

Bridging constructions

Edited by

Valérie Guérin

Studies in Diversity Linguistics 24



Chapter 6

The form and function of bridging constructions in Eibela discourse

Grant Aiton

James Cook University

Discourse in Eibela utilizes extensive repetition and summarization of events as a means of bridging discourse episodes. These bridging constructions consist of a main reference clause at the end of a unit of discourse, which is immediately referenced by a non-main bridging clause at the commencement of the following unit of discourse. Bridging clauses may be formed by medial clauses initiating a clause chain, and topic clauses that are embedded within another medial or final clause. Differing units of discourse are often accompanied by differing forms of bridging construction, with clause chain boundaries featuring verbatim repetition of clauses, and larger paragraphs being bound by bridging clauses utilizing anaphoric predicates. Bridging constructions have been previously shown to serve various functions in Papuan languages, including thematic continuity, reference tracking, and event sequencing, which will also be illustrated in the current discussion of bridging constructions in Eibela.

1 Introduction and background

Eibela, also referred to as Aimele (Ethnologue code: AIL), has approximately 300 speakers living primarily in Lake Campbell, Western Province, Papua New Guinea. The genetic affiliation of Eibela has not been thoroughly investigated, but it is likely that it belongs to the proposed Trans-New Guinea Phylum, of the central and South New Guinea stock, since this is the classification given to the closely related language Kaluli by Wurm (1978) and Voorhoeve (1968). A lower level classification is given as the Bosavi language family in Shaw (1986). The data for this paper is drawn from a corpus of approximately 17 hours of transcribed speech from a variety of genres, including narratives, procedurals, myths,



sermons, discourse, and songs, which is available online in the Endangered Languages Archive (Aiton 2016). This corpus is the result of approximately 13 months of immersive fieldwork in Lake Campbell and Wawoi Falls in Western Province, Papua New Guinea. Since bridging constructions are a phenomenon of discourse organization, they predominantly occur in long stretches of speech from a single speaker, and the examples in this chapter are therefore drawn from monologues, including narratives, myths, and procedural descriptions. An extended excerpt from a monologue is provided in the Appendix. The text chosen for the Appendix is considered by the author to be representative of personal narratives in terms of event structure and the usage of bridging constructions. Where possible claims made in the prose of this chapter are supported by examples from the Appendix so that the reader may view these clauses in the context of a larger discourse.

Discourse in Eibela utilizes frequent repetition and summarization of events as a means of bridging discourse episodes. These bridging constructions consist of a main reference clause at the end of a unit of discourse, which is immediately reiterated by a repetition in a non-main bridging clause at the commencement of the following unit of discourse. This paper offers an extensive description of this phenomenon in Eibela, but first a basic introduction to some aspects of Eibela is warranted. The canonical constituent order for Eibela is SV in intransitive clauses and AOV in transitive clauses, though other constituent orders are possible. Constituents which are prominent or topical are often omitted from clauses completely. Morphology is exclusively suffixing, with complex verbal morphology for tense, aspect, mood, and evidentiality, with optional ergative-absolutive case marking on noun phrases in core argument positions (see Aiton 2014). Word classes include open classes of nouns, verbs, and adverbs, and closed classes of adjectives, demonstratives, postpositions, verbal particles, and quantifiers.

Predicates in Eibela can be formed by lexical roots of nearly any word class, although only verbs may be inflected by the full range of tense, aspect, mood, and evidentiality suffixes. Complex inflectional classes of verbs feature various patterns of stem alternations and suppletive tense forms, as well as complex predicates consisting of multiple verbal roots forming a single predicate.

- (1) *[aɣɛ ɸɛɸɛ-ja:]_s [ɛna]_x [dobosuwɛ]_x [tɛ a:nɛ]_{pred}*
 dog skinny-ABS there underneath go.down go;PST
 ‘The skinny dog went down underneath there.’
- (2) *[sobolo-wa]_s [tɛbɛ do-wa]_{pred}*
 plane-ABS land STAT-PST
 ‘A plane has landed.’

6 *The form and function of bridging constructions in Eibela discourse*

These complex predicates may take the form of serial verb constructions as in (1), or auxiliary constructions, as in (2). In these constructions, only the final verbal root is inflected for predicate categories such as tense, aspect, mood, and evidentiality.

Eibela clauses may be linked together into clause chains, which include several medial clauses culminating in a fully inflected final clause. Clauses in examples will be labeled in subscript to show whether they are a final or a medial clause. In medial clauses, the different-subject marking suffix *-bi* may be used to show that the subject of the medial clause differs from the subject of the main clause, as seen in example (3).

- (3) a. [*nε εja-ja: mumunε ελεβε la-bi*]_{medial}
 1;SG father-ABS NAME head be-DS
 ‘My father was at the head of Mulume creek, and...’
- b. [*sa:goi εjale motuwe εjale gedajoφa sedε hena*
 NAME COORD;DU NAME COORD;DU tree.trunk;ABS hit DUR
mi-ja:]_{final}
 come-PST
 ‘Sagoi and Motuwe came while beating tree trunks (so their approach would be heard).’

In this example, the subject of the medial clause in (3a) is *nε εjaja* ‘my father’, who is described as being at a location, whereas in the final clause (3b), the subject is the coordinated noun phrase *sa:goi εjale motuwe εjale* ‘Sa:gai and Motuwe’, who are coming while hitting trees. Clauses and noun phrases may additionally be morphologically topicalized as can be seen in (4) where the verb in the topic clause is suffixed by *-bi* since its subject differs from that of the main predicate. In this case, the marking of different subjects functions in much the same way as in (3).

- (4) a. [[*na no-wa εime ka agle-si*]_{medial} *kεkεkε*]_{final}
 animal INDF-ABS quickly FOC laugh-MED;PFV laugh;IDEO
 ‘The other animals were already laughing.’
- b. [*no-wε-mi=ja: εime ka agle-bi=ja:*]_{topic}
 INDF-LOC-ASSOC=TOP already FOC laugh-DS=TOP
 ‘Another one was already laughing, then...’

- c. $[[no \quad w\epsilon \quad a:g\epsilon \quad k\epsilon ga=ja:]_{topic} \quad w\epsilon \quad suw\epsilon \quad da-li \quad l\epsilon-ki \quad w\epsilon \quad d\epsilon d\epsilon$
 CONTR this dog bony=TOP this inside lie-SIM be-CONT this hear
*la:-bi*_{final}
 be-DS

‘This one, this bony dog who was still inside was listening to this.’

A direct contrast between these two usages of the suffix *-bi* is shown in example (4). In (4b) topic clause has a different subject from the following main clause, and therefore bears the different-subject marker. The subject of the topic clause is a pig, who is laughing at the dogs in a folk tale, while the subject of the main clause is one of the dogs, who is covertly listening. In (4c) the different-subject marker appears in the main clause as well, specifying an unexpected or non-topical subject for this clause, where the dog is an unexpected introduction into the story. This use of the different-subject marker in a main clause may be interpreted as a kind of desubordination, in which a clause with the morphological form of a non-main clause is functionally and syntactically independent (Evans 2012).

