

**Bardi Arguments:
Referentiality, Agreement, and Omission in Bardi Discourse***

Claire Bowern
Rice University

November, 2005

In this paper I examine some of the issues involved in the coding of information structure, in particular the way in which the combination of argument marking on verbs and free (pro)nominal material jointly determine discourse reference in a non-configurational language. The language in question is Bardi, a Nyulnyulan (non-Pama-Nyungan) language spoken by a small number of people who mostly live at One Arm Point Aboriginal Community in Australia's north-west. Bardi is strongly non-configurational and shows phenomena characteristic of polysynthesis. Languages of this type have been argued to be pronominal argument languages (e.g. Baker (1995), Jelinek (1984), Hale (1998), Pensalfini (2004)); that is, the subject (and other) markers on the verb saturate the verb's argument structure. Free nominals and pronouns, when they appear, are assumed to be anaphoric adjuncts. Work on pronominal

* To appear in a volume edited by Ilana Mushin and Brett Baker on discourse and argument structure in Australian languages. I gratefully acknowledge fieldwork support over the period 2001-2004 from AIATSIS (G2001/6505 and G2003/6761) and the Endangered Language Foundation. This paper is based partly on material analysed from published Bardi sources (e.g. the Bardi texts in Hercus and Sutton (1986) and Metcalfe (1975)); however most of the material on Bardi is from my fieldnotes. I am very grateful to Bessie Ejai, Jessie Sampi, and especially to †Nancy Isaac, who provided many of the initial grammaticality judgements and the explanations of her intuitions which led me to look further into this topic. All errors of course are my responsibility, not theirs. All examples and the sample text in the appendix are published with their permission. I thank the editors for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

argument languages, however, seldom discusses the discourse contexts under which full arguments appear (although for an exception see Nordlinger (1998)).

This paper is a discussion of the interrelationship between argument structure, case marking, ellipsis and the placement of overt nominal material, and the evidence which Bardi provides for the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis and analyses of nonconfigurality. Section 1 gives general information on Bardi and the Nyulnyulan languages. In Section 2 I discuss verb agreement, while Section 3 provides a summary of the evidence for Bardi being a nonconfigurational language. In Section 4 I provide some discussion of constituent order and argument ellipsis. Sections 5 and 6 provide an explication of reference tracking in overt nominal material and verbal morphology, respectively.

1 Background on Bardi and the Nyulnyulan languages

Bardi is a non-Pama-Nyungan, Nyulnyulan language spoken now by about 30 people on the Northern tip of the Dampier Peninsula. The total number of people identifying as Bardi is around 1000, although most Bardi people no longer speak or understand the language and English is used in all situations, except by the oldest Bardi people when talking amongst themselves. No full published description of the language exists, although one is in preparation (Bowern [forthcoming-a]) and Metcalfe (1975) contains detailed information about verb morphology.¹ There is extensive unpublished raw data on Bardi dating back to the Laves collection of the late 1920s.

¹ Aklif (1999) also contains a summary of morphology and case marking; that analysis, as well as mine presented in Bowern (2004a) differs in several significant ways from Metcalfe's. Note that because of the severely restricted use of the Bardi language these days, I have almost no conversational data, and my information on the language comes from elicited sentences and narratives. I am aware that this greatly limits the conclusions which can be drawn regarding the principles of discourse organisation; however since Bardi is now used in such restricted contexts it is very unlikely that the necessary data can be gained. Thus the comments made here should be taken to apply to narratives only.

All the Nyulnyulan languages exhibit extensive case marking. Case morphology is ergative/absolutive for all nouns and pronouns (there is no ergative split). The Eastern Nyulnyulan languages have an overt dative case, although this is lacking in the Western languages, where the dative has changed in meaning to a causal in Nyulnyul and Jabirr-Jabirr, and has almost disappeared in Bardi.² The languages also show agreement for subject, object and oblique/indirect object. Most Nyulnyulan languages only mark one of oblique and direct object at a time, although Bardi can mark both.

The Nyulnyulan languages are all non-configurational and (as far as I can tell from the sources available to me) make use of similar principles of discourse organisation. There are, however, differences in verb morphology and agreement marking. These differences form the main evidence for the subgrouping of Eastern and Western Nyulnyulan languages; there are further minor differences between the individual languages. In all Nyulnyulan languages, verbs are marked for tense and aspect, and marking is discontinuous. There is a prefix slot (which intervenes between subject person marking and subject number marking in Bardi) where distinctions are made between past, present, future and irrealis. The tense suffixes encode finer tense/aspect distinctions and include future, continuous, completive and remote past. A template of the Nyulnyulan verb is given in (1).³

(1) Person – Tense – Number – Trans – **Root** – Tense/Aspect = IO/Poss = DO

2 Summary of Bardi verb agreement

Bardi verb morphology is complex and agreement is extensive. For full details, see Bowern (2004a:Chs 4-8). All verbs obligatorily cross-reference at least one argument,

² There are a few frozen forms, although the only place the suffix regularly appears is in the phrase *oorany-ji-monji-* ‘to fight over a woman’. See also the discussion of example (38) below.

³ Variants and a few additional affixes are ignored in this schema for reasons of clarity.

identifiable as the ‘subject’ from tests such as the addressee of imperatives and the binder of reflexives. Direct object and oblique agreement also occurs. Nominal and pronominal arguments, when they appear, are also case-marked on an ergative/absolute pattern. Some examples are given in (2) – (4) below. In (2) we see an overt absolute pronoun *joo* ‘you (singular)’, and an agreeing prefix – *mi-* – on the verb. In (3), we have another second person singular subject; this time the free pronoun is ergative (*joo-nim*, compare absolute *joo*). The verb is marked by the prefix *n-*, which appears on bivalent verbs. Note, however, that the agreement marker is the same *mi-* which appeared on the monovalent verb *-nganka-* ‘talk’ in (2). Agreement is only sensitive to transitivity marking in the second person future/irrealis/imperative, where intransitive second person *nga-* compares with transitive *a-*. Example (3) also illustrates object agreement. The noun *aarli* ‘fish’ is cross-referenced by *=irr* ‘they’ on the verb. Finally, (4) gives an example of the marking of three participants. The beneficiary is marked only on the verb, by *=jan* ‘for me’; the object/theme is marked by *=irr* and the subject is marked as a prefix.⁴

(2) *Joo mingankan.*

Joo **mi-** nganka -n.
 2SG.ABS 2SG- talk -CONT
 ‘You’re talking.’

(3) *Joonim aarli minarlijirr.*

Joo -nim aarli -∅ mi- n- arli -j =irr.
 2SG -ERG fish -ABS 2SG- TRANS- eat -PERF -3PL.OBJECT.
 ‘You ate up the fish.’

⁴ A note on my glossing conventions is required. Where the morphology is crucial to the argument, I have given the full sentence, the free translation, and then a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss. Where the precise morphology is not important for the point being made, I give schematic glossing of whole words only.

