

BRIDGING LINKAGE IN TARIANA, AN ARAWAK LANGUAGE FROM NORTHWEST AMAZONIA¹

ALEXANDRA Y. AIKHENVALD

LANGUAGE AND CULTURE RESEARCH CENTRE, JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY

Bridging constructions—a means of linking sentences within narratives—can be of two kinds. Recapitulating linkage may involve repetition of the last clause of the preceding sentence as the first, dependent clause of the following one. Summary linkage involves using a generic verb in a dependent clause summarizing the actions of the previous sentence. Both have been referred to with various terms, including tail-head or head-tail linkage. In a number of languages, including Tariana, a North Arawak language spoken within the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area in Brazil, the two techniques are distinct in their form, in the content of the recapitulating and the summary clause, and in their functions. Both bridging techniques are the result of recent areal diffusion from the neighboring and unrelated East Tucanoan languages. The use of the generic verb in summary clauses and the repetition in recapitulating sentences are consistent with broader patterns in language structure and language use.

[KEYWORDS: Tariana, Arawak languages, bridging linkage, head-tail linkage, language contact, discourse, Tucanoan languages]

1. Bridging constructions: A preamble. Tariana, the only Arawak language spoken in the multilingual area of the Vaupés River Basin in northwest Amazonia in Brazil, has a variety of means for linking sentences within discourse, which include bridging constructions (recapitulating and summary clauses) and also conjunctions. Bridging constructions are, in all likelihood, due to relatively recent contact-induced impact from East Tucanoan languages onto Tariana. We start with a preamble.

Bridging constructions—a prominent feature of narratives in many languages across the world—offer a mechanism for linking sentences within discourse. They can be instrumental in telling a coherent story and making it flow—highlighting continuity or discontinuity of actions, throwing spotlight on some participants and events, and backgrounding others. The appendix contains a list of terms used for this phenomenon by various authors.

¹ A preliminary version of this paper was presented at a special workshop on “Bridging Linkage in Cross-Linguistic Perspective” organized by Valérie Guérin and Simon Overall at the Language and Culture Research Centre, James Cook University, in February 2015. The terms “recapitulating clause” and “reference clause” are partly based on the terminology adopted throughout that workshop, and partly on Dixon (2009:7–8); see also Guérin and Aiton (2019). I am grateful to the Brito and Muniz families in Brazil for teaching me their remarkable Tariana language. Special thanks go to R. M. W. Dixon for extensive comments and inspiration, to Kasia Wojtylak for information on Murui, and to Brigitta Flick for careful proofreading.

Bridging constructions are of two kinds (see a summary in Dixon 2009:8). The first involves recapitulating linkage. This consists in partial or full repetition of the last clause of a sentence as the first clause of the next sentence. Recapitulating linkage in Dolakha Newar is illustrated in (1). In Genetti's (2007:438) words, one sentence begins by repeating, "often in abbreviated form, the substance of the preceding finite clause or sentence," and the recapitulated material "ends with a verb in participial form." The predicate of the repeated clause is cast in the form of a participle (a dependent form of a verb used in clause-sequencing; see also Genetti 2005). The repeated part is in bold. Clauses are in square brackets.²

Dolakha Newar

(1) [ām māji=e mica makche=ri **chē**
3sgERG boatman=GEN daughter Makche=IND house

pul-en **yer-a]** [**chē** **pul-en**
return-PART come-3sg:PAST house return-PART

yer-en] [ām kanyā kanyā tuṅ jur-a]
come-PART 3sg virgin virgin TOP be-3sg:PAST

'That boatman's daughter Makche returned to the house. Having returned to the house, she lived as if she were a virgin.'