With this introduction to Eibela morphosyntax in mind, the bridging clauses described in subsequent sections may be formed from two types of non-main clause, namely medial clauses initiating a clause chain, and topic clauses which are embedded within another medial or final clause. Bridging constructions have been previously shown to serve various functions in Papuan languages, including thematic continuity, reference tracking, and event sequencing, which will also be illustrated in the current discussion of bridging constructions in Eibela. The morphosyntax of clause-chaining and clause topicalization strategies will be further discussed in §2 below. The use of these clause linking devices in bridging constructions will be shown in §3, and finally, the semantics and function of bridging constructions will be explored in §4, including discourse organization, temporal anchoring, causation, and argument tracking.

2 Clause linking and topic clauses

Two clause linking strategies are relevant to the current discussion of bridging constructions in Eibela: clause chaining and topicalization. A clause will be assumed to include a predicate and all arguments of that predicate, although topical or given arguments may often be elided. Clause chaining consists of a series of at least two clauses, which describe a series of related events. A clause chain will be an important unit of Eibela discourse throughout this paper. Topicalization is

a feature of a complex clause whereby a single non-main clause or noun phrase appears immediately before a clause and functions as the topic or reference point of the following clause.

2.1 Clause linking

Clause chaining is a form of clause linking where one or more non-main clauses with limited inflection appear in a sequence, or chain, and the full inflection of tense aspect and mood is expressed on the final main clause of the chain (Longacre 2007: 374–376). For example, in the short clause chain shown in examples (A3) and (A4) of the Appendix, the first medial non-main clause includes the predicate *hena: disi*, which is not specified for tense, and is suffixed by the perfective clause chaining morpheme *-si*. Tense specification is only provided on the verb of the final main clause, *mu:du*: ‘washed’ in (4). Clause chaining structures have previously been described as something intermediate between coordinate and subordinate clause linking, or labeled as “coordinate but dependent” (Haiman 1983) or “cosubordinate” (Van Valin Jr 1984).

The two clause linkers *=ngeɛ:* and *-si* are more or less synonymous and have no obvious distributional differences. The aspectual difference represented by the glossing as imperfective for *=ngeɛ:*, and perfective for *-si*, reflects a tendency rather than a strict correspondence. The enclitic *=ngeɛ:* is seen more frequently with ongoing events that will still be co-occurring alongside the subsequently described events, whereas the suffix *-si* is seen more often with perfective events which are completed and then followed by a consecutive event.

An additional chaining enclitic *=ki* may be used for ongoing or persisting events, as in (5) and (6). This is used for ongoing imperfective events which continue up until the occurrence of the following clause. The continuous enclitic *=ki* is aspectually similar to the imperfective enclitic *=ngeɛ:*, but differs in usage primarily in that *=ki* represents stative, repetitive, or unchanging event structures, whereas *=ngeɛ:* is often used for processes or telic events. Non-verbal predicates may be used in clause chaining constructions, but must be accompanied by a verbal auxiliary in non-main clauses as seen in (6).

- (5) [*senɛ=ki*]_{medial} [*a:mi* *makiso-wa* *ɛ-sa:-bi*]_{final}
 stay=CONT DEM;ASSOC visitor-ABS do-3;VIS-DS
 ‘We were living there and a visitor did that (came).’

- (6) a. [*ɛja:gɛ* *deme* *di-sene* *wa:le-mena*]_{final}
 butterfly do do-NMLZ tell-FUT;NON.3
 ‘I will tell about what butterflies do.’

- b. [***εja:gε do-si=ki***]_{medial} [*ufu*]_{final}
 butterfly STAT-MED;PFV=CONT egg
 ‘There being a butterfly then there is an egg.’
- c. [***ufu do-si=ki***]_{medial} [*kεkεbεa:nε*]_{final}
 egg STAT-MED;PFV=CONT caterpillar
 ‘There being an egg then there is a caterpillar.’
- d. [***kεkεbεa:nε do-si=ki***]_{medial} [*koko:no*]_{final}
 caterpillar STAT-MED;PFV=CONT pupa
 ‘There being caterpillar then there is a pupa.’
- e. [***koko:no do-si=ki***]_{medial} [*εja:gε*]_{final}
 pupa STAT-MED;PFV=CONT butterfly
 ‘There being a pupa then there is a butterfly.’
- f. [*εja:gε ma:na wa kam*]_{final}
 butterfly behavior;ABS DIR finish
 ‘The (story of) butterfly behavior is finished.’

Every line given in (6) is a clause chain, and each of the main clauses (6c–6f) begin with a non-main medial clause (shown in bold) which repeats the proposition of the preceding main clause. When the nominal predicate is the predicate of a main clause, no auxiliary is needed, but in non-main clauses, the clause linking morphology may only appear with a verbal auxiliary being appended to the nominal predicate to form a complex predicate.

2.2 Topicalization

Topicalization is a general process of identifying some concept as the topic or theme of a clause. In Eibela, this is accomplished by means of left dislocated clause position and the enclitic =*ja:*. Aiton (2014) summarizes the use of topicalized noun phrases and clause arguments in Eibela argument structure, such as the example given in (7).

- (7) a. [[***sεina:bi:=ja:***]_{topic} *gomo:lo-we: hoje-kε: hεna:-genε:*]_{medial}
 tree.kangaroo=TOP NAME-ERG hunt-ITER go-MED;IPFV
 ‘Tree kangaroos, Gomoolo had gone hunting (for those animals)...’
- b. [*ola: ka la:*]_{final}
 shoot;PST FOC DEF
 ‘...and (he) had shot one (a tree kangaroo).’

The current discussion will not further explore topical noun phrases, and will focus on the occurrence of clauses as the topic of a subsequent main clause. A clause is presented in the topic position to provide a conceptual point of reference for the event described in the main clause. When the topic is a clause, as in example (8), the clause is followed by the topic-marking enclitic =*ja*: and precedes the main clause.

- (8) *[[ne εse no-wa oge di=ja:]_{topic} φili:-ne]_{final}*
 1;SG string.bag INDF-ABS pick.up take=TOP ascend-PST
 ‘Taking another bag, I went up.’

The semantic relationship between the topic clause and main clause is rather vague. In (8), the intended meaning is that the speaker primarily intended to take his string bag somewhere, and in order to do this, he walked uphill. In future time contexts, a topic clause can produce a conditional reading, as in (9).

- (9) *[[ge so:wa sugu:lu:-mena:=ja:]_{topic} ε:lemε:ntri: ti:sa-ja: kele-ma:]_{final}*
 2;SG child attend.school-FUT=TOP elementary teacher-ABS find-IMP
 ‘If your children are to go to school, then find a teacher!’

A conditional meaning as in (9) could simply be paraphrased as an intentional meaning, i.e., ‘Find a teacher in order to ensure that your children attend school.’ However, this intentional/conditional meaning cannot be taken for granted. Instead it seems to be an incidental result of the topic clause’s role as a prominent and given piece of information (Haiman 1978). In both (8) and (9), the topic clause refers to previously mentioned information which is a prominent and ongoing topic of the narrative. The role of the main clause is then to expand upon the given topic and provide new information which has not yet been presented. For example, in clause (A6) of the Appendix, the events of the topic clause and main clause are sequential, with the topic clause clearly preceding the events of the main clause, and no intentional interpretation is possible. When a clause appears as a topic, the topicalized clause reiterates familiar or already mentioned information as a reference point for new information which is introduced in the following main clause. This results in the bridging constructions, which will be discussed in greater detail in §3.