(4) *Dalboonkoon anamajanirr ooldoobal!*

Dalboon -koon a- na- ma =jan =irr ooldoobal!
 dry place -LOC 2SG.IMP- TRANS- put -1SG.OBL -3PL.DO things
 ‘Put my things in a dry place!’/ ‘Put those things in a dry place for me!’

The subject agreement markers are prefixes which are sometimes fused with tense/mood prefixes, as seen in (4) above. In contrast, the (direct and oblique) object agreement markers are clitics which attach to the end of the verb stem, following clausal clitics. In (4) there is an example of both the direct object and oblique clitic. Example (5) illustrates the relative placement of agreement and clausal clitics with the clitic =gid ‘then’.

(5) *Injaybini=gid=irr nyoon injalanabalirr.*

I- n- jaybi -ni =gid =irr
 3 TRANS ask -PAST =then =3PL.DO there 3-PST-see=QUANT=3PL.DO

“jana goongarramagal oorany?” injoonoojirr.

where 2-PAST-PL-put-REC.PST woman 3SG-PST-do/say=3PL.IO

“He asked everyone he saw, ‘where did you put the woman?’ (he said to them)”

In Bardi it is also possible to mark nominal possessors on the verb. In (6), for example, the clitic =jan ‘my, for me’ is the possessor of the free noun *birrii* ‘mother’.

(6) *Birrii Broomengan inyjiidigaljan.*

Birrii Broome -ngan i- ny- jiidi -gal =jan.
 mother B. -ALLATIVE 3- PAST go -REC.PST
 =1SG.POSS. “My mother went to Broome.”

Such marking will not be further discussed here, although we should note in passing that it represents another area in which free nominal material and affixation interact.

3 Nonconfigurationality

It is worth briefly reviewing the evidence for Bardi's nonconfigurational status and its polysynthetic properties, in order to see why one might want to make the case for Bardi being a pronominal argument language (which provides the foundation for further and more general theoretical arguments about appropriate analyses of nonconfigurationality). Bardi is nonconfigurational by all the tests discussed by Hale (1983). In addition to free constituent order and extensive ellipsis (exemplified in the text in the Appendix), Bardi has discontinuous constituents and displays no subject/object asymmetries.

Bardi does have independent pronouns for all persons (in fact, the pronouns make a distinction between first person plural inclusive and exclusive which not all of the verbal markers do). The first and second pronouns are rarely used, and are largely confined to the marking of heavy emphasis. Third person pronouns and demonstratives will be considered further below in Sections 6.2 and 6.3.

Word order encodes no information about core grammatical relations. I have examples of all permutations of Subject, Object, Oblique and verb, given in (7) below:⁵

- (7) Baawanim inanggaljin mayi aamba.
 child-ERG 3-TRANS-PAST-bring-PAST=3SG.IO food man
 'The child brought food for the man.'
- ✓ Baawanim inanggaljin aamba mayi.
 ✓ Mayi inanggaljin baawanim aamba.

⁵ These sentences were elicited by Gedda Aklif and some word order combinations seem not to have been elicited. The sentences without ticks [these don't come out as ticks here – are you using Times New Roman unicode? they should be there- if they don't come out maybe you could change them in the final camera-ready version.] against them do not appear in Aklif's field notes with the other permutations of the clause and were generated by me on the basis of patterns attested in texts and elicited with other lexical items.

- ✓ Mayi inanggagaljin aamba baawanim.
- ✓ Aamba inanggagaljin baawanim mayi.
- ✓ Aamba inanggagaljin mayi baawanim.
- ✓ Baawanim mayi inanggagaljin aamba.
- ✓ Mayi baawanim inanggagaljin aamba.
- ✓ Mayi aamba inanggagaljin baawanim.
- ✓ Aamba mayi inanggagaljin baawanim.
- ✓ Baawanim aamba inanggagaljin mayi.
- ✓ Aamba baawanim inanggagaljin mayi.

Inanggagaljin aamba baawanim mayi.

Inanggagaljin baawanim aamba mayi.

Inanggagaljin mayi baawanim aamba.

Phrases may be discontinuous, but such orders are dispreferred in natural speech, except for phrases of quantifier + noun, where discontinuity is, if not the more common order, at least very frequent.⁶ Examples are shown in (8) and (9), where the numeral *gooyarra* ‘two’ is separated from *aarli* ‘fish’. There seems to be no preference

⁶ Compare also examples of possessors marked on the verb, such as (4) above, which may also be thought of as a type of discontinuity. Note, incidentally, that we cannot just say that dative and possessive functions are marked identically, since dative function is *always* encoded as agreement on the verb, whereas possession is optionally marked within the noun phrase, along with the possessum. Moreover, dative arguments can be accompanied by a coreferential free pronoun, whereas possessives cannot. Thus

(i) *Ngayoo birrii Broomengan inyjiidinajan.*

1SG mother Broome-ALLATIVE 3SG-PAST-go-PAST-1SG.IO

with the clitic *jan* doubled by the free pronoun *ngayoo*, can only mean ‘mother went to Broome for me’, not ‘*My mother went to Broome’.

for the relative placement of quantifier and noun; that is, either the quantifier or the noun may appear directly before the verb. Another example of a discontinuous constituent is in line 27 of the text in the Appendix; *iina bardag* ‘firestick sticks’ is split by the verb.

(8) *Aarli nganarlij gooyarra.*
 fish 1sg-pst-eat-compl two
 “I ate two fish.”

(9) *Gooyarra nganarlij aarli.*
 two 1sg-pst-eat-compl fish

I have not included in counting discontinuous phrases those phrases which could be said to contain an afterthought. There is an intonation break before the extra information.⁷

Other syntactic tests reveal little evidence for subject/object asymmetries at the level of the clause; they are only present at the level of verb morphology. The case split is ergative/absolute throughout the language; nouns and pronouns are both straightforwardly marked for either ergative or absolute (although see Bowern (2004b) for some unusual uses of ergative case marking). Examples were given in (2) – (4) above. Reflexive binding holds at the level of morphology, but not syntax. Reflexive/reciprocal morphology derives monovalent verbs from bivalent verbs. Either a circumfix immediately adjacent to the root is used (of the form *m-inyji*), or, in complex predicates, a reflexive light verb, *-banji-* ‘share’, appears. Examples are given in (10).

⁷ A similar intonation contour is used for repeated reinforcing information as well. It is possible that these discontinuities could be secondary predicates. Some elicitation of secondary predication was done in 2001, however the results were highly inconclusive, but seemed to suggest that discontinuous phrases could also have readings as secondary predicates, but did not have to. This would imply that Bardi is similar to Warlpiri (Hale 1989) in this respect.

- | | | |
|------|---|---|
| (10) | <i>ingoorroomoolooloonginyjigal</i>
<i>anggarmalinyja</i>
<i>maanka imbanjj</i>
<i>loorrboolorrb ingarrbanjj</i> | They are washing themselves
We'll see each other (there)
He made/painted himself black.
They were arguing with each other. |
|------|---|---|

Binding tests provide further evidence for nonconfigurationality. Pronouns need not be bound in what appears to be their binding domain, and equally, referring-expressions may be bound by pronouns. In (11) and (12), for example, coreference is possible between *Mary* and *jin(a)* or *-in* (both meaning signalling a third person possessor). (13) is a translation equivalent of (12), with an overt possessor *ginyinggi* 'she, he'.

