guny)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat Fish (B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cake (Gany)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main function of -nha is in action continuity. As in Ganalbingu (Bickerdike et al. 2005), clauses which advance the timeline of the narrative (Labov’s Narrative Clauses) very commonly contain this discourse clitic. In Wangurri, there is a very strong correlation between the bala (deictic) and -nha. It seems that clauses which contain this deictic (variously glossed ‘that way’ or ‘then’) also contain a verb or temporal constituent with -nha attached.

2. Njapilingum
   yawungun -n djinaŋ -n bala
   (1PIExDat)-Emph yesterday -Foc this (agent) -Foc that-way
   pro-disc vpt -Clitic Dem -Clitic deictic
   dhungarrayu malŋ’tun dhanjum yän, rom.
   dhungarra -dhu malŋ’tun dhanu -ma yän rom
   year -Temp appear this -Emph language culture
temp -temp vi dem -disc n n

This language, law, recently, this year, now, appeared for us. (Funeral 4.041)

3. Gäthuna
   njarra ga-ga-ga gali’tjin bala
   gäthun-nha njarra ga-ga-ga gali’-tji -nha bala
   walk-Foc go on_and_on side -Inchoative -Foc That-way
   vi-neu-Clitic vi adv n -Inch -Clitic deictic
   bàŋ wanitjumana.
   bàŋ wanitjum -nha
cycad pick -Foc
n vt-neu -Clitic

Keep walking on and on, to the place. (Cycad Nut 1.008)
The clitic -nha functions also in contrastive focus, especially when attached to negative constructions.

4. 
Gulitjma ꪑangawulnha ꪑanapilingura ꪑapana
Gulitj-ma ꪑangawul-nha ꪑanapilingura ꪑapana -ŋa
true-Emph neg -Foc in,on or at us (1PLExLoc) back -Loc
adj-disc neg -Clitic pro n -locative

gayŋa nyena ŋarru.
gayŋa nyena ŋarru
Cont. sit will
vpt vi vpt-irr

It will not be living truly "at our backs" (idiom: in the children, descendents, those who follow us) (Guny_4.014)

4.1.3 -way/bay (REFLX), bilanya (REF) & -ya (ANA)
The results of the Givónian analysis in chapter 3 indicate that the use of these optional particles in reference may indicate psychological focus. Referents coded by these expressions are highly accessible to the hearer, yet the speaker may choose to focus the activated referent by anaphoric or reflexive reference.

4.2 Demonstratives
In Wangurri, as in Gupapuyŋu, ŋunya adds semantic focus to a third person pronoun. This phenomena to some degree eliminates the need for cliticisation on third person pronouns, and the demonstrative ŋunya.

5. 
Ga djamarrku ꪑiŋ arru Yirritja warra bayŋ dhanal
Ga djamarrku ꪑiŋ arru Yirritja warra bayŋ dhanal
and children should moiety_name many people that-Temp they (Pl)
conj n vpt-irr n adj dem pro

ŋarru ŋunhuŋ waḏalkuman dhanalinguway, manikay
ŋarru ŋunhuŋ waḏalkuman dhanalinguway -bay manikay
will that-Agent show_out their (3PIDat) -emp song
vpt-irr dem vtr pro -pro_refl n

woŋunhuŋ nhä ḏalkarra.
woŋunhuŋ nhä ḏalkarra
or anything else song_leader
n conj adv-ph n

And these children should be Yirritja when they bring out the songs or anything else, song leader, themselves. (Funeral 4.066)
Recall from chapter three that amongst the 83 pronouns in the funeral texts, only 15 were third person references, and none of these third person pronouns bore discourse clitics. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that clitics often lend semantic focus to the referent. In using the third person pronoun (in preference to zero anaphor, or a demonstrative pronoun), the speaker is already adding semantic focus to that referent. The counts indicate that in this instance (third person pronoun without D), the information is not necessarily new to the text (average RD = 1), yet the presence of the comparatively rare third person pronoun is itself focussing the hearer's attention on the referent. A discourse clitic in this environment may be superfluous. Another argument in support of this, is the option for the speaker to combine the third person referent with the demonstrative (see below). In other words, third person pronouns may inherently signal semantic and textual prominence, and beyond this, a demonstrative is available to add focus.

The demonstrative dhaŋu seems to function on some level in thematic continuity - in the Funeral text, it was less sensitive to topic continuity measures, and most frequently used in referential magnification (eg: language/law/speech act). This seems to add focus and prominence to the proposition.

4.3 Summary
From this preliminary survey of discourse clitics in Wangurri, we can affirm that these clitics function most generally in semantic/contrastive focus. There is great potential for future research into complementary features (fronting, repetition, prosody), and cognitive interface of reference and focus.
In this thesis, we have observed the relationship of reference and focus in Wangurri discourse. Most nominal expressions comply with Givón’s (1983) principle of iconicity: more accessible referents are coded with less complex forms (PRO, etc.) and less accessible referents require more explicit coding (N, etc.). Wangurri demonstratives are more sensitive to operations of the thematic paragraph - tracking major themes throughout a discourse, and adding referential magnification to referents under focus. Some choices in reference are determined more directly by sociocultural factors, and less by the discourse context - referential minimisation is employed in character introduction, and reference to deceased persons. The discourse clitic -ma serves in topic continuity (added morphological complexity attached to less accessible referents), and semantic/contrastive focus. These clitics may signal action continuity (especially -nha) or shift (-ma).

Future research in Wangurri genre, narrative structure (eg: recapitulation and repetition), syntax (eg: fronting), and prosody will yield further results in Wangurri reference and focus techniques. It is certainly clear from this survey and its accompanying review that the discourse pragmatic factors governing reference and focus are quite involved, and the surface manifestation of these processes are equally complex.
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Appendix A: Funeral Text

Gunydjirryirr

**Guny_4.001**
Yo ga dhaŋjuŋ yanyaŋarruwarraram wangany nhawurn rom
yes and this -Emph I will tell one like culture
adv conj dem -disc pro vpt-irr vtr num adv n
ŋanapilingu djinaku yän-gu, Wangurriwu bāpurruwu,
ŋanapilingu djinaku yän -gu Wangurri -ku bāpurru -ku
our (1PIExDat) of this language -DAT Wangurri -dat clan -dat
pro dem n -pos Prop-n -case n -case

Yes, and here I will tell one, um, law for this language, for the Wangurri clan.

**Guny_4.002**
Dhaŋjuŋ -ma banha rom barpuruŋnanapilingum malŋ¹thun
dhaŋjuŋ this -Emph that culture Temp our (1PIExDat) -Emph appear
dem -disc dem n vpt pro -disc vi

This law appeared for us recently, showing our law recently.

**Guny_4.003**
Manymak.
manymak good
para mkr

Good.

**Guny_4.004**
Yana warri dhaŋjuŋyam rom ŋnanapilingu ŋarru gayŋa
yana warri dhaŋ -ya -ma rom ŋnanapilingu ŋarru gayŋa
ŋarra only contra this -Ana -Emph culture our (1PIExDat) should Cont.
adv vpt dem -clitic -disc n pro vpt-irr vpt

vi
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This law should be (but isn't) ours; this law should keep going, forever. ["Bilanya linygu" or "bitjan linygu" mean "forever".]