2.3 Topicalized medial clauses

Interestingly, chaining and topicalization, the two strategies of clause linking, may co-occur. The perfective clause linking suffix *-si* may be used in a topicalized clause to provide specific aspectual information, as in example (10). In the

example (10b), the clause *nε bedesija*: is presented with both the clause linking suffix *-si* and the topicalizing enclitic *=ja:*.

- (10) a. [*kosuwa-ja: ja gige di beda-nε*]_{medial}
 cassowary-ABS come make.noise PFV hear;PST-MED;IPFV
 ‘I heard a cassowary come and make noise.’
- b. [[*nε bedε-si=ja:*]_{topic} *ma bobo*]_{final}
 1;SG hear-MED;PFV=TOP NEG real
 ‘I heard that, and (I thought) it was not real (i.e., a spirit).’

In this construction, the clause linking suffix *-si* provides aspectual information regarding the timing of the topic with respect to the main clause. Specifically, the topic and main clause are consecutive events, where the topic clause is a perfective event occurring immediately prior to the main clause. In addition to these semantic and functional considerations, topical clauses containing an auxiliary within the predicate require the clause linking suffix *-si*. This is true even if the aspectual information provided by the suffix *-si* is redundant as in (11b).

- (11) a. [*a:mi dεφija-φεi*]_{final}
 DEM;ASSOC measure-HYPOTH;COMP
 ‘(The other sleeping space being made like this,) measure there.’
- b. [[*ε di-si=ja:*]_{topic} *hena:-nε:*]_{medial} [*isi-ja: kodu-mεi*]_{final}
 do PFV-MED;PFV=TOP DUR-MED;IPFV post-ABS cut-HYPOTH
 ‘That being done, go and cut the posts.’

In example (11), the auxiliary *di* specifies a perfective aspect, and in this context, the aspectual overtones of the suffix *-si* are redundant. In contrast, the auxiliary *hena:* is used for continuing durative action, which is incompatible with the perfective aspect which often corresponds to the clause linker *-si*.

3 Formal aspects of bridging construction in Eibela

In this section the form of bridging constructions in Eibela will be examined and shown to fall into two types: Recapitulative linkage and summary linkage. The general notion of a bridging construction, along with these two sub-types of bridging construction, is thoroughly explained in Guérin & Aiton (2019 [this volume]), and this section will follow the same terminology and conventions except where noted. These notational conventions will include underlining the

reference clause and displaying in bold the bridging clause in a bridging construction. This section will include the presentation and definition of key terms and concepts involved in the realization of bridging constructions in Eibela, and the ways in which clause chaining and topical clauses form linking structures in Eibela discourse.

3.1 Overview of bridging constructions

The type of bridging constructions examined in this paper is confined to non-main clauses, including medial and topical clauses, which repeat or summarize a previous element of the discourse (de Vries 2005; 2006; Dixon 2009; Thompson et al. 2007: 382–383). If example (11) is again considered, it is apparent that the topical clause in (11b) is a repetition of the main clause in (11a). In the discussion of these sorts of repetitions, it will be useful to refer to the original clause, as in (11a), as the reference clause, while the repetition, as in (11b), will be referred to as the bridging clause as presented in Chapter 1 of this volume. A reference clause is most often a final main clause, but as seen from the medial clause in (11a), this is not always the case. Additionally, a reference clause need not be a main clause with a verbal predicate, as evidenced by the nominal predicates involved in the bridging constructions in example (6). A bridging clause on the other hand may be either a medial non-main clause, or an embedded topic clause, as seen in the topic clause forming a bridging clause in (11b).

3.2 Recapitulative linkage

The form of the bridging clause may broadly be described as either recapitulation or summarizing. Recapitulative linkage refers to a bridging clause with a predicate which is synonymous or identical to the predicate of the reference clause. In contrast, summary linkage refers to a bridging clause with a generic or anaphoric verb which makes reference to the same event as the reference clause. All of the examples given thus far fall into the category of recapitulation. In these examples, much of the lexical content and argument structure from the reference clause is repeated in the bridging clause, as illustrated in clauses (A6) and (A7) of the Appendix where the predicate and object of the reference clause is repeated in the bridging clause, and only the case-marking and verbal inflection differ.

In addition to very close repetitions of vocabulary like the examples seen in (A6) and (A7) of the Appendix, recapitulative linkage may also include substitutions in the reference clause as described in Guérin & Aiton (2019 [this volume]). This may be due to differing word choices which may slightly alter the proposition by including more or less information than the reference clause, or to the

inclusion or exclusion of clause constituents. Of course the bridging clause and the reference clause must by definition describe the same event, but the use of synonyms or the choice to include or exclude certain details may alter the information load of the bridging clause relative to the reference clause.

In instances where a synonym or near synonym is used, the predicates may differ in their precise meaning, and therefore offer differing perspectives on an event. For example, in example (12), the reference clause in (12a) and the bridging clause in (12b) both refer to the same event, namely the act of whittling a strip of vine so that it is thin and smooth and can be used as a fine cord in construction.

- (12) a. [sɛ:li ga:lɛ-mɛi]_{final}
 properly shave.thin-HYPOTH
 ‘(You) should shave it properly’
- b. [sɛli ɛmɛlɛ-si]_{medial}
 properly make.flat-MED;PFV
 ‘Flatten it properly (by shaving) and then...’
- c. [[ga:jɛ-li:: ga:lɛ di=ja:]_{topic} ɸogono di-si]_{medial}
 shave.thin-SIM;DUR shave.thin PFV=TOP other.side PFV-MED;PFV
 ‘Keep shaving it thin, when it’s shaved thin, take the other side, and then...’
- d. [mɛ:gi ɛna gudɛ:-kei ɸili:-mɛi]_{final}
 rope DEM wrap-INST ascend-HYPOTH
 ‘(You) should wrap the rope going up.’

The reference clause and bridging clause use different verbs to predicate the event however, and in doing so, they each present a different aspect of the action being described. Initially, the verb *ga:lɛ* is used in (12a) and describes the act of whittling or shaving thin strips of material off of an item with a knife. The bridging clause in (12b) then describes the same action, but uses the predicate *ɛmɛlɛ* meaning ‘to level’ or ‘to make flat’. This word choice describes the intention or goal of the event in the bridging clause and complements the description of the method described in the reference clause. In this way, the two clauses taken together present a more complete description of the event than either clause taken on its own. Elements of the reference clause are also routinely omitted in bridging clauses, as noted in Guérin & Aiton (2019 [this volume]). This is not particularly surprising in Eibela since backgrounded arguments are often elided in all Eibela clause types. A given argument is typically elided when it is readily predictable from the context. Additionally, a complex noun phrase

in the reference clause may be repeated in a simplified form as in line (A2) of the Appendix where *ba:kele duna* ‘bush turkey nest’ is reduced to the simpler form *ba:kele* ‘bush turkey (nest)’ in the bridging clause seen in line (3). Elements of a bridging clause are obviously very predictable given their repetitive nature, and omitting arguments, or elements of complex arguments, is simply a means of back-grounding known information which has less prominence within the discourse.