- (11) *Mary_i nim jina_i birrii injalagal.*
 M-ERG 3SG.POSS'R mother 3-TR-see-REC.PST.
 'Mary's mother sees her.' / 'Mary sees her mother.'

- (12) *Birriinimin_i injalagaljin_i Mary_i.*
 mother-ERG-3SG.POSS'R_i 3-TR-see-REC.PST=3SG.IO_i Mary_i.
 'Her_i mother sees Mary_i.'

- (13) *Ginyinggi_i nimjin_i birrii injalagal Mary_i.*
 3SG-ERG-3MIN.POSS mother 3-TR-see-REC.PST M.
 'Her_i mother sees Mary_i.'

Weak-crossover effects are not in evidence. The relevant sentences are fully grammatical, as seen from example (14) -- compare the ungrammaticality of the English translation.

- (14) *Anggabanim injalanajin birrii?*
 who-ERG 3-TR-see-REC.PST=3SG.IO mother
 lit 'Who_i saw her_i mother?'

All these pieces of data provide evidence for Bardi's nonconfigurational status. The status of Bardi as a polysynthetic language is more controversial, however, and depends a great deal on the definition of polysynthesis used. Under Baker's (1996) definition, Bardi would not be classed as polysynthetic. It does not, for example, exhibit noun incorporation (although Proto-Nyulnyulan probably did have some sort of incorporation strategy, see Bowern (forthcoming-b) and Bardi's complex predicate constructions are the vehicle for the pseudo-incorporation of instruments and manner adverbs).

Various authors, including Baker (1996; 2000) have appealed to the pronominal argument hypothesis to explain the behaviour of nonconfigurational languages. The idea that the verb markers on such languages behave somewhat like pronouns is not new --- cf von Humboldt (1975) --- and it received its first treatment in a generative framework by Metcalfe (1975) and Jelinek (1984). Bardi is a good candidate for a pronominal argument language. As we have seen from the previous examples, subject-object asymmetries and other markers of configurationality appear to hold within the verb, but not at the level of the clause.

It is worth noting, however, that other tests for argument/adjunct status show that free nominals display properties of arguments when they are co-referential with an agreement marker. For example, although one can include multiple locational adjuncts, multiple arguments cause coherence problems unless they are interpreted as secondary predicates or are conjoined with plural agreement. Consider (15), the first clause of the story in the Appendix.

(15) *Giido Ganbaliny ingarralana injiidarr.*

G. G. 3pl-live-past spouse.

“Giido and Ganbaliny lived as husband and wife.”

*“Giido and Ganbaliny lived a husband and wife/spouse.”

Likewise, transitive verbs without overt nominal material are still interpreted as transitive. *Injalagal* must mean, for example, ‘he was looking **at something**’, with an unexpressed object which may be definite, indefinite but specific, or generic.

It is also worth mentioning that although ellipsis is very frequent and pervasive, it is not universally licensed. There are contexts where overt nominal material is required (see also Nordlinger's 1998 discussion of similar properties for the nonconfigurational language Wambaya). For example, although heads of nominal phrases may be non-overt, arguments in raising constructions must be expressed. In (16), for example, omitting *oorany* ‘the woman’ results in an ungrammatical sentence, even though in the corresponding set of paratactic clauses (17), an argument may be inferred.⁹

(16) *Nganjalagal* *(*oorany*) *roowil innyana jaarla*.

1sg.pst-see-past woman walk 3sg-‘catch’-pst beach-(loc).

‘I saw the woman walking on the beach.’

(17) *Nganjalagal*. *Roowil innyana jaarla*.

‘I saw [her/someone/something]. [She/he/it] was walking on the beach.’

Therefore, although Bardi provides no evidence for subject/object asymmetries, it does provide evidence for argument/adjunct asymmetries. There are further issues in the syntax of Bardi that pose problems for the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis (PAH); for example, as I discuss in Bowern (2005), Bardi exhibits none of the ancillary correlations of the PAH which we expect from languages such as Mohawk and Mayali, such as the absence of referentially defective nouns (which could not be simultaneously nonreferential and coreferential with the pronouns on the verb). Therefore, either Bardi is nonconfigurational, as is strongly suggested by

⁹ The position of *oorany* ‘woman’ in the clause is not fixed; it may precede or following *nganjalagal*, for example. To express ‘I saw someone walking on the beach’, one uses *anggabal* ‘someone or other’.

the core tests described above, but the strongest interpretation of the PAH does not hold (that is, that the verb markers are pronoun-like), or Bardi is configurational at the clause level, and we need some alternative explanation of the nonconfigurational behaviour seen above. I assume here that the core tests of nonconfigurationality do establish Bardi's status as a nonconfigurational language and that there is an alternative explanation for the presence of referentially defective nouns, for which see further Bower (2005).

4 Constituent order

Let us now turn to the situations in which free nominal arguments appear, and how they behave in the discourse. As discussed in the previous section, core constituent order encodes no information about grammatical relations in Bardi. Free nominals in argument positions are rather rare, thus arguments regarding constituent order must be based on relatively small amounts of data. However, from text counts we do find some intriguing results. The following are the counts based on two typical texts from Tudor Ejai (Text 1) and David Wiggan (Text 2). The first column gives the order in question; the second is the number of occurrences of this order in the texts. The third column is this figure expressed as a percentage of total clauses. In the final two columns, the two texts are compared; percentages are given as a fraction of the total number of that type of word order.¹⁰

¹⁰ A single clause here is defined by the presence of an intonation boundary (usually about 1 second, sometimes a little longer) or by the presence of a clause-marker =*amba*, =*gid*, =*min* or =*arda*, which only occur after the first word of the clause. I did this because of the problems of assigning the argument of a sequence V Arg V to one clause or the other. Text 1 was recorded by CD Metcalfe in 1970 and is about a drunk who talks to his dog and danced with it; text 2 was recorded in 1990 by Gedda Aklif and is a traditional story about a woman and her two daughters travelling to find a husband. I have not run any tests of statistical significance on these data because I do not believe that there are enough clauses to make any findings statistically significant. This was a pilot test.

Order	Count	%age of total orders	% in Text 1	% in Text 2
SVO	0	0%		
SOV	0	0%		
OVS	1	0.6%	100%	0%
OSV	0	0%		
VOS	0	0%		
VSO	2	1.2%	100%	0%
SV	13	7.6%	15%	85%
VS	22	12.9%	86.3%	13.7%
OV	10	5.8%	50%	50%
VO	26	15.2%	69%	31%
OVO ¹¹	10	5.8%	50%	50%
VOV	4	2.3%	25%	75%
SVS	1	0.6%	100%	0%
VSV	1	0.6%	100%	0%
V	81	47.4%	59%	41%
Total:	171	100%		

Table 1: Basic word order and argument presence in Bardi texts

From these statistics we might conclude that the basic word order of Bardi is V! Of 171 clauses, almost half contained no core arguments at all. Of the other orders, VS and VO have approximately the same frequency (between 13% and 15%). Less common again (5%-7%) are the SV and OV orders.