Just as it was for our fathers, not anything else.
Our children, Dhuwa and Yirritja, will hear through that particular (law).

And this (aforementioned) law is ours.

Our song ceremonies (which encode the law) must continue.

You (men) must still keep creating our own law.

This language of ours is just not true. (i.e. This language of ours is not being truly spoken.)
It will not be living truly "at our backs" (idiom: in the children, descendants, those who follow us)

_Guny_ 4.015

Bilanyaya.
thin -ya
thus -Ana
ref -clitic

And that's a fact!

_Guny_ 4.016

Yutjuwaŋa nhawun ŋanapilingu
yutjuwaŋa nhawun ŋanapilingu
young like our (1PlExDat)
adj adv pro

Our little brother was the youngest.

_Guny_ 4.017

Yukuyuku'minju ŋanapilingu banha yutjuwaŋa,
ŋarru
yukuyuku -'minju ŋanapilingu banha yutjuwaŋa
ŋarru
younger_sibling -kinship proprietive our (1PlExDat) that young
but
pro
n-Suff

Our little brother was the youngest, but he holds all the law himself.

_Guny_ 4.018

Ga manikayjim ŋunhuŋ nhawun nhan
ga manikay -ŋ -ma ŋunhuŋ nhawun nhan
and song -All -Emph that-Agent like 3SgNOM
conj n -Allative -disc dem adv pro

ŋarakawŋkal.
He was the song leader for the songs.

People were gathering to him in the songs, you see. [i.e. people were looking to him as song leader, you see.)

And this, but this will soon pass away.

Recently, our younger brother (went) from us to the elders. (Euphemism for "died").
I don’t know; I don’t know. Those people living over there at Milingimbi, four of them there,

**Guny_4.023**

Nhätha dhanal ŋarru nhawun bi̊lma warraṭthun, ga rirrakay

Nhätha dhanal ŋarru nhawun bi̊lma warraṭthun ga rirrakay

when they (Pl) will like clapstick take and sound

and adv pro vpt-irr adv n v conj n
cconj
dalkarra, ɲe?
dalkarra ɲe

ceremonial_law tag_ques

when will they take up the clapsticks and the singing and the ceremonial law/politics.

**Guny_4.024**

Ņanapum ŋarru marrkapthuna.

ņanapu -ma ŋarru marrkapthun -nha

we (1PlExNom) -Emph should endear -Foc
pro -disc vpt-irr vtr -Clitic

We should feel affection for them; endear them to us; become emotionally closer,

**Guny_4.025**

ņanapu yapa’miŋu warra wo

ņanapu yapa ’miŋu warra wo

we (1PlExNom) sister -kinship proprietive many people or
pro n -Suff adj conj

wāwa’miŋu warra ġjanapiligugu dhanu banha

wāwa ’miŋu warra ġjanapiligugu dhanu banha

brother -kinship proprietive many people our (1PlExDat) this who
n -Suff adj pro dem conj

galŋa ġnambaŋambatji warra, ya?
galŋa ġnambaŋambatji -mi warra ya

skin sickness -having many people tag-ques

n n -noml adj exclam

All our sisters and brothers and those who are sick, right?

**Guny_4.026**

Bilanya bitjan ɲunha Dhălinyŋa gayŋa nyena.

bilanya bitjan ɲunha Dhăliny -ŋa gayŋa nyena

thus do_thus that Dhăliny -Loc Cont. sit
ref pro-vb Dem prop-n -locative vpt vi

Always there at Dhăliny, it is living.
Two are living there.

One left us yesterday. [gunnharruman is a euphemism for dying]

And there at Yurrwi, four of our younger brothers are living

When are will they take up that law, bring themselves into the open, reveal themselves, which their inner beings desire.
(When they) bring it out into the open, we will be at peace.

A clever (knowledgable one) vanished from us recently and the law became distant,

one who was making us strong here, our younger brother, see?

And we long for the law.
You should help us, our gäthu, wäwa and märi (clans) there and there and there, lots of songs.

Where are our märi, or gäthu or um, the clan of our gäthu's husband?

You must just keep on creating, right?

I am saying this for later times, for the children.
These are our law.

**Guny_4.041**

儾anapilinguŋ yawungu djinaŋunj bala
儾anapilinguŋ -ma yawungu -n djinaŋjn -n bala
for us (1PlExDat) -Emph yesterday -Foc this (agent) -Foc that-way
pro -disc vpt -Clitic Dem -Clitic deictic

dhungarrayu malŋ'thun dhanunj yän, rom.
dhungarra -dhu malŋ'thun dhanu -ma yän rom
year -Temp appear this -Emph language culture
temp -temp vi dem -disc n n

**Guny_4.042**

Djinakum yängu, rom ñananapilingu barpuru malŋ'thun.
djinaku -ma yän -ku rom ñananapilingu barpuru malŋ'thun
of this -Emph language -dat culture our (1PlExDat) recently appear
dem -disc n -case n pro vpt vi

**Guny_4.043**

Ga goŋ-wapapayunmi ñanapu ga
ga goŋ-wapapayun -mi ñanapu ga
and extremely_concerned -Reflx we (1PlExNom) and
conj vit -rflx pro conj

warwuyun.
warwuyun
grieve
vit

**Guny_4.044**

Näŋji ga warwuyun ñanapu banha bitjan gayŋa thinking,
ñaŋji ga warwuyun ñanapu banha bitjan gayŋa *thinking
cry and grief we (1PlExNom) who do_thus Cont. ***
vit conj vit pro conj pro-vb vpt ***
yapa‘minuju warayu gam’, "Banha
ñananapilingu
yapa -‘minu -duh warra -thu gam’ banha
ñananapilingu
sister -kinship proprietive -Agent many people -Agent thus that
our(1PlExDat)
n -Suff -Agent adj -Agent adv dem pro

yukuyuku‘minju nhä?
yukuyuku -‘minu nhä
younger_sibling -kinship proprietive what
We were crying and grieving, all us sisters who were thinking thus, "What was our younger brother?"

**Guny_4.045**
Manikay Ꙛokun.
manikay Ꙛokun
song song leader
n n

He was a song leader.

**Guny_4.046**
Manymak nhän.
manymak nhän
good he, she, it
para mkr pro

He was good!

**Guny_4.047**
Ga manikay djämami ga rom djämami, nhän
nemanapilingu
ga manikay djäma -mi ga rom djäma -mi nhän
nemanapilingu
and song work -having and culture work -having he, she, it
our(1PlExDat)
conj n n -noml conj n n -noml pro pro

yukuyuku'miu.
yukuyuku -'miu
younger_sibling -kinship proprietive
n -Suff

And he was a song worker and a law worker, our little brother.

**Guny_4.048**
Yolthun nemanapiliny njarru biyapulma gunga'yun?
yol -thu -n nemanapiliny njarru biyapul -ma gunga'yun
who -Agent -Foc us (1PIExAcc) will again -Emph help
pro -Agent -Clitic pro vpt-irr adv -disc vt

Who else will help us?