In cases where the reference clause contains a topic, the topic is also omitted from the repetition in the bridging clause, as in examples (A28–A30) of the Appendix. The bridging clause makes reference to only the main clause of this final clause of the clause-chain, and does not repeat the embedded topic *hane seja* ‘river shore’ or the preceding medial clause *hena:nege:* ‘went and...’. In summary, recapitulative linkage is a repetition of lexical elements from the reference clause. These can be exact repetitions of the same lexical items, or may be semantically related terms with the same predicative or argument reference. The repeated bridging clauses are typically reduced relative to the previous reference clause and tend to include only the predicate and highlighted arguments, while less prominent elements are reduced or omitted. The function and motivation for choosing particular clause elements to be repeated in a bridging clause will be further explored in §4.

3.3 Summary linkage

Summary linkage differs from recapitulative linkage in that the predicate of the bridging clause utilizes a generic verb to refer to a preceding event rather than repeated lexical items. In Eibela, this can take several forms, including the light verb ϵ ‘do’, the demonstrative verb *wogu* ‘do thus’, or the durative auxiliary verb *hena:*. In contrast to recapitulative linkage, the bridging clause in summary linkage is always preceded by a final clause. In recapitulative bridging, the preceding reference clause may be either a final or medial clause. This means that summary linkage in Eibela is always the first part of a new clause chain or complex clause. As with recapitulative linkage, the bridging clause may take the form of either a medial clause or topic clause.

3.3.1 ϵ ‘do’

The light verb ϵ is by far the most common summary linkage strategy. It occurs with a variety of aspectual and conjunctive enclitics, including switch reference, perfectivity, and completion, but without any tense morphology. The reference

of ε ‘do’ is non-specific and general. In (A9) of the Appendix, the topic clause $\varepsilon bija$ ‘do’ makes reference to the preceding final clause, $\varepsilon im\varepsilon o:\phi a a:n\varepsilon$ ‘The sun set’. Bridging clauses formed with ε are commonly medial clauses, as in (13), or topic clauses as in (14). In these cases, the bridging clause is an introductory dependent of a larger complex clause or clause chain. In (13), the summary bridging clause in (13b) forms the initial medial clause of a short chain of three clauses.

- (13) a. $[a:mi \quad \varepsilon na \quad b\varepsilon:-\phi\varepsilon i]_{final}$
 DEM;ASSOC DEM;ABS put.on-HYPOTH;COMP
 ‘Then put it on there.’
- b. $[\varepsilon \quad di-si]_{medial}$
 do PFV-MED;PFV
 ‘Do that and then...’
- c. $[ena \quad m\varepsilon gi \quad \varepsilon na \quad adl\varepsilon-l\varepsilon-si]_{medial} \quad [ta:l\varepsilon=ta]_{final}$
 DEM rope DEM;ABS tie.on-SIM-MED;PFV finish=ATEL
 ‘...then tie that rope on there and finish.’

Similarly, the non-main clause in (14b) is the topic of the following main clause.

- (14) a. $[usaja \quad ka \quad ja \quad di]_{final}$
 NAME FOC came marry
 ‘Usaja came and married her.’
- b. $[[\varepsilon=ta-bi=ja:]_{topic} \quad \varepsilon g\varepsilon-j a: \quad ugei \quad \varepsilon na \quad a:mi]$
 be-ATEL-DS=TOP someone-ABS NAME that;ABS DEM;ASSOC
 $mi-ja:-bo]_{final}$
 come-PST-INFER
 ‘He was doing that, so this guy, this Ugei came there.’

The main difference between the uses seen in (13b) and (14b) is the scope of the bridging clause’s dependency, either as a constituent of a single following main clause, as with the topical function in (14), or a component in a series of medial clauses forming a clause chain as in (13).

3.3.2 *wogu* ‘do thus’

The demonstrative verb *wogu* (commonly reduced to *o* or *ogu*) functions very similarly to the semantically light verb ε with regard to bridging constructions, except that the reference of the demonstrative verb must be a specific event. A reference event is either an exophoric reference (e.g., ‘doing that’ where the event is

in progress and may be seen), or an event described immediately previously. In a bridging role, *wogu* does not present any tense, absolute aspect, mood, or evidentiality morphology, and is limited to clause-linking morphology such as relative aspect, topicalization, and switch reference. This results in a slightly more morphologically deficient predicate than ε . A prominent semantic difference is that *wogu* is more limited with regard to its scope of reference, whereas ε may reference an entire discourse episode or state of affairs. For example, in (15) there are multiple instances of *wogu* bridging clauses which specifically reference the immediately preceding clause. Bridging clauses with the demonstrative verb *wogu* may take the form of topic clauses as in (15b), and medial clauses as in (15d) and (15e).

- (15) a. [isa-ja: tila bu-sa:-bi]_{final}
ground-ABS descend impact-VIS;3-DS
'They continued struggling and fell to the ground.'
- b. [[wogu-bi=ja:]_{topic} bɛda=nɛgɛ:]_{medial} [a:mi kolu-wa
do.thus-DS=TOP see=MED;IPFV DEM;ASSOC man-ABS
wɛlɛ-sa:-bi]_{final}
shout-3;VIS-DS
'They did that and then I saw (Hauwa) call to the men.'
- c. [dobuwɛ-jo:: ɛ-sa:-bi]_{final}
NAME-VOC do-VIS;3-DS
'He said, "Dobuwe!"'
- d. [wogu-bi]_{medial} [bɛda-lolu=wa wa::]_{final}
do.thus-DS see;PST-COMP=TOP wah!
'He did that and I saw them go "whaa!"'
- e. [o-si=ki]_{medial} [ja-bi]_{final}
do.thus-MED;PFV=CONT come-DS
'I did that (saw them) and they came.'

As seen in (15e), and (16b), in topic and medial positions, the two reduced forms of *wogu* (*o* and *ogu*) are commonly used in free alternation.

- (16) a. [gɛ: hɛ:ga-ja: ɛ-sa:]_{final}
2;SG how;PST-INTER;NON.PRS say-3;VIS
'He said "What happened to you?"'

- b. [*logu beda*]_{medial} [*nε εnεbε wε dε:ja wε kei*]_{final}
do.thus CONS 1;SG leg this swollen this ASSER
‘He did (said) that, so (I said) “My leg is swollen, this one.”’

This reduction does not occur when *wogu* is used as the main predicate of the clause, and is a prominent feature of topical and medial bridging clauses formed with *wogu*.

3.3.3 *hena*: ‘durative’

The durative auxiliary *hena*: may also be used as the predicate of a bridging clause, as shown in (17c). Like *wogu*, there is no tense, aspect, mood, or evidentiality inflection in topic or medial clauses predicated by durative *hena*:. Additionally, the auxiliary *hena*: cannot appear as the final predicate in a final clause.

- (17) a. [*εime oga ε γε-mena=ta*]_{medial} [*holo anε-obo*]_{final}
already pandanus seedling plant-FUT=ATEL DEM;up go;PST-INFER
‘He had already gone up there to plant pandanus seeds.’
- b. [[*logu-bi=ja*]:]_{topic} *nε nε-φeni εna ja di*]_{final}
do.thus-DS=TOP 1;SG 1;SG-alone still here PFV
‘He did that, I was still alone here.’
- c. [[*hena:-si=ja*]:]_{topic} *si-ja*]_{final}
DUR-MED;PFV=TOP move.around-PST
‘That being the case, I was wandering around here.’