This lack of overt material and preponderance of verb-initial (or verb-only) orders makes sense when considering the information structure of narratives and the

¹¹ I have included here forms which seem to me on intonation grounds to be monoclausal but to contain more than one verb, and clauses which contained discontinuous constituents. The O is the object of both verbs; I could not decide whether the order was V, OV or VO, V. I have listed here all such occurring sequences. Note, incidentally, that in OVO, SVS and VSV constructions, there is no intervening material (although there can be in the case of VO and OV, and so on.

targets of ellipsis. Kuno's (1982) point that ellipsis targets recoverable information seems to hold true generally for Bardi. Omitted arguments are old information and form part of the 'common ground' in the discourse (in the sense of XX). Thus nominal arguments that appear are already marked just by their presence. Overt nominal material is either novel, or there is some reason for highlighting it; either the participant is doing something novel, or is standing in contrast to another participant, or for some other reason is not recoverable from the discourse. There are two positions where such information is introduced – clause initially, and clause finally.

Novel information (verbal or nominal) occurs first in the clause. New characters in a story, for example, always appear initially in the clause at their first mention. Answers to questions are usually initial too. In clauses where the same character performs a string of actions, the verbs of those clauses are initial; the action (or change of action) is new information. This position thus has the core characteristics of a position for syntactic focus (see, e.g. Dalrymple 2001:182-185) and I will be referring to this as the focus position for the remainder of this paper.

Final position in the clause is the most usual position for reintroduced old information. Occasionally in texts, foregrounded old information also appears initially, although this is rarer. It is most common when one participant is being contrasted with another. There is a strong correlation between the use of the participant tracker *ginying(i)* 'he/she' and final position in the clause. The text in the Appendix illustrates these principles. Note that I follow Mithun (1992) in simply noting a strong correlation between novelty of information and word order; I do not deny that there are exceptions to these tendencies. Furthermore, we will see below that the expression of new information focus and participant tracking is not wholly dependent on constituent order, and that verb morphology and determiners also play a role. These points are taken up in Section 6.1.

5 Reference and agreement

In the second part of the paper I examine the role of agreement, argument ellipsis and free pronouns in establishing referentiality and encoding discourse and argument structure. This section concentrates on the role of agreement in

establishing discourse reference and marking referentiality and quantification. I examine subject marking separately from object marking, and in 5.3 I discuss the special properties which third person agreement displays. In Section 6 I turn to overt nominal material and discuss the same issues.

5.1 Subject marking

Subject marking in Bardi takes the form of a prefix. All verbs take a subject prefix (cf. the examples in (2)-(4) above). Subject marking in Bardi behaves much like subject agreement in more familiar pro-drop languages, such as Italian. The third person marker *i-*, for example, may be coreferential with a free nominal (as in 18), referential, and anaphoric as in (19), non-referential, as illustrated in (20), or impersonal, as in (21).

(18) *Oorany inyjiidina Broomengan.*
 woman 3SG-PAST-go-PAST Broome-ALLATIVE
 “A/some/the woman went to Broome.”

(19) *Bardi birarr injoon.*
 yesterday return 3sg-do-past.
 “She came back yesterday.”

(20) *Aarl irli.*
 fish 3sg-eat
 “People eat fish.”

(21) *Ool inamana.*
 water 3sg-put -pst
 “It rained.”

Which reading obtains (referential, indefinite, etc) is determined by discourse as a whole and by the use of demonstratives and pronouns such as *ginyinggi* (3rd person) or *jarri* ‘this’ (to be further discussed below). The marker itself does not vary. This

reinforces Evans' (2003:16) point that simply equating pronominal arguments with pronouns is misleading. Pronouns do not tend to have the same degree of variability in interpretation, at least in languages like English.¹²

5.2 Object and oblique marking

Direct object and oblique marking in Bardi have rather different properties from subject marking. While subject marking is always overt (even in imperatives), DO marking is null in the third person singular. IO marking is always overt, however, even in the third person singular. DO and IO markers are clitics, while Subject markers are affixes. Secondly, speech-participant (that is, first and second person) DO and IO markers are sensitive to discourse roles in a way that third person markers and all subject markers are not. Possessives do not seem to participate in this system either.

Direct object and oblique agreement markers have two forms. Examples (22) and (23) illustrate this with the verb 'to give':¹³

- (22) *Anangay (oola)!*
 a- n- ø -a =ngay oola
 IMP- TRANS- 'give' -FUT =1SG.DO water
 'Give me water!'

¹² As I argue in Bowern (2005), however, one way to get around the problems that Bardi poses for the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis is to assume that pronouns (or rather, pronominal agreement markers) in languages such as Bardi are more susceptible to non-referential or generic readings than pronouns in languages like English (see also Evans 1999, 2003 for different conclusions based on the same data).

¹³ Note that the 'direct object' forms also occur on predicative adjectives and also show =*jarr*- marking. The oblique forms are related to the free possessive pronouns, however the possessive pronouns cannot occur with *jarr*.

(23) *Anajarrngay* %(oolo)!

a- n- ø -a =*jarrngay* oola
 IMP- TRANS- 'give' -FUT =1SG.DO water
 'Give me water!'¹⁴

Table 2 below gives the forms for first and second person. The third person agreement markers do not participate in this system; they are invariantly = \emptyset for the singular and =*irr* for plural.

	<i>Jarr</i> -forms	unmarked forms
1 sg	= <i>jarrngay</i>	= <i>ngay</i>
2 sg	= <i>jirri</i>	= <i>rri</i>
1+2 dl	= <i>jarrway</i>	= <i>way</i>
1 pl	= <i>jarrmoord</i>	= <i>moord</i>
2 pl	= <i>jarrgoorr</i>	= <i>goorr</i>

Table 2: Forms of the direct object markers

Jarr-forms (as I will call the set) are transparently related to the unmarked set of agreement markers. Various authors have given different accounts of the distribution of the two sets. Aklif (1993), for example, says that the *jarr*-forms are used after stems ending in a consonant. Metcalfe (1975), however, argues that *jarr*-forms occur on stems containing an odd number of syllables. Neither of these distributions accounts for the data, as syntactic minimal pairs like (22) and (23) show. The distribution cannot be phonological.

I argue that the *jarr*-forms mark a type of relative object prominence. There are several pieces of evidence for this. There are two very common frames where the *jarr*-forms occur. The first place where *jarr*-forms occur is where arguments are contrastive, such as in example (24) below. The second is where there is a third person subject and first or second person object, and the speech act participant is featured in the discourse over several clauses (that is, the object is a grammatical

¹⁴ This sentence is pragmatically highly marked with the word *oolo* 'water'.

topic in the sense it is used in frameworks such as LFG: see, for example, Dalrymple (2001)). This is shown in example (25).