**Guny_4.049**
Yol nemanapiliŋu njarru manikaymiyim yu-
kyuku?
yol nemanapiliŋu njarru manikay -mi -dji -ma yu-
kyuku
who for us (1PIExDat) will song -having -Inchoative -Emph
younger_sibling
pro pro vpt-irr n -noml -Inch -disc n

Which younger brother will become the singer for us?"
Thus we were crying grievously, "None of our other little brothers are singers like that last born little brother, ay?"

**Guny_4.051**
Yawilanya.
thus
tag_pro-verb

**Guny_4.052**
Dhaju nhangu gayilinydjil barrku.
this his head far away
dem pro n vi

**Guny_4.053**
Ga nhumamu marngi, bukmak nhuma dhaju
yolju
and You (2DuNom) -emph knowledgeable everyone You (2DuNom) this person
conj pro -Clitic adj n pro dem n

**Guny_4.054**

And as you know, all of you, the whole number of you living at Galiwin'ku, we helped.
Nhanaŋpu yuyuyuku'miyjuwu nhanaŋpilinguru

ganaŋpu yuyuyuku -'miyju -thu nhanaŋpilinguru
gan we (1PlExNom) young_sibling -kinship proprietive -Agent from us
(1PlExAbl) and pro n -Suff -Agent pro
conj

Nhanaŋpilinguru bapa'miyjuwu warrawara
Nhanaŋpilinguru bapa -'miyju -thu warra -thu
from us (1PlExAbl) father -kinship proprietive -Agent many people -Agent
pro n -Suff -Agent adj -Agent

bewaḻi jinyu Miliŋinbiŋuru ga nyayathan Galiwin'ku.
bewaḻi jinyu Miliŋinbiŋuru ga nyayathan Galiwin'ku
that-Abi (-Hu) finished Miliŋinbiŋuru -Abi and reach Galiwin'ku
dem adv Prop-n -Ablative conj vt Prop-n

We, our little brothers and our fathers, long ago left Milingimbi for good and reached Galiwin'ku.

Guny_4.055
Ga bilanya -ya nhuma -ma nyaru
Ga bilanya -ya nhuma -ma nyaru
and thus -Ana You (2DuNom) -Emph should
conj ref -clitic pro -disc vpt-irr

mä-ŋuwaŋjinyara milkum nhanaŋpilinguru.
mä-ŋuwaŋj -nhara milkum nhanaŋpilinguru
kind -noml show for us (1PlExDat)
adj -noml vt pro

And in the same way, you should show us kindness.

Guny_4.056
Ga dhaŋu yän nyaya gayŋa garrun.
ga dhaŋu yän nyaya gayŋa garrun
and this language I Cont. speak
conj dem n pro vpt v

And I am speaking this language.

Guny_4.057
Yäna nhanaŋpu gayŋa dhaŋu warwuyun.
yana nhanaŋpu gayŋa dhaŋu warwuyun
still we (1PlExNom) Cont. this grieve
adv pro vpt dem vit

We are still grieving/worrying about it.

Guny_4.058
Yukuyuku'miyjuwu warra nhanaŋpilinguru gayŋa
yukuyuku -'miyju warra nhanaŋpilinguru gayŋa
younger_sibling -kinship proprietive many people our (1PlExDat) Cont.
n -Suff adj pro vpt
Four of our younger brothers are living, but we are really wanting a skillful song-leader to sing out our songs as they used to be sung.

Together (As one), we have been making him special.

Recently, that one left us. (Euphemism for death.)

There is no clever one amongst us.

Sometime, they might have a change of heart, those living at Milingimbi.
many mak
good
para mkr

Good.

**Guny_4.064**

Djamarrkulji' ɲanapilingu miya'miyaman ɲarra djinaŋ linyu
djamarrkulji' ɲanapilingu miya'miyaman ɲarra djinaŋ linyu
children our (1PIExDat) sing_pl keep_on this (temp) finished
n pro vtr-redup vi Dem adv

marngi'marngiyi.
marngi'marngiyi learn_pl
adj

*Our children are learning to sing now*

**Guny_4.065**

Dhaŋu banha bąpawuy burrparwuy djamarrkulji'.
dhaŋu banha bąpa -wuruy burrpar -wuruy djamarrkulji'
this who father -Assoc two -Assoc children
dem conj n -assoc num -assoc n

*These are the children of two fathers.*

**Guny_4.066**

Ga djamarrkulji' ɲarru Yirritja warra bayiŋ dhanal
ga djamarrkulji' ɲarru Yirritja warra bayiŋ dhanal
and children should moiety_name many people that-Temp they (Pl)
conj n vpt-irr n adj dem pro

ɲarru ɲunhunŋ waŋałkuman
ɲarru ɲunhunŋ waŋałkuman
will that-Agent show_out
vpt-irr dem vtr

dhanalinguway, -bay manikay wo ɲunhunŋ nhä djalcarra.
dhanalingu -bay manikay wo ɲunhunŋ nhä djalcarra
their (3PIDat) -emph song or anything else song_leader
pro -pro_refl n conj adv-ph n

*And these children should be Yirritja when they bring out the songs or anything else, song leader, themselves.*

**Guny_4.067**

Nalma -ma ɲarru ɲarra ɲayajaran ɲam'thuna.
ɲalma -ma ɲarru ɲarra ɲayajaran ɲam'thun -nha
we (PIInc) -Emph will keep_on inner being close -Foc
pro -disc vpt-irr vi n vtr -Clitic

ɲanapum mukul'miŋum warra wo
ɲanapu -ma mukul -'miŋu -ma warra wo
we (1PIExNom) -Emph aunt -kinship proprietive -Emph many people or
pro -disc n -Suff -disc adj conj
We will be closing our inner-beings (centre of feeling), we aunts and fathers and old people of the clan. NB: "Closing our inner beings" is an idiom for "satisfied", so this sentence really means, "We will be satisfied, we aunts and fathers and the old people."

Guny_4.068
Bilanyaya bitjan barpuru ŋanapu ŋatji wanha nhäpa
bilanya -ya bitjan barpuru ŋanapu ŋatji wanha nhäpa
thus -Ana do_thus recently we (1PlExNom) cry where um
ref -clitic pro-vb vpt pro vit adv filler
rangam.
rangam
search
vit

In that way, we were recently crying, searching.

Guny_4.069
Rangam ŋanapu barpuru ŋatji, wäwa ga yapa.
rangam ŋanapu barpuru ŋatji wäwa ga yapa
search we (1PlExNom) recently cry brother and sister
vit pro vpt vit n conj n

We brothers and sisters were crying, searching recently.

Guny_4.070
Yuwalk banham, mä-yuwalk.
yuwalk banha -ma mä- yuwalk
true that -Emph quite- true
adj dem -disc prefix- adj

It's true, that, quite true.