Other auxiliaries must be preceded by the dummy verb *ε* (e.g., 13b), and the independence of *hena*: as a predicate is unique among auxiliaries. Semantically, *hena*: specifies an ongoing action or continuing state, and originates from a verb meaning ‘to go’.

Similarly to *wogu*, in medial clauses *hena*: is often reduced, in this case to *na*:, as shown in (18a).

- (18) a. [*ε-φεija*]_{medial} [*na:-si*]_{medial}
do-PRF DUR-MED;PFV
‘That had happened and then...’
- b. [*nε εna hodosu-wε=mi*]_{medial}
1;SG still small-LOC=ASSOC
‘when I was still small...’

This reduction occurs only in bridging constructions such as the example in (18a). The primary difference between ϵ 'do', *wogu* 'do thus', and *hena*: 'continue doing' is a semantic contrast. ϵ 'do' has no substantive semantic content, and makes reference to an indefinite stretch of preceding discourse while providing a verb stem for clause-linking morphology. *wogu* 'do thus' on the other hand makes definite reference to a specific event which immediately precedes the bridging clause, or is clear from the extra-linguistic context. Finally, *hena*: 'continue doing', has a prominent aspectual meaning of durativity, and references a definite immediately preceding event. More on the discourse roles of bridging constructions follows in §4.

4 Discourse functions of bridging constructions

Bridging constructions are found to have several functions within a discourse, including frame-setting, argument tracking, showing temporal relations between clauses, and defining discourse episodes. Generally speaking, these functions revolve around establishing a given frame of reference, and then situating new information within this frame of reference. Prince (1981) presents a relevant discussion in which given entities may be thought of as "hooks" for new information. Thus, the given information therefore provides a sentential anchor for additional information. This anchor provided by the bridging clause may establish information such as a temporal setting, the participants involved, or the relevance of events to one another with regard to reasons, causes, and effects. This information then helps the hearer to integrate the subsequent new information in the broader discourse thereby promoting textual cohesion.

In this analysis, two levels of discourse organization become apparent. A larger series of related events is broken into episodes, while the entire series of related events forms a cohesive unit within a larger discourse. This larger unit will be referred to as the paragraph (corresponding to the idea of a paragraph in Thompson et al. 2007: 372), and the constituent parts will be referred to as episodes. Episodes are made up of one or more clause chains, and the formal realization of these discourse units is the preference for recapitulative linkage at episode boundaries, and summary linkage at paragraph boundaries. The use of bridging constructions in discourse organization to define two levels of discourse is discussed in greater detail in Aiton (2015).

4.1 Discourse organization

Bridging constructions occur at a boundary between discourse episodes. They are a way of reiterating and summarizing the conclusion of a series of events, and then highlighting the relationship of the following episode to the previous events (see de Vries's 2005 discussion of thematic continuity and discontinuity). In Eibela narratives, the identity of these two discourse units is often defined by the type of bridging clause that is used. Accordingly, these distinctions will result in different types of bridging constructions having differing discursive functions. Two representative examples will be discussed in the text below, and additional examples may be seen in the final Appendix of this chapter.

For example, in (19a–19c), there is a significant shift between a description of an event in the distant past, when the speaker burned himself as a child, and a description of the present state of affairs, when the speaker shows the scar that is currently present due to these past events. The summary linkage in (19c) appears at the end of a text, and marks the end of the final paragraph of the narrative, and the beginning of a metatextual commentary on the narrative as a whole rather than a single identifiable reference clause. This transition both marks a shift in temporal reference and highlights the semantic relationship between the paragraphs.

- (19) a. *[gulu tila=nεgε:]_{medial}*
 knee descend=MED;IPFV
 'This knee was down and then...'
- b. *[dε εna ka gε-φεija]_{medial}*
 fire that FOC burn-PRF
 'It was burned on that fire.'
- c. *[ε-φεija]_{medial} [umoko wε da: ko]_{final}*
 do-PRF scar this exist DEM;PRED
 'That happened and this is the scar.'
- d. *[ε-φεija]_{medial} [nana la babalε do-wa]_{final}*
 do-PRF 1;SG;P DEF not.know STAT-PST
 'That happened and I didn't know (about it).'
- e. *[ε-φεija]_{medial} [ka nε εja ε wa:lε beda]_{medial}*
 do-PERF FOC 1;SG father 3;SG tell CONS
 'That happened, and my father, he told (me about it) so...'

- f. $[n\epsilon \ \epsilon na \ d\epsilon da]_{final}$
 1;SG DEM understand;PST
 'I know about that (story).'

While the excerpt in example (19) is not long enough to show the individual episodes in the initial paragraph, a larger example drawn from the Appendix shows a long series of events broken into four discourse episodes which describe three stages of a narrative and a final episode marking the coda of the paragraph. In the first episode beginning line (A17) of the Appendix, the protagonists decide to attack a pig that was unexpectedly encountered. In the second episode, (A18) of the Appendix, the protagonists are attacking the pig without successfully killing it. Then in (A21–A23) of the Appendix the speaker steps into the assault and successfully kills the pig. The bridging clauses in (A18) and (A21) of the Appendix signal a transition between these three distinct episodes in the narrative. Finally, another instance of summary linkage in (A24) of the Appendix references the entire series of events and is followed by a finale of sorts which describes the final result of the entire narrative.

In the lines (A17–A23) of the Appendix, the entire sequence constitutes one paragraph. This paragraph is divided into four episodes in total, with the first three episodes describing the events that occurred, and the final episode providing a summary and result of the whole paragraph. Whereas the bridging constructions in (A18) and (A21) of the Appendix reference only the immediately preceding event, the final example of summary linkage references the entire series of events and comments on the result of the entire paragraph. This shows two levels of discourse organization, which are associated with different types of bridging construction. Individual events form episodes, which are linked to other episodes describing related events by means of recapitulative linkage. A series of episodes linked by recapitulative linkage may then form a paragraph. An instance of summary linkage at the termination of a paragraph may then present a conclusion or commentary, which is presented in relation to the entire series of linked episodes.

The same pattern can be seen in procedural texts, where a series of steps constitute a larger coherent stage in the project. Example (20) is a continuation of the process described in example (12) above in which the speaker is describing the process of making a headdress. The paragraph from (20a) to (20i) describes how to wrap the frame of the headdress in vine cord before inserting feathers into the cord. Each individual step is part of the larger task of wrapping the head dress and inserting feathers into the cord, and the paragraph is brought to a conclusion by the concluding episode in (20h) which is introduced by summary linkage.