(24) *Niiwandi=jarrngay, joo ngaada=jirri.*

tall=1sg.DO, 2sg short=2sg.DO.

“I’m tall, but you’re short.”

(25) *Ngoorra inanggalajarrngay amboorinyim.*

last night 3sg-trans-past-visit=1sg.DO person-ERG.

“Someone visited me last night.”

The *jarr*-forms are not used when the verb (or another participant in the clause) is in focus. In (26), for example, the speaker wanted to be sure that the person she was talking to wasn’t just daydreaming.

(26) *Nganyji milamanka=ngay?*

QUESTION 2sg-listen=1sg.DO?

“Are you **listening** to me?”

Similar forms are found for oblique markers (=jarran/jan in the first person), although they are much rarer. The oblique markers have the same distribution between the two sets in discourse as the direct object forms do. An example is given in (27).

(27) *Marbiddynim inanggalajarrngay bardi, gooyarr aalga inggoodalijarran arra darr oolarnajan.*

Marbiddy-ERG 3sg-trans-past-visit=1sg.DO yesterday, two day 3sg-past-lost=1sg.IO NEG come 3sg-irr-‘spear’=1sg.IO.

“Marbiddy came to visit yesterday, for two days I didn’t know where she was [lit. she was lost on me], she didn’t come.”

Jarr-marking is distinct from word order discourse marking. For example, the presence or absence of *=jarr*-forms does not seem to affect the appearance of free pronouns. They are rare whether or not they co-occur with *jar*-marking. It also co-occurs with fronted new information which is not coreferential -- speech participants marked by *=jarr*- have already been introduced to the discourse and thus fulfil a separate role.

The forms with *=jarr*- are cognate with verb forms marking relative clauses in the related languages Warrwa and Nyikina -- for details see Bowern (2004a). It is also no doubt cognate with the demonstrative *jarri* 'this' (for which see further Section 6.2 below). It is not surprising that a marker with the function of introducing relative clauses, that is, one that establishes co-reference relations in syntax, should be co-opted to track and signal coreference across clauses. What is surprising, however, is that the forms are only used for speech act participants, especially since relative marking is not restricted to speech act participants in Nyikina and Warrwa. Perhaps the *jarr*-forms also have functions which are linked to discourse-based obviation (for which see, for example, Aissen (1997)). I have seen no evidence for similar marking in Nyulnyul or Jabirr-Jabirr and in the absence of further data this remains an open question.

5.3 Third person object quantification and definiteness

While it is true that third person object markers are not sensitive to marking by *jarr*-, third person direct object verb marking does encode whether the participant is definite or indefinite (or unspecified for definiteness); object quantification is also marked on the verb. This is done in two ways. For plural arguments, the presence or absence of plural agreement signals individuation. A quantifier may also appear on the verb stem.

The non-appearance of object marking was noted by Metcalfe (1975) and argued to be optional in Bardi, on the basis of pairs of sentences such as (28) and (29), which differ only on the presence or absence of the plural object agreement marker *=irr*.

- (28) *Aambanim inamboona niimana aarli.* ‘The man speared many fish.’
aamba -nim i- na- m- boo -na =∅ niimana aarli.
 man -ERG 3 TRANS PAST spear -REM.PAST =3SG.DO many fish
- (29) *Aambanim inamboonarr niimana aarli.* ‘The man speared many fish.’
aamba -nim i- na- m- boo -na =rr niimana aarli.
 man -ERG 3 TRANS PAST spear -REM.PAST =3PL.DO many fish

The best generalisation for predicting the ‘optionality’ of agreement is that plural agreement occurs when the object is individuated, and singular agreement occurs when the object is treated as a group or collective. This is the intuition of speakers when asked about the difference. Nancy Isaac described (28) is being spoken when the speaker is talking about the fact that there’s a lot of them, or maybe when you’re looking at the pile of the fish at the end of the day, whereas (29) would be used when the speaker is concentrating on the fact that the fish were all speared individually, one after the other.

Furthermore, we can argue that in sentences such as (28), agreement is not absent, it is singular. This can be seen more clearly when the agreement is dative, and thus overt in both singular and non-singular.¹⁵ In (30), the more normal construction, the third person plural agreement marker =*jirr* is co-referential with the noun *ambooriny* ‘people’. (31) is the same, except that the agreement marker is singular.¹⁶

¹⁵ This example is not definitive as the verb *-joo-* has a variable argument structure without agreement, meaning ‘speak, say something’, however note the use of the singular agreement and the normally plural *ambooriny* ‘people’.

¹⁶ A note is warranted also on some reflexive forms in the text in the Appendix (for example, line 36), as they also appear to be number mismatches. Forms such as *ingirrinijin* ‘they said to each other’ have a plural subject, marked by *ingirr-*, but a singular oblique object, =*jin*. Indirect reflexives (that is, where the reflexive is not the direct object of the verb) are always marked by =*jin*, whatever the person and number of the verb.

(30) *injoonoojirr ambooriny.*
 ‘He spoke to the people.’

(31) *Injoonoojin ambooriny.*
 ‘He spoke to the people.’

Moreover, similar agreement patterns for subject agreement were possible in earlier stages of the language (for example in the Laves texts, recorded in the late 1920s), although such agreement for subjects is no longer possible in current Bardi. Furthermore, in earlier Bardi there are examples of certain nouns forcing plural agreement. *Gaalwa* ‘mangrove log raft’ always takes plural agreement in the Laves corpus, even when the sentence refers to a single raft (perhaps *gaalwa* originally meant the logs tied together to form the raft). In the face of this it is difficult to argue that *gaalwa* is an adjunct, which it would be under the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis, if it is a notionally singular noun triggering irregular plural agreement. A further example of non-notional agreement in the Laves corpus is given in (32). Here we see the subject is marked by singular agreement on the verb, however the number of the subject is clearly plural: *guyarra agal guyarra agal guyarra agal guyarra*, literally ‘two and two and two and two’.

(32) *Guyarra agal guyarra agal guyarra agal guyarra galgarriny inyjalgun.*
 two and two and two and two swim 3sg.pst.fall-cont.
 ‘Eight of them were swimming.’

We can see from these examples from texts from the 1920s that Bardi agreement was even less purely anaphoric than it is in the modern language.

Bardi also has several clitics which occur just before the direct object agreement and mark quantification. The two most common forms are =*nid* and =(b)*al*.

=*nid* refers to a large group, while =*al* or =*bal* denotes an indefinite number.¹⁷ Note that these clitics are not obligatory when the object is indefinite or a large group; their presence forces a specific interpretation but their absence does not. Note further that =*nid* and =*bal* can appear on intransitive verbs and quantify the subject; on transitive verbs, however, they obligatorily quantify the object. This is the only area of Bardi verb marking which exhibits ergative/absolutive patterning; all other areas are nominative/accusative. An example is given in (33).

- (33) *Nyoonoo Landandinyinngan arr angarrinannid.*
 here L. go 1-pst-aug-tr-do/say-cont-rem.pst-quant
 ‘We used to go to Landandinyin.’