² The following abbreviations are used: 1, first person; 2, second person; 3, third person; A, subject of transitive verb; ACC, accusative; ACT.CONTR, action contrastive; ADV, adverb; AFFIX, affix (no abbreviation); ANAPH, anaphoric; ANIM, animate; ANT, anterior; APPLIC, applicative; AUG, augmentative; AUX, auxiliary; BC, bridging clause; CAUS, causative; CL, classifier; COMPL, complete; CONTR, contrast; COP, copula; DECL, declarative; DEM, demonstrative; DIM, diminutive; DS, different subject; EMPH, emphatic; ERG, ergative; f, feminine; FEM, feminine derivation; FOC.A/S, focused subject; FRUST, frustrative; FUT.CERT, future certain; GEN, genitive; GEN.ADJ, generic adjective; GEN.ROOT, generic root; IMP, impersonal; INAN, inanimate; IND, individuation particle; INDF, indefinite; INSTR, instrumental; IRRES, irresultative; INTER.INFR, interrogative inferred; LOC, locative; MASC, masculine; MC, main clause; NCL, noun class; NEG, negation; NF, nonfeminine; NMLZ, nominalizer; NOM, nominalization; NONTHIRD.P, nonthird person; NUM.CL, numeral classifier; O, object of transitive verb; OBJ, object; PART, participle; PASS.ADJ, passive adjective; PAST, past (no abbreviation); PAUS, pausal; PERV, perfective; pl, PL plural; POSS, possessive; PRES.INTER, present interrogative; PRES.NONVIS, present nonvisual; PRES.VIS, present visual; PRES.VIS.INTER, present visual interrogative; PROH, prohibitive; REC.P.VIS, recent past visual; REC.PAST, recent past; REC.PAST.VIS.INTER, recent past visual interrogative; REL, relative; REM.P.INFR, remote past inferred; REM.P.REP, remote past reported; REM.P.VIS, remote past visual; S, subject of intransitive verb; Sa, subject of an active intransitive verb; So, subject of a stative intransitive verb; SC, sequential clause; SEQ, sequential; sg, singular; sgf, singular feminine; sgnf, singular non-feminine; SR, speech report; SUM.CL, summary clause; SVC, serial verb construction; SS, same subject; TOP, topic; TOP.ADV, topic-advancement; TOP.NON.A/S, topical nonsubject.

Sentence boundary is marked with ||. Clauses are in square brackets. Serial verb constructions are underlined. Subscripts indicate clause types: MC for main clause, SR for speech report, SC for sequential clause, RecapC for recapitulating clause, SUM.CL for summary clause. The symbol ↑ (arrow going upward) marks rising intonation at the end of non-main clauses marked just by intonation. Unless indicated otherwise, examples from languages other than Tariana are given in the orthography of the source.

summary constructions—described for a number of languages—have been referred to as “head-tail” or “tail-head” linkage, obscuring the distinction between the two kinds of bridging (e.g., Longacre 1968:8, de Vries 2005, 2006).

Summary linkage in Aguaruna is expressed with the demonstrative verb ‘do that,’ with an inherently anaphoric meaning (a typological study of demonstrative verbs and their use in anaphora is in Guérin 2015). A similar effect in other languages can be achieved by using a nominal anaphoric demonstrative as a connector: this was described by Seifart (2010) for Bora, by Wojtylak (2015) for Murui, a neighboring Witotoan language, and also for Aguaruna, a Jivaroan language (Overall 2017a:501–2).³ The generic verb in summary linkage tends to grammaticalize into a conjunction (see, for instance, Seifart 2010). No such grammaticalization path has been attested for recapitulating linkage.

The two kinds of bridging constructions—recapitulating linkage and summary linkage—differ in their structure, meanings, and grammaticalization paths. For recapitulating linkage, the variables include:

- (i) the content of the recapitulating clause—whether it consists of just the predicate, or also its arguments and obliques;
- (ii) the status of the recapitulating clause and type of its marking; and
- (iii) the position of the recapitulating clause in the sentence.

Recapitulating constructions may share similarities with repetitions of other kinds, deployed for additional discourse effects.

For each summary clause in summarizing linkage, we need to determine:

- (i) what summarizing verbs may occur and whether any arguments or obliques can be used within the summary clause;
- (ii) the status of the summary clause and its marking; and
- (iii) the position of the summary clause in the sentence.

Further functions of the summarizing verbs within the language may shed light on the overall nature of summary linkage. Bridging constructions of both kinds may coexist with sentential conjunctions as further means of linking sentences, but with different pragmatic overtones. Tariana, an Arawak language from northwestern Brazil, is among the few languages which combine recapitulating linkage (similar to that in example 1) and bridging with summary linkage (similar to that in example 2), and also has sentential conjunctions.