- (20) a. [a:mi kowε:ge-si]_{medial} [φili:-mei]_{final}
 PRO;ASSOC weave.together-MED;PFV ascend-HYPOTH
 ‘Then weave (the strands) going up.’
- b. [a:nε-kεi go=ta:]_{medial}
 two-INST meet=TEL
 ‘The two ends are joined together.’
- c. [[kowε:ge-si φili:=ja::]_{topic} ta:lε=ta: di-si]_{medial}
 weave.together-MED;PFV ascend=TOP;DUR finish=TEL PFV-MED;PFV
 ‘Having woven (the strands) together, then that’s finished.’
- d. [a:mi mεgi no-wa la ga:lε-mei]_{final}
 DEM;ASSOC rope another-ABS DEF;ABS shave.thin-HYPOTH
 ‘Then shave thin another piece of rope.’
- e. [[mεgi no=wa]_{topic} abo bu solu-mei]_{final}
 rope another=TOP bird quill put.in-HYPOTH
 ‘Then push bird quills into the other rope.’
- f. [[mεgi no=wa ga:=ja::]_{topic} la-bi-no di-si]_{medial}
 rope another=ABS shave.thin=TOP exist-DS-IRR PFV-MED;PFV
 ‘The other shaved rope is there, so...’
- g. [a:mi εna bε:φεi]_{final}
 DEM;ASSOC DEM;ABS put.on;HYPOTH
 ‘Then put it on there.’
- h. [ε di-si]_{medial} [εna mεgi εna adlε-li-si]_{medial}
 be PFV-MED;PFV DEM rope DEM;ABS
[ta:lε=ta]_{final}
 tie.on-SIM-MED;PFV finish=ATEL
 ‘That’s done, and then tie that rope on there and finish.’
- i. [no-wa la wogu-mei]_{final}
 other-ABS DEF do.thus-HYPOTH
 ‘Do the other one like that.’

The final line in (20i) describes a new series of events in the discourse and constitutes a separate and distinct stage in the construction of the head dress. Another detail of note in the extract is that the instances of recapitulation bridging at episode boundaries within the paragraph are not contiguous with the reference clause that they refer to. Instead the bridging clauses seems to precede a paraphrase of the immediately preceding clause. It is possible that the speaker is

self-correcting to repeat a clause with the addition of a bridging clause referring to the preceding event for clarity.

The concluding episode of a paragraph, such as (20h), is typically marked by a summary linkage clause utilizing the light verb ϵ , which references the events of the entire paragraph. In some cases, summary linkage can introduce commentary on a much larger discourse unit such as an entire narrative. In (19) a speaker is commenting on a story he has just completed which describes events from his childhood. He is explaining how he came to know the story and the lasting scar that resulted. In this example, the summary linkage clauses in (19c–19e) all reference the entire narrative and offer concluding remarks on the story. Bridging constructions are a way to signal a shift in an episode and perspective, while maintaining a clear sentential link between related episodes.

4.2 Temporal relations

One of the most straightforward functions of bridging constructions is to repeat the reference clause with the addition of a morpheme which specifies relative aspect. These morphemes specify the temporal relationships between the main clause and the bridging clause, and in so doing, specify the temporal relationship between two stretches of discourse. The first example is beginning a new clause chain with a bridging clause consisting of a medial clause using the perfective linker *-si*, either specifying a completed perfective event, or in conjunction with the simultaneous action suffix *-li*. When used to describe a completed perfective event, as in (20h), this represents an immediately preceding completed action followed by a subsequent action. When combined with the simultaneous event suffix *-li*, the bridging clause specifies that the preceding event is still in progress when the following events in the clause chain occur, as in *solalisi* ‘peeling’ in line (A7) of the Appendix. When describing an ongoing state rather than a telic event, a bridging clause may present the enclitic *=ta*, which specifies that the state continues during the following events of the following discourse episode, which is seen in *ta: do:ta:* ‘having crossed’ in line (A12) of the Appendix. A final example is the perfect aspect suffix *- ϕ eiija*, which specifies a completed event, the result of which is still relevant to the ensuing discourse, as seen prominently in the bridging clauses in (19c–19e).

4.3 Causal relations

The consequential auxiliary *beda* specifies a consequential relationship rather than a temporal one. In a bridging clause utilizing *beda*, the events of the previous discourse episode are represented as the cause of the subsequent events. For

example, in line (A30) of the Appendix, the final event of the previous series of events, i.e., the setting of the sun, is presented as the event which initiates the following series of events, i.e., the decision to leave. Similarly, in line (A21) of the Appendix the event preceding the reference clause, a failed attempt to kill a pig, is presented as the cause of the events following the bridging clause, i.e., another attempt to kill the pig. By adding a consequential auxiliary when making reference to previous summary-linked discourse, the relevance of the reference clause and the previous series of events to the subsequent series of events is made explicit.

4.4 Argument tracking

Another way that bridging constructions situate new information within an ongoing discourse is to specify the participants involved. The different-subject morpheme *-bi*, introduced in §1, serves this function by displaying a change in subject. The usage of the different-subject marker differs in function between main clauses and non-main clauses. In main clauses, an unexpected or non-topical subject will also necessitate a different-subject marker, as in (15a) and (15c) where the different-subject marker is used on the predicate of a main clause. In non-main clauses, a different-subject marker specifies that the subject of the non-main clause differs from the following main clause. For example, in line (A9a) of the Appendix the anaphoric form *ɛbija:* also specifies a change in subject, from ‘the sun’ in the preceding reference clause ‘the sun was setting’ to the narrator in following clause ‘(I) finished peeling the *owa:lo* bark’. The excessive and perhaps redundant switch reference marking in (15) may be a way of emphasizing the shift in participant reference and further clarifying the relevant arguments for each clause. In (15), for example, four different participants are referenced, which might contribute to confusion regarding the roles that each person or group in playing in the individual clauses.

5 Summary

To conclude, bridging constructions in Eibela are formed through two syntactic clause-linking strategies, topicalization and clause chaining. These bridging constructions may be further described as either summary linkage, which utilizes one of three different anaphoric verbs to form the bridging clause, or recapitulative linkage, which repeats the lexical material of the reference clause.

Summary linkage using the verb *wogu* ‘do thus’ or the aspect-marking verb *hε-na*: ‘continue doing’ has definite reference to the immediately preceding reference clause, while the pro-verb *ε* ‘do’ makes indefinite reference to preceding discourse. Recapitulative linkage repeats elements of the reference clause as a non-main bridging clause, but may omit or substitute elements.

Discourse organization is also shown to feature two levels of discourse which coincide with the usage of recapitulative linkage and summary linkage. Individual events form smaller units of discourse, here referred to generically as episodes, which may be combined with related events by means of bridging constructions to form larger units of discourse, here referred to as paragraphs. These two discourse units are formally distinguished in Eibela. At episode boundaries, recapitulative linkage is used to show that a subsequent episode is related to the previous episode, while summary linkage at the end of a series of related episodes may assert that a proposition is relevant to the entire series of episodes rather than only to the immediately preceding event. A similar pattern may be found in the closely related language Kasua, which likewise favors the use of summary linkage at the beginning of a “new thematic paragraph” (Logan 2008: 24).

Bridging constructions may be found with similar form and function in other languages of Papua New Guinea, and the patterns observed in Eibela may represent a general regional trend. Jendraschek (2009) observes that bridging constructions allow for switch reference marking between discourse units that would not otherwise be possible, and therefore contribute to reference tracking in the Iatmul language. He also observes that languages which feature prominent use of bridging constructions generally do not feature a native class of conjunctions, and that bridging constructions may be serving the same functional role of a conjunction in linking independent clauses. This follows from de Vries (2005: 367) and Longacre (2007: 374–375), who argues that languages of Papua New Guinea tend to avoid noun phrases and argument anaphors as a means of referent tracking, and instead rely on verbal morphology and switch reference marking in dependent (or cosubordinate) clauses. Bridging linkage may therefore be a general coordination strategy for those languages which feature rich verbal morphology, and a tendency to use fewer overt arguments in discourse.