Guny_4.071
Ga nhuma marengi, bukmak nhawun Galiwin'ku djinalaŋa
ga nhuma marengi bukmak nhawun Galiwin'ku djinal
and You (2DuNom) knowledgeable everyone like Galiwin'ku this-Loc
(-Hu)
conj pro adv n adv Prop-n dem
njirrimanja gunga'yunda nhuma gayŋan warraṯhuwan.
jjirim -ŋa gunga'yun -nyara nhuma gayŋan warraṯhuwan
place -Hu_Loc help -Noml You (2DuNom) Cont-P got
n -locative vt -noml pro vpt vtr

And you know, everyone here in this place, Galiwin'ku, you were getting help.

Guny_4.072
Ŋnanpu nhumalinguŋ gayŋan gunga'yunda warraṯhuwan.
ŋnanpu nhumalinguŋ gayŋan gunga'yun -nyara warraṯhuwan
we (1PlExNom) 2DuOrig Cont-P help -Noml got
pro pro vpt vt -noml vtr
We were getting help from you.

**Guny_4.073**
Bilanya.
bilanya thus ref

It's like that.

**Guny_4.074**
Dhaŋum nay a gaya dhäwu rakaram, wanganyguruy.
dhangu -ma nay a gaya dhäwu rakaram wangany -guruy
this -Emph I Cont. story tell one -Assoc+-Hu
dem -disc pro vpt n vtr num -assoc

Now I am going to tell you a story about one person.

**Guny_4.075**
Wanganyguruyma banha nätjil djulkhuwan banha nhän
wangany -guruy -ma banha nätjil djulkhuwan banha nhän
one -Assoc+-Hu -Emph who before went_ahead who he, she,
it
num -assoc -Hu -Emph -Assoc-+Hu -Emp who he, she,

jangawul djinal gaygan
jangawul djinal gaygan
neg this-Loc (-Hu) Cont-P
neg
dem vpt

bilanya baŋami nyanan bāpurru, Wangurri.
bilanya -ya baŋami nyanen -n bāpurru Wangurri
thus -Ana female sit -completed clan Wangurri
ref -clitic n vi -suff n Prop-n

About one person who was the first to lead, that woman of the Wangurri clan who was
dem not living here.

**Guny_4.076**
Gunga’yundami njanapilingu, nhawun yawungu njarra
gunga’yun -nyara -mi njanapilingu nhawun yawungu njarra
help -Noml -having our (1PIExDat) like recently come
vt
-noml -noml pro adv vpt vi
bewaŋl Baŋawata yäku.
bewaŋl Baŋawata yäku
that-Abl (-Hu) Baŋawata name
dem Prop-n n

Our helper who recently came named Baŋawata.

**Guny_4.077**
Ga nhän bitjjan, "Dhaŋu nay a njarra
ga nhara -mi -ma nhän bitjjan dhaŋu nay a njarra
and tell -noml -Reflex -Emp he, she, it do_thus this I lan-
guage
And she said to herself, "I am a language worker; a language worker am I."

**Guny_4.078**

"Yän warkmi ŋaya dhaŋu ŋarru.
language work-having I this will
n n -noml pro dem vpt-irr

That's what Batawata said.

**Guny_4.079**

"Yän warkmi ŋaya dhaŋu ŋarru.
language work-having I this will
n n -noml pro dem vpt-irr

I will be a language worker.

**Guny_4.080**

ŋaya gayŋa ŋarru marnjiyim dhaŋu yâŋgum ga
ŋaya gayŋa ŋarru marnjiyi -ma dhaŋu yän -gu -ma ga
I Cont. will learn -Emph this language -dat -Emph and
pro vpt vpt-irr vtr -disc dem n -pos -disc conj

Wangurrriwu,"
Wangurri -ku
Wangurri -dat
Prop-n -case

I will be learning this language, Wangurri, "

**Guny_4.081**

Bewalim nhån ŋarran nhân.
bewali -ma nhân ŋarra -n nhân
that-Abl (-Hu) -Emph he, she, it come -Foc he, she, it
dem -disc pro vi -Clitic pro

She came here

**Guny_4.082**

Ga bitjan nhân garruwanam, "Wangurri ŋaya dhaŋu ga
Ga bitjan nhân garrun -wan -ma Wangurri ŋaya dhaŋu ga
And she said thus, "I am Wangurri and a language worker."

**Guny_4.084**

Manymak.

manyamak
good
para mkr

Good.

**Guny_4.085**

Ga banha ŋátjil bilanyamiyu djulkthuwan, bilanya linygu
ga banha ŋátjil bilanya -mi -dhu djulkthuwan bilanya linygu
and that before thus -having -Temp went_ahead thus finished
conj dem temp ref -noml -temp vit-P ref adv
gakal ga bilanyaya linygu ḏalkarra ga manikaywu,
ŋe?
gakal ga bilanya -ya linygu ḏalkarra ga manikay -ku
ŋe
skill and thus -Ana finished ceremonial_law and song -dat
tag_ques
n conj ref -clitic adv n conj n -case
tag

And then, before that time, a highly skilled singer and song leader went ahead (died), see?

**Guny_4.086**

Bilanyaya linygu nhawun yawungu ŋanapiliny gunnharruman.
bilanya -ya linygu nhawun yawungu ŋanapiliny gunnharruman
thus -Ana finished like recently us (1PlExAcc) leave
ref -clitic adv adv vpt pro vit

Like that, (he) left us recently. ("left us" is a euphemism for "died")

**Guny_4.087**

Djinaku Gämburrwuywu ŋátjil banha djulkthuwan
djinaku Gämburrwuy -ku ŋátjil banha djulkthuwan
of this Gämburrwuy -dat before that went_ahead
dem Prop-n -case temp dem vit-P

Gämhurrwuy's father went-ahead (died) before that time.
She wasn't here at that time, our Wangurri language worker woman.

And I am telling you this, and now this day, yesterday, one of ours from this language dropped out (died).
dhanalingu.
dhanalingu
their (3PIDat)
pro

And I am telling you this story of how we love one another, the Wangurri people, our brothers and their sisters.

Guny_4.091
Yawilanya malany.
yawilanya mala -nha
thus group -Foc
tag_pro-verb n -Clitic

It's like that.

Guny_4.092
Ga nyeli ḧarru nyeliway rakaranhami
ŋarra,
and you (2PINom) should you (2PINom) -emph tell -noml -Reflx
keep_on conj pro vpt-irr pro -pro_refl vt -noml -rflx
vi

And you should keep talking about yourselves to your white friend who you gave (adopted into) the clan.

Guny_4.093
Ga bilanya.
and thus
conj ref

And that's it. (The End)

Guny_4.094
Dhanu gaya rakaram Ḫaya dhāwu nthangu.
Dhanu gaya rakaram Ḫaya dhāwu nthangu
this Cont. tell I story for her
dem vpt vtr pro n pro
Appendix B: Cycad Nut

Gunydjirriyirr

I'm going to tell you this (story) about cycads and how to collect the food named cycad.

I will start to tell you.

The good food gatherer always carries a bag with her then she will go out.

Gunydjirriyirr
ŋala ŋuwakurrŋirrima ŋatha -ku ɗingu -ku
conj adj n n -case n -case
where good place food -DAT cycad -DAT

Good. She will go looking for a spot that is a good place for cycad food.