As Bolinger (1977:ix–x) put it, “any word which a language permits to survive must make its semantic contribution; and . . . the same holds for any construction which is physically distinct from any other construction.” In line

³ See also Heine and Kuteva (2002:207–8), on a recurrent grammaticalization path from an anaphoric demonstrative to a clausal or sentential conjunction.



Fig. 1—Map of languages spoken in the Vaupés area and its surrounds

with this statement, the two types of bridging constructions in Tariana have different properties and different functions.

We will begin with some background information on Tariana, and a brief overview of bridging constructions in the language, in **2**. In **3** we outline a few relevant features of the grammar of the language, and we then turn to the features of recapitulating and summary clauses in **4**. The functions of bridging linkage are the topic in **5**. In **6**, we look at how they were impacted by contact-induced change. A summary is given in **7**. The final section, **8**, focuses on broader functions of the generic verb, and of repetition in the language.

2. Bridging constructions in Tariana. Tariana (ISO 639-3 = *tae*) is an endangered Arawak language spoken in two villages, Santa Rosa and Periquitos, in northwestern Amazonia (Brazil) (figure 1). Once a powerful group, the Tariana are now reduced to about 70 speakers (only a handful of them children). The traditional Vaupés River Basin linguistic area—where Tariana is spoken—is characterized by language-based exogamy: one can only marry someone who belongs to a different language group (inherited through one’s father) (see Aikhenvald 2002, 2012:75–83, 2017, and references therein). The Vaupés River Basin spans adjacent areas of Brazil and Colombia. Tariana is spoken only in the Brazilian Vaupés. Speakers of Tariana intermarry with speakers of the neighboring East Tucanoan languages.

Tucano is currently the major language spoken in the Brazilian Vaupés, and most Tariana use this language on a day-to-day basis.

Every speaker of Tariana is proficient in at least one language of the unrelated East Tucanoan family (including Tucano, Wanano, Piratapuya, and Desano). There is a cultural inhibition against “language mixing,” viewed in terms of using loan forms, especially from Tucano or any other East Tucanoan language. A careful linguistic investigation reveals that numerous structural patterns in Tariana are shared with East Tucanoan languages (see details and references in Aikhenvald 2002, 2003, 2006b, 2006c, 2013, 2017), rather than with other Arawak languages. Tariana has been restructured under the impact of language contact. Consequently, any statement about a feature of the Tariana language will be incomplete without paying some attention to what is inherited and what is contact-induced. Features that Tariana acquired through language contact from East Tucanoan languages include differential object marking, evidentiality and tense, single-word serialization,⁴ a number of clause types, and the ways in which discourse is organized. A fair amount of materials is available on closely related North Arawak languages of the Uaupú subgroup (Baniwa-Kurripako and Piapoco, and also Guarequena [not to be confused with Warekena of Xié, also an Arawak language, but from a different subgroup: see Aikhenvald 1999]). This is what allows us to distinguish genetically inherited patterns from those that are areally diffused.⁵

Throughout the Vaupés area in Brazil in the twentieth century, Tucano (the majority East Tucanoan language) has been gradually gaining dominance at the cost of other East Tucanoan languages and Tariana. At present, Tariana is spoken less and less in day-to-day life. In the 1990s and early 2000s, older and traditional speakers used Tariana with their children. Now that most of them are gone, the majority of ethnic Tariana speak Tucano at home most of the time (some also speak Portuguese). There is a marked difference between the “Traditional Tariana” (almost gone; documented by the author in the 1990s and early 2000s) and the “Innovative Tariana” (see also Aikhenvald 2013, 2017). The latter exhibits increasing impact from Tucano, especially in syntax and discourse patterns (some of which were discussed in Aikhenvald 2002).

⁴ This is sometimes referred to as verb-compounding in the literature on East Tucanoan languages (see Gomez-Imbert 1988; Stenzel 2007).

⁵ See, for instance, Aikhenvald (2002, 2012:75–83). This paper is based on my extensive fieldwork with the living speakers of Tariana (72 in all), beginning in 1991. The total corpus consists of about forty hours of transcribed audio recordings of spontaneous conversations and stories of varied genera, including origin myths, traditional legends and other tales, autobiographies, procedural texts, and hunting stories, in addition to field notes collected during immersion fieldwork and participant-observation. I generally avoid using elicitation. A comprehensive reference grammar of Tariana is Aikhenvald (2003). This paper follows current orthographic conventions for Tariana as adopted by the Tariana School in Iauaretê (Amazonas, Brazil).