Bridging constructions in Eibela provide varying ways of reiterating previous discourse before presenting new information. This can be viewed as form of topic setting, where a frame of reference is established by a bridging clause which then serves as the basis for subsequent events. The frame of reference defined by the bridging clause will therefore define the relevance of the following main clause. In the case of a medial clause functioning as a bridging clause, the frame of reference can be relevant to an entire clause chain. Bridging clauses formed by a

topic clause, on the other hand, typically provide a frame of reference for a single following main clause. Finally, this topic setting role may be viewed as a means of assisting in reference tracking through verbal switch reference morphology, and coordinating independent clauses or clause chains in discourse where there is no native class of coordinating conjunctions.

Appendix

This Appendix provides an extended excerpt from a narrative told by Edijobi Hamaja, an adult female speaker of Eibela who resides in Lake Campbell, while she describes a bush walk. Bridging constructions are labeled throughout using the familiar notation of underlined text for reference clauses and bold text for bridging clauses.

- (A1) $[[ja:-n\epsilon:]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 come-MED;IPFV
 ‘(I) came and...’
- (A2) $[[ba:k\epsilon\epsilon \quad du:na]_o \quad [d\epsilon la:]_{pred}]_{final}$
 bush.turkey nest;ABS dig;PST
 ‘(I) dug into a bush turkey nest.’
- (A3) $[[ba:k\epsilon\epsilon]_o \quad [d\epsilon la:]_{pred}]_{final} \quad [[h\epsilon na: \quad di-si]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 bush.turkey dig;PST DUR PFV-MED;PFV
 ‘(I) continued to digging into the bush turkey (nest) and then...’
- (A4) $[[tila:]_{pred} \quad [ha:na:]_o \quad [mu:du:]_{pred}]_{final}$
 descend water;ABS wash;PST
 ‘(I) went down and washed.’
- (A5) $[[[ha:na:]_o \quad [mu:lu:-w\epsilon:]_{pred}]_x \quad [h\epsilon na: \quad di-si]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 water;ABS wash-LOC DUR PFV-MED;PFV
 ‘(I) finished washing and then...’

6 The form and function of bridging constructions in Eibela discourse

- (A6) $[[\phi ili:-n\varepsilon:=ja:]_{topic} [owa:lo-wa:]_o [sola: \quad di]_{pred}]_{final}$
 ascend-PST=TOP tree.type-ABS peel.bark PFV
 ‘(I) went up and peeled bark strips from an owa:lo tree.’
- (A7) $[[owa:lo]_o [sola:-li:-si]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 tree.type peel.bark-SIM-MED;PFV
 ‘While (I) was peeling bark off a owa:lo tree...’
- (A8) $[[b\varepsilon da:-lo:lu=wa:]_{topic} [\varepsilon im\varepsilon]_x [o:\phi a:]_s [a:n\varepsilon:]_{pred}]_{final}$
 see-ASS.EV=TOP already sun;ABS go;PST
 ‘I saw that the sun was already setting.’
- (A9) a. $[\varepsilon -bi:=ja:]_{topic} [[owa:lo-wa:]_o [sola: \quad h\varepsilon n\varepsilon \quad di-si=ja:]_{pred}]_{topic}$
 do-DS=TOP tree.type-ABS peel.bark DUR PFV-MED;PFV=TOP
 ‘It was doing that, so (I) finished peeling the owa:lo bark and then...’
 b. $[[h\varepsilon na:]_{pred} [to:go l\varepsilon:]_x [\varepsilon :sa: \quad ka:]_o [o:g\varepsilon: \quad di]_{pred}]_{final}$
 go road;LOC bilum;ABS FOC carry.bilum PFV
 ‘(I) went to the road and picked up my bilum (string bag).’
- (A10) $[[[o:k\varepsilon]_x [dija: ti-n\varepsilon:=ja:]_{pred}]_{topic} [ja:-n\varepsilon:]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 okay hold descend-PST=TOP DIR;VEN-MED;IPFV
 ‘(I) was coming down carrying (the bilum) and...’
- (A11) $[[o:lona:]_o [ta:-n\varepsilon:]_{pred}]_{final}$
 NAME CROSS-PST
 ‘I crossed the O:lona.’
- (A12) $[[[o:lona:]_o [ta: \quad do:-ta:]_{pred}]_x [no:lo: \quad ho:no:]_{pred}]_{final}$
 NAME CROSS-TEL STAT-TEL other.side DEM;LVL
 ‘I was on that other side having crossed the O:lona.’
- (A13) $[[h\varepsilon na:]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 go;DUR
 ‘We were going and...’

- (A14) $[[j\epsilon:-si \ d\epsilon n\epsilon \ ba:l\epsilon]_x \ [k\epsilon:-ja: \ ka:]_o \ [ho:d\epsilon-si]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 come-PL PROG COORD pig-ABS FOC bark-MED;PFV
 ‘While we were coming, (the dogs) were barking at a pig and then...’
- (A15) $[[[k\epsilon:-ja:]_o \ [ho:d\epsilon-bi=ja:]_{pred}]_{topic} \ [kali:ja:]_s \ [\epsilon-ta:]_{pred}]_{final}$
 pig-ABS bark-DS=TOP wallaby do-TEL
 ‘We thought the dogs barking at a pig was (actually) a wallaby.’
- (A16) $[[[h\epsilon n\epsilon-si \ d\epsilon n\epsilon \ ba:l\epsilon]_x \ [k\epsilon: \ ka:]_o \ [ho:d\epsilon=ja: \ la:-bi:=ja:]_{pred}]_{topic} \ [ka:]_{pred}]_{final}$
 go-PL PROG COORD pig FOC bark=TOP exist-DS=TOP FOC
 ‘While we were going the dogs were there barking at a pig.’
- (A17) $[[[k\epsilon: \ \epsilon na:]_o \ [sobo:.o: no:-k\epsilon i]_x \ [s\epsilon b\epsilon: na:-ta:]_{pred}]_x \ [ka: \ h\epsilon n\epsilon-sa:]_{pred}]_{final}$
 pig DEM;ABS ax-INST hit;N.SG.A;PURP-TEL FOC go-PL;PST
 ‘We went to hit that pig with an ax anyway.’
- (A18) $[[[sobo:.o: no:-k\epsilon i]_x \ [s\epsilon da:-lo: lu]_{pred}]_{medial}]_{medial}$
 ax-INST hit;N.SG.A-ASS.EV
 ‘In hitting it with the ax...’
- (A19) $[[[moga: g\epsilon-li \ s\epsilon d\epsilon-si]_{pred}]_{medial}]_{medial}$
 bad-SIM hit;N.SG.A-MED;PFV
 ‘We hit it badly and then...’
- (A20) $[[[\phi o: s\epsilon: \ ki:-j\epsilon:]_{pred}]_{final}]_{final}$
 back;LOC bone-LOC
 ‘(It was) on the backbone (that we hit it).’
- (A21) $[[[\epsilon=b\epsilon da:-n\epsilon:]_{pred}]_{medial}]_{medial}$
 do=CONS-MED;IPFV
 ‘We did that so...’