Guny_1.005
Bilanya bitjan gurrutuwarr ŋarru nhan nhâma
bilanya bitjan gurrutuwarr ŋarru nhan nhâma
thus do_thus cycad_place Irr 3SgNOM see-Neu
ref pro-vb n vpt pro vt

There at a spot like that, she will see a gully (low lying?) place.

Guny_1.006
Nhâma nhän ŋarru banham balaya ŋatha ɗingu,
hâma nhän ŋarru banha -ma bala -ya ŋatha ɗingu
see-Neu he, she, it Irr which -Emph That-way -Ana food cycad
vt pro vpt dem -disc deictic -clitic n n
ga yilipim nhän ŋarru ŋarra banha gutjparrun.
ga yilipi -ma nhän ŋarru ŋarra banha gutjparrun
and bag -Emph he, she, it Irr go which carry
conj n -disc pro vpt vi dem vt-neu

She will see that cycad food, and she will go carrying the bags.

Guny_1.007
Manymak.

Paragraph marker.

Guny_1.008
Gâthuna ŋarra ga-ga-ga gali'tjin bala
gâthun -nha ŋarra ga-ga-ga gali' -tji -nha bala
walk -Foc go on_and_on side -Inchoative -Foc That-way
vi-neu -Clitic vi adv n -Inch -Clitic deictic
dباحث wanitjumana.
bâŋ wanitjum -nha
cycad pick -Foc
n vt-neu -Clitic

Keep walking on and on, to the place.

Guny_1.009
Gulkthuna ŋarra ga-ga-ga yilipiŋim baha

Paragraph marker.
Pick the cycads and keep going, (putting them) into the bags.

_Guny_1.010

Bayiŋ ŋangawul yilipiŋ, bayiŋ ŋangawul yilipi -ji
that-Temp neg bag -All
dem neg n -Allative

3SgNOM Irr just sand -All
pro vpt adv n -Allative

ŋätjil gätthun guṯkthun, yep nhinathungan
ŋätjil gätthun guṯkthun yep nhinathungan
before walk pick heap put-neu
conj vi-neu vt-neu n vdt

wanganyliŋ mulkurrliŋ nhawun.
wangany -liŋ mulkurr -liŋ nhawun
one -All head -All like
num -Allative n -Allative adv

When there is no bag, she will walk and pick and put them into a heap (one head) on the sand.

_Guny_1.011

Gunhan ŋarra ga-ga-ga baya nhän guṯkuyim
gunhan ŋarra ga-ga-ga baya nhän guṯku -dji -ma
leave-neu go on_and_on until he, she, it lots -Inchoative -Emph
vit vi adv adv pro adv pro adv -Inch -disc

bala yilipin gurruyu wutjparkun.
bala yilipi -nha gurruyu wutjparkun
then bag -Foc inside carry
conj n -Clitic adv vt

Leaving (them there) and then keeping going on and on until she has lots. Then she will put them inside the bag.

_Guny_1.012

Yilipim ŋarra gurruyu wutjparkun,
yilipi -ma ŋarra gurruyu wutjparkun
bag -Emph go inside carry
n -disc vi adv vt

bala dhethungana ŋarra.
bala dhethungan -nha ŋarra
That-way put -Foc go
deictic vdt -Clitic vi

(she will) keep on carrying the bag around, putting (them) inside the bag.

_Guny_1.013
Those bags are mingaminga, ṇaliwarrkarr and warrkatja (types of bags)

**Guny_1.014**
Manymak. Guwattharaman ṇarru ṇarra ga-ga-ga
manymak guwattharan -mara- ṇarru ṇarra ga-ga-ga
good gather -Causative- Irr go on_and_on
para mkr vt -Caus- vpt vi adv

bayiŋ nhän ṇarru dhaŋanydjī.
bayiŋ nhän ṇarru dhaŋany -tji
that-Temp he, she, it Irr plentiful -Inchoative
dem pro vpt quant -Inch

Good. (She would) continue to gather them on and on and there were heaps of them.

**Guny_1.015**
Gwattharamam nhän ṇarru ṇarra banha nhalpiyan
guwattharan -mara- nhän ṇarru ṇarra banha nhalpiyan
gather_emph -Causative- he, she, it Irr go which how
vt -Caus- pro vpt vi dem v

bāŋ wanitjuman, ñe?
bāŋ wanitjuman ñe
cycad pick tag_ques
n vdt tag

That’s how she would gather them, picking cycads, you see. (Note: wanitjuman is a special word for cycad picking.)

**Guny_1.016**
Bāŋ wanitjuman nhän ṇarru ṇarra guwattharamam, din-
gum banhaya
bāŋ wanitjuman nhän ṇarru ṇarra guwattharam -mara-
ʤingu -ma banha -ya
cycad pick he, she, it Irr go gather_emph -Causative- cy-
cad -Emph which -Ana
n vdt pro vpt vi vt -Caus- n
-disc dem -clitic

mā-wangany ṇarru ṇarrama rarru-rarrunma
mā-wangany ṇarru ṇarra -ma rarru-rarrun -ma
same_thing Irr go -Emph pour_and_pour -Emph
She would keep picking the cycads, gathering them like that, pouring them onto the sand, doing the same thing until they were all done.

**Guny_1.017**

Ga ganydjarr widj'yun nhän ŋarru banha yolŋu
ga ganydjarr widj'yun nhän ŋarru banha yolŋu
and strength lose he, she, it Irr which person
conj n vit pro vpt dem n

rarrun nhän ŋarru waripum.
rarrun nhän ŋarru waripu -ma
pour he, she, it Irr another -Emph
vt pro vpt adj -disc

She would lose strength, that person, pouring more and more.

**Guny_1.018**

Bitjan thinking nhäpa birrka'yun
bitjan *thinking nhäpa birrka'yun
do_thus *** um think
pro-vb *** filler vit

nhän ŋarru bitjan garrunmi gam'
nhän ŋarru bitjan garrun -mi gam'
he, she, it Irr do_thus to talk -Reflex thus
pro vpt pro-vb v -rflx adv

She would be thinking about it and say to herself,

wu banhaya yolŋu warra ŋarru bitjanmi garrunmi
gam',
wu banha -ya yolŋu warra ŋarru bitjan -mi garrun -mi
or which -Ana person many people Irr do_thus -Reflex to talk
-Reflex thus
con dem -clitic n adj vpt pro-vb -rflx v -rflx
adv

"Way! Dhanu ŋalma dhanjumbalan bäyman
way dhanu ŋalma dhanjumbala -nha bäyma -nha
hey this we (PlInc) to this -Foc right.there -Foc
excl dem pro dem -Clitic adv -Clitic

rarrun, ŋe?
rarrun ŋe
pour tag_ques
vt tag

or those people would say this to each other, "Hey! Let's pour all these in the same
And early in the morning we will go there, to that same place and crack them, to save strength.

Our hands are holding us (we have too much work), (we’re) exhausted. We will gather them in their shells then go back,” they said.

They said that to each other, those women of long ago. Good.
"Yes that's good," (they) used to say.