The clitics =*nid* and =*bal* occur in addition to third person agreement marking, in the same slot that =*jarr-* does, although they are in complementary distribution with =*jarr-*, as =*nid* and =*bal* do not occur with speech act participants. The examples in (34) and (35) provide illustration. In (34) we have a very interesting example of change in agreement. At the first mention, the subject *ambooriny* is singular; when *ambooriny* is the understood object of the second verb, *ingarralaninirr* ‘they caught sight of them’, agreement changes to plural. The third verb, *ingoorroongoorribinanabalirr*, has them with plural but indefinite agreement, presumably because we don’t know exactly how many dogs there were, and while we know that there are non-zero numbers of dogs and people, we do not know precisely which people out of the group are being chased. (35) gives an example of a generic and nonreferential singular. As shown from (34), however, items marked by =*bal(irr)* are not always nonreferential.

¹⁷ Metcalfe (1975; Metcalfe (n.d.)) records one or two other items of this kind which I was unable to re-elicite and confirm on my field work. He gives only a few examples of them, however.

¹⁹ This text was chosen as representative of the material as a whole. Statements made here also apply to my corpus of Bardi texts, which is currently about 15,000 words of digitised and searchable material and more than three times that amount of hand-written transcription.

- (34) *Inyjaralan bard ambooriny, bard iilanim ingarralaninirr
ingoorroongoorribinanabalirr.*
3-pst-run-cont off person, off dog-erg 1-pst-aug-tr-see-cont-rem.pst=3aug.DO
3-pst-aug-tr-chase-cont-rem.pst=indef=3aug.DO
“The [group of] people ran off, and the dogs caught sight of them and chased them.”
- (35) *Jabarra jinarr lagoorr arrarlinjambal.*
k.o. lizard 3sgposs'r-3pl-poss'e eggs 1pl-eat-cont-thus-indef.
“We eat *jabarra* lizard’s eggs.”

5.4 Summary

This survey of agreement and free nominal marking has revealed considerable evidence in favour of the pronominal argument hypothesis for Bardi (that is, that the ‘agreement’ markers are acting as the arguments themselves). For example, the direct object markers are sensitive to discourse marking, as shown by the *jarr*-forms of speech-act participant object markers. Other verbal marking provides direct information about quantification and individuation.

We have also, however, seen evidence that it is the combination of verb marking and free nominals which provides information about referentiality and discourse continuity. Subjects and objects behave differently from each other, and third person objects are different again from speech act participants. In Section 3 we also examined evidence that while pronominal marking could saturate theta roles and showed argument-like properties, the free nominals did not behave as adjuncts.

The next stage is to examine in more detail the behaviour of overt nominals in syntax and discourse.

6 Definiteness and referentiality in overt nominal material

First and second persons are always definite and referential in Bardi. That is, there is no use of the second person in non-referential uses, as in English “you (=people in general, one) want to be careful of linguists”. Third person participants, however, can be referential or non-referential, definite or indefinite, individuated or not. In Section

5 we saw the ways in which verbal morphology marks discourse functions. There are also ways to signal definiteness, referentiality, and anaphora with material outside the verb. Bardi speakers also use pronouns, demonstratives and ellipsis (no material at all) to signal different discourse functions.

In order to illustrate the points made in this section, I have included an interlinearised text in the Appendix. The portion included here is the beginning of a longer narrative which was told by the late David Wiggan to Gedda Aklif in 1990, transcribed by Aklif and checked by me with the speaker's sister. The text is a variation of the well-known fire-making stories of northern Australia. In this version, Giido and Ganbaliny (the sooty oystercatcher and pied oystercatcher respectively) steal the *iina* 'firesticks' from Girrgij (grey goshawk or osprey). In some Bardi versions of the story Girrgij is replaced by Joonggilbil, a falcon. The points made will be illustrated using this text so that the context of examples can be clearly seen.¹⁹

6.1 Character introduction and continuity

New participants in the discourse are introduced in initial position. We see this, for example, in the first line of the text.

(36)	<i>Giido</i>	<i>Ganbaliny</i>	<i>ingarralanana /</i>	<i>injidoron //</i>
	Giido	Ganbaliny	they lived	husband and wife

Topic continuity is usually signalled by omission of the argument. In the text, for example, after the first mention of Giido and Ganbaliny their next mention is six clauses later, when Giido says something to Ganbaliny (who is not mentioned). The next time they are mentioned is when they are reintroduced after the description of Girrgij's fire-making at line 15.²⁰ Note that the singular agreement of Girrgij versus the plural marking of husband and wife Giido and Ganbaliny provides disambiguation.

²⁰ Note that when Girrgij is introduced at line 3, he is not in initial position. I assume that this is because once Giido and Ganbaliny are introduced, any Bardi person listening to the story will know that Giido is also a character; thus once Giido and Ganbaliny are introduced Girrgij is not new information.

The next mention of Giido and Ganbaliny is contrastive: after the description of Girrgij's incendiary abilities we are reminded at line 15 that the oystercatchers are still without fire and must eat their fish raw, in contrast to Girrgij who can eat his fish cooked. Line 15 also represents a change of scene; we are back with Giido and Ganbaliny and remain with them for eleven lines.

Once the characters in the discourse have been introduced and activated, switches between characters are not necessarily signalled. In lines 22-24, for example, where the speaker is reporting a conversation back and forth between Giido and Ganbaliny, the change in speaker is not signalled by any overt material, but may be inferred by the fact that we are witnessing a conversation.

It is also useful to co-opt a distinction between active participants in the discourse and passive participants -- I have in mind something similar to the 'figure' and 'ground' distinction of Talmy (1983), extended to 'figure' participants (or characters) and 'ground' participants (non-characters) -- see also Kuno (1987). In 12-14, for example, the arguments *aarli* 'fish' and *noorroo* 'fire' are less important than the actions that Giido and Ganbaliny are watching Girrgij perform. I assume that the verbs are in initial position, the position for newsworthy information, and that the actions are more newsworthy than the patients of the verbs (after all, one expects the lighting to be done to the fire and the cooking to be done to the fish).

Thus discourse characters are introduced in initial position, and are continued, usually by ellipsis, until they are reactivated. Let us now consider other overt marking of items in the clause.

6.2 *Jarri* 'this'

Bardi has a number of deictic elements, including *nyoonoo* 'here', *nyalab* 'this way', and *balab* 'that way'. There is also a demonstrative *jarri* 'this', along with *boonoo* 'that' and *jiiba* 'this one close up' (demonstrative and the system of deixis is discussed extensively in Bowern (forthcoming-a)). The neutral demonstrative *jarri* is of interest here, because it is the only one used extensively in narratives.

Jarri is a marker of deixis in the literal sense of the word. That is, *jarri* points to its referent independent of the discourse context. The referent of *jarri* can be established independently of the preceding discourse, whereas the referent of

ginyinggi is dependent on pre-introduced information; it is always bound and behaves rather like a logophor. It is used for third persons in a rather similar way to that in which *jarr*-forms of direct object markers of speech act participants are used. This is not surprising, since the two are etymologically related. The free form *jarr* is not limited to direct objects, however.