6 The form and function of bridging constructions in Eibela discourse

(A22) $[[mi\text{-}j\epsilon\text{:}=ja\text{:}]_{topic} [so\text{:}bo\text{:}\text{-}k\epsilon i]_x [ja\text{:} do\text{:}\text{-}si]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 come-PST=TOP knife-INST DIR;VEN STAT-MED;PFV
 ‘I came there with the knife, and then...’

(A23) $[[k\epsilon\text{:} \epsilon na\text{:}]_o [ka\text{:} o\text{:}la\text{:}]_{pred}]_{final}$
 pig DEM;ABS FOC shoot;PST
 ‘I stabbed the pig.’

(A24) $[[l\epsilon \text{ h}\epsilon na\text{:}]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 do DUR
 ‘I did that then...’

(A25) $[[k\epsilon\text{:}\text{-}ja\text{:}]_s [ka\text{:} gu\text{:}du\text{:}\text{-}sa\text{:}\text{-}bi]_{pred}]_{final}$
 pig-ABS FOC die-3;DR-DS
 ‘that pig died.’

(A26) $[[k\epsilon\text{:}\text{-}ja\text{:}]_s [gu\text{:}du\text{:} \text{ h}\epsilon na\text{:} do\text{:}\text{-}si]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 pig-ABS die go STAT-MED;PFV
 ‘The pig had died, and then...’

(A27) $[[jo\text{:}la\text{:}]_{pred}]_{final}$
 butcher;PST
 ‘(We) butchered (it).’

(A28) $[[h\epsilon na\text{:}\text{-}n\epsilon\text{:}]_{pred}]_{medial}$
 go-MED;IPFV
 ‘We went and...’

(A29) $[[ha\text{:}n\epsilon \text{ s}\epsilon\text{:}=ja\text{:}]_{topic} [ka\text{:} so\text{:}lo\text{:} di]_{pred}]_{final}$
 river beach=TOP FOC darken PFV
 ‘It got dark, at the riverside.’

(A30) *[[[so:lo di=ja:]_{pred}]_{topic} [bɛda:=nɛgɛ:]_{pred}]_{medial}*
 become.dark PFV=TOP CONS=MED;IPFV
 ‘It had gotten dark, so...’

(A31) *[[ka: ta:=nɛgɛ:]_{pred}]_{final}*
 FOC CROSS=MED;IPFV
 ‘We still crossed.’

(A32) *[[ha:nɛ wa:wi-ja:]_o [ka: ta:lɛ-si...]_{pred}]_{medial}*
 river name-ABS FOC CROSS-MED;PFV
 ‘We crossed the Wa:wi river and then...’

Abbreviations

;	portmanteau	DEM	demonstrative	N	not
-	affix boundary	DIR	directional	NEG	negation
=	clitic boundary	DS	different subject	NMLZ	nominaliser
1	1st person	DR	direct	NON	non
2	2nd person	DUR	durative	P	patient
3	3rd person	ERG	ergative	PFV	perfective
A	transitive subject	FOC	focus	PL	plural
ABS	absolutive	FUT	future	PRED	predicative
ASS.EV	associated event	HYPOTH	hypothetical	PRF	perfect
ASSER	assertion	IDEO	ideophone	PROG	progressive
ASSOC	associative	IMP	imperative	PRS	present
ATEL	atelic	INDF	indefinite	PST	past
COMP	complement	INFER	inferred	PURP	purposive
	clause	INS	instrumental	SG	singular
COMPL	completive	INTER	interrogative	SIM	simultaneous
CONS	consequence	IPFV	imperfective	STAT	stative
CONT	continuous/ continuative	IRR	irrealis	TOP	topic
		ITER	iterative	UP	higher elevation
CONTR	contrastive	LOC	locative	VEN	venitive
COORD	coordinator	LVL	same elevation		
DEF	definite	MED	medial		

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank the participants of a two-day workshop entitled *Bridging Linkage in Cross-linguistic Perspective* that was organized by Valérie Guérin and Simon Overall at the Cairns Institute (James Cook University, Australia), on 25–26 February 2015. Without the organization of this workshop and the insightful comments of its participants, this chapter would not have been written. Additional comments from two anonymous reviewers and the editor, Valérie Guérin, were greatly appreciated and substantially improved the quality of this publication.

References

- Aiton, Grant. 2014. Grammatical relations and information structure in Eibela: A typological perspective. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 32. 1–25.
- Aiton, Grant. 2015. Repetition and anaphora as a cohesive device in in Eibela discourse. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 33(2). 35–44.
- Aiton, Grant. 2016. *The documentation of Eibela: An archive of Eibela language materials from the Bosavi region (Western Province, Papua New Guinea)*. London: SOAS, Endangered Languages Archive. <https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Collection/MPI1013856>, accessed 2018-8-19.
- de Vries, Lourens. 2005. Towards a typology of tail-head linkage in Papuan languages. *Studies in Language* 29(2). 363–384.
- de Vries, Lourens. 2006. Areal pragmatics of New Guinea: Thematization, distribution and recapitulative linkage in Papuan narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(6). 811–828.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in typological perspective. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *The semantics of clause linking*, 1–55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, N. J. 2012. Insubordination and its uses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guérin, Valérie & Grant Aiton. 2019. Bridging constructions in typological perspective. In Valérie Guérin (ed.), *Bridging constructions*, 1–44. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.2563678
- Haiman, John. 1978. Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54(3). 564–589.
- Haiman, John. 1983. On some origins of switch-reference marking. In John Haiman & Pamela Munro (eds.), *Switch reference and universal grammar*, 105–128. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Jendraschek, Gerd. 2009. Switch-reference constructions in Iatmul: Forms, functions, and development. *Lingua* 119(9). 1316–1339.
- Logan, Tommy. 2008. *Kasua sketch grammar*. Ukarumpa, PNG: SIL. <http://www-01.sil.org/pacific/png/abstract.asp?id=50999>, accessed 2018-8-10.
- Longacre, Robert E. 2007. Sentences as combinations of clauses. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description: Complex constructions*, vol. 2, 372–420. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prince, Ellen. 1981. Towards a taxonomy of given-new information. In Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical pragmatics*, 223–256. New York: Academic Press.
- Shaw, Daniel. 1986. The Bosavi language family. *Papers in New Guinea linguistics* 24. 45–76.
- Thompson, Sandra A., Robert E. Longacre & Shin Ja J. Hwang. 2007. Adverbial clauses. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description: Complex constructions*, vol. 2, 237–300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin Jr, Robert D. 1984. A typology of syntactic relations in clause linkage. *Proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. 542–558.
- Voorhoeve, Clemens L. 1968. The central and South New Guinea Phylum: A report on the language situation in south New Guinea. *Pacific Linguistics A. Occasional Papers* 16. 1–17.
- Wurm, Stephen A. 1978. *New Guinea phylum of languages* (Pacific Linguistics D11). Canberra: Australian National University.