Gunya_1.023
Guwatthararra-a-a ga rarruwarra-a-a ga ɲoyarra-a-a-a,
guatthararra -a-a ga rarruwarra -a-a ga ɲoyarra -a-a-a
gather -on_and_on and used_to_pour -on_and_on and used_to_sleep
-on_and_on vt-h -extension conj vtr-h -extension conj vit-h -extension
dja ḏaw' dhuniyarran.
dja ḏaw' dhuniyarra -nha
sunrise used_to_go_back -Foc
n vit-h -Clitic

They used to keep on gathering, and keep on pouring and keep on resting, then return at dawn (to do more).

Gunya_1.024
Go, ɲalma ɲarran dhuwanma, ɲarru gayŋa ɲoya.
go ɲalma ɲarran dhuwan -ma ɲarru gayŋa ɲoya
come we (PlInc) came that -Emph Irr Cont. sleep
vit-sht pro vit-p dem -disc vpt vpt vi

"Come on, we came here. We will rest.

Gunya_1.025
Njalma ɲarru munhamurrun ḏuwaṯtu räli,
ɲalma ɲarru munhamurr -nha ḏuwaṯtu räli
we (PlInc) Irr early_morning -Foc go_out this-way
pro vit vpt adv -Clitic vit-irr deictic
bitjanmin garrunminam.
bitjan -mi -nha garrun -mi -n -ma
do_thus -Reflx -Foc say -Reflx -Foc -Emph
pro-vb -rflx -Clitic v -rflx -Clitic -disc

In the morning, we will come back out again." That's what they said to each other.

Gunya_1.026
Bitjarra nhän bayiŋ garruwarra yolju warra.
bitjarra nhän bayiŋ garruwarra yolju warra
used-to_do_thus he, she, it Hab used_to_say person many people
pro-v-h pro Vb pt vit-h n adj

That's what they used to say, those people.

Gunya_1.027
Garrunmiyarra dhanal bayiŋ banha warra
garrun -mi -yarra dhanal bayiŋ banha warra
say -Having -used_to they (Pl) Hab which many people
v -noml -suff-v-h pro Vb pt dem adj
banha dhanal bayiŋ ɲaykarraya räli wutjparruwarra.
banha dhanal bayiŋ ɲaykarra -ya räli wutjparruwarra
which they (Pl) Hab used_to_go -Ana crop Used to carry (eg for crops)
dem pro Vb pt vtr-h -clitic n vtr-h

They used to tell each other that they should go and carry the crops.

Guny_1.028
Yo, ga nyoyarra gayyarra djađaw' dhanjun
yo ga nyoyarra gayyarra djađaw' dhanjun -n
yes and used_to_sleep cont-h dawn this -Foc
adv conj vit-h vpt-h n dem -Clitic

rāli martjmartjun yilipimi warra.
rāli martjmartjun yilipī -mi warra
dem this-way go_(group) bag -having many people
deictic vit-neu n -noml adj

Yes, they used to rest till dawn then return with the bags.

Guny_1.029
Ga-ga-ga wurruy'kay.
ga-ga-ga wurruy'kay
on_and_on sit_(group)
adv vit-neu

(They would keep working) on and on, sitting as a group.

Guny_1.030
Bīlma djarrktjarrkthuwarram bala liyuwarra.
bīlma djarrktjarrkthuwarra -ma bala liyuwarra -n
clapstick used_to_chip -Emph then used_to_hit -Foc
n vtr-redup-h -disc conj vtr-h -Clitic

They used to make clapsticks then hit /crack (the nuts with them).

Guny_1.031
liyuwarra -n Ṿarra -n ga-ga-ga ga-ga-ga.
liyuwarra -n Ṿarra -n ga-ga-ga ga-ga-ga
used_to_hit -Foc go -Foc on_and_on on_and_on
vtr-h -Clitic vi -Clitic adv adv

They used to keep cracking the nuts, on and on and on.

Guny_1.032
Barrukuwalyumarrra dhanaliny
barrukuwalyu -ma -rra dhanaliny
separate -Caus -used_to them (3PIAcc)
vit- -Caus -suff-v-h pro

banha bayin liyuwarra nhan.
banha bayin liyuwarra -n nhan
which Hab used_to_hit -Foc 3SgNOM
dem Vb pt vtr-h -Clitic pro

They used to separate them as they were cracking them.

Guny_1.033
They used to crack them and separate them at the same time.

As they hit them, they would separate the shells from the nuts.

They used to be saying to separate all the snack food out,
Manymak, bala ŋaykarran.
manymak bala ŋaykarra -n
good then used_to_go -Foc
para mkr conj vtr-h -Clitic

Good. (They all) used to go. (Note: ŋaykan is inherently plural.)

Gunya_1.038
Bilin dhaŋu. Nyäkum dhaŋu bilin
gumurŋa
bili -n dhaŋu nyäku -ma dhaŋu bili -n
gumurr -ŋa completed -Foc this my (1SgDat) -Emph this completed -Foc
chest -Loc adv -Clitic dem pro -disc dem adv -Clitic n
-locaive
nyäkulim ŋangawulyinan.
yäku -lj -ma ŋangawul -dji -na -n
my (1SgDat) -All -Emph neg -Inchoative -completed -Foc
pro -Allative -disc neg -Inch -suff -Clitic

This is finished. All at my chest are completed. (I.e. All in my care, that I have to worry about, are done.)

Gunya_1.039
Nhunum gayŋa nhalpiyan birrka'yun?
nhunu -ma gayŋa nhalpiyan birrka'yun you (2SgNom) -Emph Cont. how think
pro -disc vpt v vit

What do you think? (Lit: How are you thinking?)

Gunya_1.040
Go, ŋalma dhuni'dhuniyan.
go ŋalma dhuni'dhuniyan come we (PlInc) go_back
vit-sht pro vit-redup-neu

Come, we will go back.

Gunya_1.041
ŋalma ŋarru waḍapthumana," bitjarran.
ŋalma ŋarru waḍapthun -marä -nha bitjarra -n
we (PlInc) will wet -Causative- -Foc used-to-do_thus -Foc
pro vpt-irr vit -Caus- -Clitic pro-v-h

We must soak (them), " they used to say

Gunya_1.042
Ga yilipim banha jinygu ŋaya raka'rakaran
ga yilipi -ma banha jinygu ŋaya raka'rakara -n
and bag -Emph which already I tell -completed
conj n -disc dem adv pro vrt-redup -suff
ŋätjil yäkumi mala.
ŋätjil yäku -mi mala
before name -having plural
temp n -noml n

And I told you before the names of the bags.

**Guny_1.043**
Banha ya yilipi ŋanapilingu djinaku yâŋgu, ŋe?
gha ya yilipi ŋanapilingu djinaku yän -ku ŋe
which -Ana bag our, of us, for us (1PlExDat) this-Dat language
-DAT tag_ques
dem -clitic n pro dem n
-case tag

That yilipi (belongs to) our language, you see?