There are only two uses of *jarri* in this text; at line 41 and at line 37. The instance at line 37 is in direct speech, while the use at line 41 is repeated as (37):

(37) *Injalana arrjambala jarr injidar irr Giido Ganbaliny.*
 he saw their tracks this spouse they Giido Ganbaliny.

‘He saw the tracks of the husband and wife Giido and Ganbaliny.’

In the story Giido and Ganbaliny have remained activated for the previous few lines, while they run away, and Girrgij returns and sees that his firesticks are missing. He does a number of actions (all focused) and then he sees their tracks, and Giido and Ganbaliny are then mentioned, in final position, with *jarri*.

6.3 *Ginyinggi* ‘he, she, it’ and *irr* ‘they’

Ginyingg or *ginyinggi* is the third person singular pronoun. It is referentially dependent on an antecedent in the preceding discourse (usually, the closest character). It thus behaves rather like a logophoric pronoun. It is very rarely used to refer to participants, however. Lines 31, 33 and 37-38 are the only examples in the text. In 31 and 33 *ginyingg* is used just before the topic is changed. In 37-38 it is used to reintroduce Girrgij as a topic in the discourse. These examples are typical of the corpus as a whole. *Irr* ‘they’ is used for plural nouns; *ginyinggi* is always singular.

While *ginyingg* is commonly translated as the equivalent of English ‘he’, ‘she’ or ‘it’, it has a rather different distribution, and behaves more like a demonstrative than a true pronoun. For example, in ll 33 and 37-38, *ginyingg(i)* co-occurs with the name. In contexts other than elicitation, *ginyingg(i)* is much more common as a modifier rather than a true pronoun.

It is interesting to compare the discourse use of *ginyinggi* to the use of the English third person pronouns. Broadly, English pronouns in discourse signal

character continuity. Compare, “Girrgij_i lit the fire. He_i brought back his fish_j. He_i cooked them_j.” In Bardi, however, *ginyinggi* is used to signal either the reactivation of an earlier character or the abandonment of the current active character in favour of an earlier one. It does not signal topic continuity.

Ginyinggi has a further use in referring to the action of the previous clause rather than to any particular participant. Case-marked forms of *ginyinggi*, such as the ablative *ginyinggo* and locative *ginyinggon*, serve as discourse linkers. They are invariably translated as ‘then’ and signal advances in the narrative with or without changes in the main character (this text has one example of each with *ginyinggo* ‘from this’).

7 Summary and conclusions

We can thus summarise the preceding sections in terms of a few general principles of discourse organisation. First, recoverable participants undergo ellipsis. Characters in discourse which are mentioned overtly are first introduced initially, in the position of newsworthy information. They are then omitted except when they are either reactivated (that is, that there is a shift in the narrative) and/or they are contrasted with another character. In that case, *ginyinggi* is used for reintroduced characters or for moving along the action of the narrative, and *jarri* is used to signal prominence while not shifting viewpoint. The agreement system itself does not appear to play a large part in this system, for the tracking of discourse participants is done entirely through the different marking of free nominal items.

The verb morphology makes its own set of distinctions. Speech act participants do participate in discourse marking in verb morphology; direct objects and obliques are marked for relative prominence over the subject. Third person objects are also marked for quantification and individuation in the verb morphology. Verb morphology cross-references person and number, and is often the only exponent of argument structure in the clause. However, it is not strictly ‘pronominal’, since it need not be anaphoric. Furthermore, we have seen that Bardi free pronouns do not have many of the characteristics of English pronouns either. For example, they are never used to track topics through discourse. In short, most

(but not all) discourse marking is achieved at the clause level, and most (but not all) grammatical and quantificational marking is done on the verb.

Therefore we are left with a very intriguing problem. Although Bardi shows many of the characteristics of a non-configurational, pronominal argument language, the 'adjunct' status of overt nominal material runs counter to the usual analyses of such languages. The interplay between referentiality, ellipsis, and topic marking spans both free and verb-marked material, and analyses of non-configurationality which do not address the role played by overt nominal material in the clause will not be able to account sufficiently for the behaviour exhibited by Bardi.

Let us briefly consider what such a solution might look like. One way we might proceed is to modify the pronominal argument hypothesis to take Bardi into account. I make a suggestion for how this might be done in Bowern (2005). A second direction we could pursue would be to treat Bardi verb marking as agreement marking, rather than pronominal argument marking. We would then need an alternative explanation for Bardi's nonconfigurational properties for free nominal material. A third possibility would be to recognise that many of the problems described here only arise because of the type of model used. Investigating Bardi syntax in the framework of LFG, for example, would allow to account for most of the behaviour noted here quite elegantly. The same applies to any framework where phrase structure need not play a greater role than modelling constituency. However, these are all questions for further research.

References

- Aissen, J. (1997). "On the syntax of obviation." *Language* 73(4): 705-750.
- Aklif, G. (1993). The Baardi language Unfinished PhD, Australian National University.
- Aklif, G. (1999). *Ardiyooloon Bardi ngaanka: One Arm Point Bardi dictionary*. Halls Creek, Western Australia, Kimberley Language Resource Centre.
- Baker, M. (1996). *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Baker, M. (2000). The natures of nonconfigurationality. *Handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*. B. Mark and C. Chris, Blackwells: 407-438.
- Baker, M. C. (1995). *The polysynthesis parameter*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Bowern, C. (2004). Bardi verb morphology in historical perspective PhD, Harvard University.
- Bowern, C. (2004). Some Uses of Ergativity in North-Western Australia. *proceedings of CLS 39*. Chicago, IL, Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago: 12pp.
- Bowern, C. (2005) Correlates of nonconfigurationality. NELS 36; UMass Amherst.

- Bowern, C. (forthcoming). A grammar of Bardi. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Dalrymple, M. (2001). *Syntax and Semantics 34: Lexical Functional Grammar*. San Diego, Academic Press.
- Evans, N. (2003). The true status of grammatical object affixes: evidence from Bininj Gun-wok. *Problems of Polysynthesis*. N. Evans and H.-J. Sasse, Akademie Verlag: 15-50.
- Hercus, L. and P. Sutton (1986). *This is what happened: historical narratives by Aborigines*. Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Jelinek, E. (1984). "Empty categories, case and configurationality." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 39-76.
- Kuno, S. (1987). *Functional Syntax*. Chicago, Illinois, University of Chicago Press.
- Metcalf, C. D. (1975). Bardi verb morphology (Northwestern Australia). Canberra, Australian National University.
- Metcalf, C. D. (n.d.). Bardi dictionary: draft, handwritten dictionary of c. 3000 items.
- Mithun, M. (1992). Is basic word order universal. *Pragmatics of word order flexibility*. D. L. Payne. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins: 15-62.
- Nicolas, E. (1998). Etude du système verbal du bardi, langue du nord-ouest australien, avec une présentation contrastive du système bunuba, Université Paris VII - Denis Diderot.
- Nordlinger, R. (1998). *Constructive Case: Evidence from Australian languages*. Stanford, CSLI Publications.
- Pensalfini, R. (2004). "Towards a Typology of Configurationality." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22(2): 359-408.
- Talmy, L. (1983). How language structures space. *Spatial orientation: theory, research, and applications*. H. Pick and L. Acredolo. New York, Plenum Press: 225-282.