TABLE 1
BRIDGING LINKAGE IN TARIANA

Kind of bridging	Option	Marking	Meaning	Examples
Recapitulating	Ia	Recapitulating clause marked by rising intonation only	Temporal overlap between the first and the second sentence	(3)
	Ib	Recapitulating clause marked by rising intonation and an enclitic	The action of the first sentence finished before the second sentence begins	(4)
Summary	IIa	Summary clause contains the generic verb <i>-ni</i> 'do' marked by rising intonation only	Temporal overlap between the first and the second sentence	(5)
	IIb	Summary clause contains the generic verb <i>-ni</i> 'do' marked by rising intonation and an enclitic	The action of the first sentence finished before the second sentence begins	(6)

The options for linking sentences that come up time and again in Tariana narratives and procedural texts are outlined in table 1. Options Ia and Ib cover recapitulating linkage. Options IIa and IIb cover summary linkage. In both cases, a recapitulating and a summary clause are separated from the subsequent clause with a pause.

2.1. Options Ia and Ib. The last verb of a preceding main clause (“reference” clause) is repeated as the first, dependent verb of the following sentence, “recapitulating” the previous clause. This is an instance of recapitulating linkage, as outlined in 1.

Option Ia is illustrated by (3), from a hunting story.⁶ Here, the verb in the bridging clause bears rising intonation on its last syllable and takes no overt marking of clause linking. The verb is formally unmarked for tense, aspect, mood, modality, evidentiality (more on this in 3.2).

(3) [Nese=naku **waka=na**]_{MC}|| [[**waka**↑[Pause]]]_{RecapC}
 there=TOP.NON.A/S 1PL:arrive=REM.P.VIS 1PL:arrive

[karuna=pu=nhina=niki]_{MC}||
 scary=AUG=REM.P.INFR=COMPL

‘We **arrived** there. As we were **arriving**, it was scary.’

⁶ Throughout the paper, the repeated verbs in the “reference” clause and in the “bridging” clause are in **boldface**.

There is a temporal overlap between events in the first sentence and those in the second sentence. An alternative option is Ib, illustrated in (4), from a story about a man working for a white boss. The dependent verb in the recapitulating clause is formally marked with the sequential clitic =*ka* ‘as, after’. It bears the same rising intonation on the last syllable, as in (3):

- (4) [[Nhua=de nu-a]_{SR} di-a=pidana]_{MC}|| [kayu
I=FUT.CERTAIN 1sg-go 3sgnf-say=REM.P.REP thus

 di-a=ka↑[Pause]_{RecapC} [diha nawiki di-ema⁷
 3sgnf-say=SEQ he Indian/person 3sgnf-stand

 di-na di-a=pidana]_{MC}||
 3sgnf-want 3sgnf-go=REM.P.REP]

“‘I will go,’ he (white man) **said**, after he **had said** thus, the Indian wanted to outdo (him)’ (lit. ‘he-stand he-want he-go’).

The action in the first sentence is finished before the action in the main clause of the second sentence begins.

2.2. Options IIa and IIb. The generic verb *-ni* ‘do’ occurs in a dependent clause at the beginning of a sentence, “summarizing” the previous sentence. This is an instance of summary linkage as outlined in 1. In option IIa, the verb ‘do’ appears on its own (marked with rising intonation only), as in (5).

- (5) [Disa-kha di-a=pidana]_{MC}
3sgnf:go.up-away 3sgnf-go=REM.P.REP

 [di-matamata disa
 3sgnf-paddle.with.one.paddle 3sgnf:go.up

 di-nu=pidana hanu-why-a-pasi-ne]_{MC}||
 3sgnf-come=REM.P.REP big-CL.CANOE-AUG-INSTR

 [kay di-ni↑[Pause]_{SUM.CL} [tuki di-kapuku
 thus 3sgnf-do little 3sgnf-overturn

 disa di-a di-ñale=pidana]_{MC}||
 3sgnf:go.up 3sgnf-go 3sgnf-disappear/die=REM.P.REP

‘(As) he was doing thus, he almost overturned going upward (and) disappearing.’

⁷ Underlined words include serial verb constructions, discussed in 3.1.

There is a temporal overlap between events in the first sentence and the main clause of the second sentence (reflected in the translation: ‘as he was doing . . .’).