**Guny_1.044**
Ga bukmakku ŋalmalingu banha nhuma bayiŋ rakararra
gi bukmak -ku ŋalmalingu banha nhuma bayiŋ rakararra
and everyone -DAT our (1PlIncDat) which You (2DuNom) Hab us-
ed_to_tell
conj n -case pro dem pro Vb pt vtr
nyälka banha nhumalingu yâku bukmakku
nyälka banha nhumalingu yâku bukmak -ku
cycad_bag which your (2DuDat) name everyone -DAT
n dem pro n n -case

And for all of us, you used to say 'nyälka' which was your name, everyone's, and that bag.

**Guny_1.045**
Bayikumiyuya maya bayikumiyuya warra
bayiku -mi -dhu -ya maya bayiku -mi -dhu -ya warra
that -having -Agent -Ana own that -having -Agent -Ana many
people
dem -noml -Agent -clitic vtr dem -noml -Agent -clitic adj
ŋanapu yolŋu warra, Wangurri.
ŋanapu yolŋu warra Wangurri
we-Exc people Plural Wangurri

We Wangurri people own that (aforementioned bag/food)

**Guny_1.046**
Nhumam ŋanapiliny ŋarru yâŋnu maya-wumbuman
nhuma -ma ŋanapiliny ŋarru yana -n maya-wumbu -ma
-n
You (2DuNom) -Emph us (1PlExAcc) should just -Foc share -Caus
-Foc pro -disc pro vpt-irr adv -Clitic vtr-rt -Caus
-Clitic waripuyum warrayu.
waripu -dhu -ma warra -dhu
other -Agent -Emph many people -Agent
adj -Agent -disc adj -Agent

You other groups must just share us (our food/bag etc)

**Guny_1.047**
Manymak, ga banhaya ṇatham ṇanapilingu ḍingu.

Good, and that food is ours, the cycad.

**Guny_1.048**
Manymak, ga bukmakku ṇanapilingu ṇatha

Good, and that food is for all of us.

**Guny_1.049**
Njarru ṇunjhuj yolthu banha ṇanapilingum
but that-Agent who -Agent which our (1PIExDat) -Emph

But someone put that food for us, our food named cycad.

**Guny_1.050**
Ga gätthunma nhunu ṇarru dhutkay nyena
and walk -Emph you (2SgNom) must sit-sg sit

And you must walk and sit then crack (the nuts).

**Guny_1.051**
Baŋpaļjuna ma nhunu ṇarru
then crack -Foc

And that-Dat and this-Dat and that-Dat and this-Dat
And you must crack (the nuts) for that and for this and for that and for this. (This is an idiom for "on and on" or "for hours and hours").

**Guny_1.052**

Dhethu

garrunj -li

Put bag -All

vdt n -Allative

ga biyapul yanaya nhunu Garru bal'palun.

gai biyapul yana -ya nhunu Garru bal'palun

and again just -Ana you (2SgNom) must crack

**Guny_1.053**

Ga munha marma' mi banha - menguwan ñaya -

gamunha marma -mi banha - menguwan ñaya

and night two -having which - forgot I

**Guny_1.054**

Munha wagany -mi ratju -ma -n ñätjil

munha wagany -mi ratju -ma -n ñätjil

night one -having dry_out -Caus -completed first

temp num -noml vtr-root -Caus -suff temp

banha nhunu Garru liyunma

banha nhunu Garru liyun -ma

which you (2SgNom) must hit -Emph

dem pro vpt-irr vtr-neu -disc

**Guny_1.055**

Ga be gayña ñoya.

gal be gayña ñoya

and emphatic Cont. lie

And there are masses and masses.
For one night and day, it must just dry out.

After one night and a day, she must go back to the cracking work. [Note: "Yäku", name, is used here as work identification. See later for further use in this way.]

You must hit them on and on. (Note: "djinaku ga ñunhuku" means "on and on", and extended activity.)

Crack them on and on, crack them on and on.

Put you (2SgNom) will bag -All
You must put them into the bags, put them in and put them in and put them in.

Guny_1.061

When (if) the bag is half full, up to the middle, only a few, then crack (more) on and on.

It should overflow through the mouth of the bag, VERY full.

And how long will that food work occupy you? (Note: "Yäku" here is again identifying the described work as in 57. "Gutjparrun", carry, is used idiomatically here for "occupy").
Four days and four nights. ("muḻkurrnharra", without a head, refers to the setting out of turtle eggs in groups of 5 - four as a base and one as a "head". "without a head" refers to situations when there aren’t enough to make 5, and the four of the base are set out. Consequently, Yolŋu have transferred the meaning of "muḻkurrnharra" to 4. Similarly, "Muḻkurmi" means 'having a head' and has taken on the meaning of 5.)

**Gunny_1.065**
Bothurru’mu nhunu ɲarru ɲarra bala muḻkurrnharra
bothurru’ -mu nhunu ɲarru ɲarra bala muḻkurr -nharra
count -Clitic pro vpt-irr vi deictic n -priv
vit -Clitic pro vpt-irr vi deictic n -priv
waŋgany (widipiya), burrpar, ɭurkun, ḏāmbunharra ga
wangany widipiya burrpar ɭurkun ḏāmbu -nharra ga
one one two few head -Priv and
num count num quant n -priv conj
หลายๆ (rawid), burrpar, ḏāmbun ḏāmbun -nharra ga
hill -having -Emph which one -Foc hand
n -nomin -disc dem num -Clitic n

You must keep counting up to 4: one, two three four and five, which is one hand.

**Gunny_1.066**
ŋatha dhananjma nhunu ɲarru warrat̲hun.
ŋatha dhanaj -ma nhunu ɲarru warrat̲hun
food full -Emph you (2SgNom) must take
n adj -disc pro vpt-irr v

You must retrieve the full bags of food.

**Gunny_1.067**
Ḍāmbumiyu wo ḏāmbunharrayu waluyu
ḍāmbu -mi -dhu wo ḏāmbu -nharra -dhu walu -dhu
head -having -Temp or head -Priv -Temp day -Temp
n -nomin -temp conj n -priv -temp n -temp
bala nhunu ɲarru warrat̲hun ma
bala nhunu ɲarru warrat̲hun ma
and then you (2SgNom) should take -Emph
conj pro vpt-irr v -disc
gapuŋurum.
gapu -ŋuru -ma
water -Abl -Emph
n -Ablative -disc

After four or five days you will take it from the water.

**Gunny_1.068**
Makatiŋurum nhunu ɲarru warrat̲hun ma bala
makati -ŋuru -ma nhunu ɲarru warrat̲hun -ma bala
water -Abl -Emph you (2SgNom) must take -Emph then
n -Ablative -disc pro vpt-irr v -disc conj

93
gutjparruna. gutjparrun -nha carry -Foc vt-neu -Clitic

You must take it from the water then carry it.

**Guny_1.069**
Rajan dharryarrun ŋąjtįl, ranjan.
rajan dharryarrun ŋąjtįl ranjan paper-bark peel first paper-bark n vtr-neu temp n

First peel the paper bark. (Paper bark is used to carry things, but also used to put things onto, if you do not want them on the dirt.)