Appendix: Girrgij, Giido and Ganbaliny

Glosses are schematic (that is, not every morpheme is individually glossed). Single slashes indicate a short pause. Double slashes mark major phrase boundaries.

- 1 Giido Ganbaliny ingarralanana / injidoron //
 Giido Ganbaliny they lived husband and wife
Giido and Ganbaliny were husband and wife.
- 2 Ginyinggo / goonkoordoo ingarralanana / mangir irrgoordoomarra
 then smoke they saw always every-when
- 3 booroo / mooyoon ingarralanan biila Girrgijjina noorroo //
 time morning they saw it again G. his fire.
They saw smoke each morning, every morning they would see Girrgij's fire.
- 4 arra nyoonoo irrgoordoomarrabooroo.
 thus there every time
It was there all the time.
- 5 “Arra nyoonoo anggiyoon goonkoordoo darnan,” / ingirrinijin “arra
 thus here what from smoke coming they said to each other Hey
- 6 barda jawa,” injoonin Giidonim injidar.
 away us he said to her Giido spouse
“Why is there smoke here?” they asked each other. “Let’s go and look,” Giido said.
- 7 “Anggala goonkoordoo nyoon anggiyoon goonkoordoo darnan,” injoonoojin
 we will go smoke there what for smoke coming he said to her
“We’ll go and see what the source of the smoke is,” he said.
- 8 “Waygi gala jawa.”
 come on gous
“Come on! Let’s go!” They walked.
- 9 Roowil ingirrinyan nyoonoo ingarralana Girrgiji / inyjarmina gardino /
 Walk they did therethey saw Girrgij he flew out from cave
- 10 noorroo ingooloorroonan. Bijorro ingarrjalginijin //
 fire it was burning from there they hid themselves
They saw Girrgij fly out of the cave and light a fire. They hid themselves.
- 11 Ingarralalan boonoo roowil innyana. //
 they watched him from there walk he did
They watched Girrgij go away.

12 Bardi ingarralalana gardo nyoonoo / inambanyin aarli nyalab
 Away they watched him still there he killed them fish then

13 jarr injoon.
 come he did

They watched him there. He speared some fish and returned home.

14 Inooloorroonoo noorroo. // Inamarramarranirr aarli. //
 he lit fire he cooked all of them fish

He kindled a fire. He cooked all the fish.

15 Nyin Giido agal Gambaliny injidar gardo ingarralanan
 here Giido and Gambaliny husband still they lived

16 garnkanyarr barnangga niwarda /
 with raw shell fish meat rock oyster

Giido and his wife Ganbaliny still ate raw shellfish and oysters.

17 Anggirgoordoo arang barnangga gardo garnka ingarralanan. //
 something other shell fish meat still raw they ate it

18 Nganyjal irrgoordoo aalga / ingarralanana namard.
 How many every day they / lived just

We don't know how long they lived that way [without fire].²¹

19 Aralgamin gala lalin imbanyin=arda jirr //
 another day thus lalin season it finished when to them

The Lalin season had finished.

20 Barn injoonin Ganbalinynim aamba barn injoonajin
 tell she said to him Ganbaliny husband tell she did to him

21 Giido / aamba jin,
 Giido man her

Ganbaliny said to Giido her husband:

22 "barda jawa anggala=mba nyirroogoordoo inmannoorroo
 off our we see=then how he makes fire

23 anggiyoon goonkoordoo darnanjin" injoonoojin. "Ngoorriji=aamba
 what from smoke coming he said to her tomorrow=thus

²¹ *Nganyjal* is the interrogative particle and the indefinite suffix; it is used to introduce a clause of doubt and is best translated as "we don't know..."

- 24 anggarrmi mooyoon,” injoonoojin.
we'll get up morning she said to him
“We'll go and see how he makes fire, where the smoke's coming from,” he said. “Tomorrow we'll get up and do it,” she said.
- 25 Ingarrjarrmini maankarngoon=kard. Garra garra garra²² roowil ingirrinyan nyoonoo.
They got up night time=when walk they did there
They got up when it was dark. They walked there.
- 26 Ingarrjalginin goolboon baybirrony.
they hid rock behind
They hid behind a rock.
- 27 Ingarralanana injarrminna iina / ingarralanan iina injooloonganarrbardag. //
they saw he got up fire stick they saw it fire stick he picked them up sticks
They saw him get up, they saw him pick up the fire sticks.
- 28 Bajibaj injoonirr garra garra garra inamana gooljoon noorroo //
rub together he did to them kept on doing it he put it in dry grass fire
He rubbed and rubbed them and put dry grass in the fire.
- 29 Bijorro inamanirr bardag goona iina. //
from there he put them sticks back fire stick
From there, he put the sticks back.
- 30 Innyana gooljoo / boo inamana ingarralanana goonkoordoo darr inarna.
he got grass blow he did they saw smoke come it did
- 31 Ginyingg barn inmanirr bardaga. // Ingirrinjin.
This do he did stick. They saw
He got grass and blew on it. They saw smoke coming out. He did this with the sticks. They thought about it.
- 32 Inooloorroonoo noorroo. // Ginyinggo injarrmin biila / barda / aarlingan.
he lit fire then he got up again away fishing
- 33 balaboo jarr injoonoo. Goonaba roowil inyana ginyingg Girrgij.
away come he did away there walk he did this Girrigij
He lit the fire, then he got up and went off for fish. He went away. Girrigij walked away from there.

²² Garra could be translated as “do thus”; it is a particle which when repeated (as here) signifies a gap in the story where the action continues for a while. There is another example in line 28.

- 34 Ginyinggo ingarrjarralana Giido injidar Ganbaliny.
 then they ran Giido husband and wife Ganbaliny

Then Giido and Ganbaliny ran.

- 35 Ingarralanarra “jarri gorna giija,”ingirrinijin. /
 they saw this good really they said to each other

They looked at them and said “these are really good”.

- 36 Ingirriiloonganairr ginyingg iina.
 they picked up them this fire stick

They picked up those firesticks.

- 37 Diird ingirrinin / barda ingarralginarr nyalaboomin jarr injoonoo ginyingg
 run away they did away they hid them this way comehe did this

- 38 Girrgij. Boor injalanajirr iina, arrajirr.
 Girrigj place he looked for them fire stick nothing of them

They ran away and hid them, and as they did so, Girrgij came back. He looked for the firesticks and found nothing.

- 39 Injalana arrjambala jarr injidar irr Giido Ganbaliny.
 he saw their tracks this spouse they Giido Ganbaliny.

He saw the tracks of the husband and wife Giido and Ganbaliny.