**Guny_1.070**
Bala buku ŋarran nhunu ŋarru, bala buku ŋarra -n nhunu ŋarru then head go -Foc you (2SgNom) will conj n vi -Clitic pro vpt-irr

"Way," bitjan, "ŋunha ŋatha nyąku ŋunha bilin. way bitjan ŋunha ŋatha nyąku ŋunha bili -n hey do_thus that food my (1SgDat) that completed -Foc excl pro-vb Dem n pro Dem adv -Clitic

Then you will think, "Hey, that food of mine is finished.

**Guny_1.071**
Munham dhaŋu wilŋŋan'thurwanan mulkürmin. munha -ma dhaŋu wilŋŋan'thurwan -n -a mulkürr -mi -n night -Emph this got_ready -Foc -Foc head -having -Foc temp -disc dem vit-p -Clitic -Clitic n -noml -Clitic

It takes five nights to be ready.

**Guny_1.072**
Mulkürmin, mulkürmin dhaŋum mulkür -mi -n mulkür -mi -n dhaŋu -ma head -having -Foc head -having -Foc this -Emph n -noml -Clitic n -noml -Clitic dem -disc

munham." munha -ma night -Emph temp -disc

Five, it is five nights.

**Guny_1.073**
Birrka'yun nhunu ŋarru banhaya ŋatha birrka'yun -nha nhunu ŋarru banha -ya ŋatha think -Foc you (2SgNom) must which -Ana food
After five nights, you will remember that the food is ready and you will go back.

**Guny_1.074**
Djunama nāṭjil ñarra ranan ñarra dharryarryun.
djunama nāṭjil ñarra ranan ñarra dharryarryun
away_from first go paper-bark go peel
deic temp vi n vi vtr-neu

First, go to peel the paperbark.

**Guny_1.075**
Njuwakurr ranan nhunu ñarru warraṯthun.
juwakurr ranan nhunu ñarru warraṯthun
good paper-bark you (2SgNom) must take
adj n pro vpt-irr v

You must get good paperbark.

**Guny_1.076**
Ga barrakiny banha Ḿanak,
ga barrakiny banha Ḿanak
and bad which flesh
conj adj dem n

barrakiny ranan nhunu ñarru ñangawul warraṯthun.
barrakiny ranan nhunu ñarru ñangawul warraṯthun
bad paper-bark you (2SgNom) must neg take
adj n pro vpt-irr neg v

Bad flesh, bad paperbark, you must not collect.

**Guny_1.077**
Ga dhaniya
ga dhaniya
and paper_bark_container
conj n

ŋamanjamyun nhunu ñarru bitjan
ŋamanjamyun nhunu ñarru bitjan
make you (2SgNom) must do_thus
vtr pro vpt-irr pro-vb

ŋarru wapiyan mā nhan ñarru yaka lurrya gätthun nhungu.
ŋarru wapiyan mā nhan ñarru yaka lurrya gätthun nhungu
nose tie so 3SgNOM will not juice walk for you
You must make a paper bark container this way: tie a nose so the juice will not run out for you.

It will all just stay right there for you.

Then you must go back.

Walk way back then collect the cycads. Pull it out; wash it, that food; shake the sand off; that’s how to do it. Then leave.
It will be lying there, another lot of paper bark, fallen paper bark which you will (use) later.

After that, you will grind the cycads, which you will later keep putting into a heap.

Ground cycad has many names, ɲurrumi (having a nose) and dämbu-lumbak.

This cycad food has many names.
Gunny_1.085

Warrkthunma nhunu ɲarru ɲarra yalalam
warrkthun -ma nhunu ɲarru ɲarra yalala -ma
pull_out -Emph you (2SgNom) must go later -Emph
vt-neu -disc pro vpt-irr vi adv -disc

banha ɲamaŋamayunma nhäpam
banha ɲamaŋamayun -ma nhäpa -ma
which make -Emph um -Emph
dem vtr -disc filler -disc

yarrwa’yunma yäkumi malany, ɲathan
yarrwa’yun -ma yäku -mi mala -nha ɲatha -n
grind -Emph name -having plural -Foc food -Foc
vt-neu -disc n -noml n -Clitic n -Clitic

You must later go and pull out (the cycads) then grind and make those names (the different types of cycad foods named above.)

Gunny_1.086

Gäna nhunu ɲarru lūpthuman warrkthun
gäna nhunu ɲarru lūpthuman warrkthun
separate you (2SgNom) should soak pull_out
adv pro vpt-irr vtr-neu vt-neu

nhunguway nhunu, lūpthumanda
nhungu - way nhunu lūpthuman -nyara
your (2SgDat) - hey you (2SgNom) soak -Noml
pro - excl pro vtr-neu -noml

manutji.
manutji
nut
n

Separately, you should soak and pull out your own soaked nuts.

Gunny_1.087

Dhupalim ɲarru wanganyŋa, bala barrkuwalyumana
dhupal -ma ɲarru wangany -ŋa bala barrkuwalyu -ma -n
they (2) -Emph will one -Loc then separate -Caus -Foc
pro -disc vpt-irr num -locative conj vit- -Caus
-Clitic

dhupaliny guwathurrunjuny
dhupaliny guwathurrunju -nha
them (3DuAcc) ground_cycad -Acc
pro n -Acc

ga dingu ŋuwakurrunj -ŋa ɲatha -nhan.
ga dingu ŋuwakurru -ŋu ɲatha -ma nhan
and cycad good -Noml food -Emph 3SgNOM
conj n adj -noml n -disc pro

Those two (types of processed nuts) will be together, then separate them, the snacks from the good cycad.
**Guny_1.088**
Manymak.
manymak
good
para mkr

**Guny_1.089**
Yarrwa’yunma nhunu njarru njarra, bilanyamiyu waluyu.
yarrwa’yun -ma nhunu njarru njarra bilanya -mi -dhu
walu -dhu
grind -Emph you (2SgNom) must go thus -having -Temp sun

vt-neu -disc pro vpt-irr vi ref -noml -temp n

You must keep grinding, during the day.

**Guny_1.090**
Nhanam njarru nhunany bulukthuna, marjurryu.
nhana -ma njarru nhuna bulukthun -nha marjurr -dhu
him, her, it -Emph will you (Sg Acc) cover -Foc cloud -Agent
pro -disc vpt-irr pro vt-neu -Clitic n -Agent

It will cover you, a cloud.

**Guny_1.091**
Ma nurrarru nhunany njarru bulukthuna.
marjurr -dhu nhuna njarru bulukthun -nha
cloud -Agent you (Sg Acc) will cover -Foc

n -Agent pro vpt-irr vt-neu -Clitic

A cloud will cover you.

**Guny_1.092**
Njurrurwa’jan nhunu njarru njarra, bala yarrwa’yunma.
jurrurrwa’jan nhunu njarru njarra bala yarrwa’yun -ma
hum you (2SgNom) must go That-way grind -Emph
vit-neu pro vpt-irr vi deictic vt-neu -disc

You will keep humming as you grind.

**Guny_1.093**
Bilanyaya jinygu.
bilanya -ya jinygu
thus -Ana finished
ref -clitic adv

That’s the end.
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