Another option is IIb. There the generic verb is marked with the sequential enclitic =*ka*, as in (6) (from a description of a shamanic dream):

- (6) [Tapuli–se di–ka=mha]_{MC||}
 dream–LOC 3sgnf–see=PRES.NONVIS
 ‘He (shaman) sees (the person) in a dream.’
- [Kayu **di–ni=ka**↑[Pause]]_{SUM.CL} [diha dhita=mha]
 thus 3sgnf–do=SEQ he 3sgnf:take=PRES.NONVIS
- di–pusua_{MC||}
 3sgnf–suck
- ‘**Having done thus**, he takes (the person) sucking (him or his wound, or his spirit).’

The dream is over by the time the shaman starts sucking the person’s body: the sequential marker indicates that the action in the first sentence is finished, and something else (connected with that) begins: the shaman sucks the man’s spirit out of him after he had seen the person in his shamanic dream.

Both techniques—recapitulating linkage in (3) and (4) and summary linkage in (5) and (6)—serve to link one sentence with the next, providing discourse coherence and flow. They show overlap—or lack thereof—between two adjacent sentences which contain information about interlinked events. We now turn to a discussion of how these techniques fit in with the general principles of clause and sentence linking in Tariana, and how they are special. We also address the role of areal diffusion from Tucano in their emergence. We start with an outline of some grammatical features of Tariana, relevant for clause linking and clause structure.

3. Some relevant features of Tariana grammar. Typological profile of Tariana, the marking of grammatical relations, verb types, and the structure of verbal predicate are the topic of 3.1. In 3.2, we turn to clause types and sentence structure in the language.

3.1. Grammatical relations and verb types in Tariana. Tariana is agglutinating, with some fusion, and is also highly synthetic. Similarly to other Arawak languages, the few prefixes are cross-referencing markers, relative prefix *ka-* and its negative counterpart *ma-* (Aikhenvald 1999, 2002, 2018a). All other categories are expressed through suffixes or enclitics. Grammatical relations are marked with prefixes (on a split-S basis, as in most Arawak languages), and with cases.

TABLE 2
CROSS-REFERENCING PREFIXES AND PRONOUNS IN TARIANA

	Singular		Plural	
	cross-referencing	pronouns	cross-referencing	pronouns
1	<i>nu-</i>	<i>nuha</i>	<i>wa-</i>	<i>w(a)ha</i>
2	<i>pi-</i>	<i>piha, phia</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>iha</i>
3nf	<i>di-</i>	<i>diha, dihya</i>	<i>na-</i>	<i>n(a)ha</i>
3f	<i>du-</i>	<i>duha, duhua</i>		
impersonal	<i>pa-</i>	<i>p(a)ha</i>	–	–
indefinite	<i>i-</i>	–	–	–

Person-marking prefixes have the same form for the transitive subject (A) and active intransitive subject (Sa) on verbs, and possessors on obligatorily possessed nouns. This is shown in table 2 (see also Aikhenvald 2003:122, 2018a).

In contrast to other Arawak languages, Tariana has differential case marking for core arguments: *-ne/nhe* ‘focused A/S’ and *=naku* (Innovative Tariana *=nuku*) ‘topical/definite non-subject’. Open word classes are nouns and verbs. Underived adjectives constitute a closed class of about twenty members. Adjectives can be derived from nouns and from verbs and are thus an open class through derivation.

Following the pattern found in most Arawak languages, verbs in Tariana can be either active (A/Sa) or stative (So). Active verbs take cross-referencing prefixes (four persons). Stative verbs do not take prefixes (see Aikhenvald 1999, 2018a, 2018c). Tariana no longer has any reflexes of the proto-Arawak cross-referencing So/O enclitics (a feature Tariana shares with a number of closely related languages). Prefixed verbs typically refer to actions; they can be transitive, extended transitive, S=A ambitransitive and (rarely) S=O ambitransitive, or intransitive. Prefixless verbs refer to states. In their majority they are intransitive; about ten are S=A ambitransitives and just one is extended intransitive. In addition, Tariana has a small subclass of intransitive prefixless verbs whose only argument takes the non-subject case. These verbs refer to physical and emotional states—e.g., *inuna* ‘be unwilling’, *hama* ‘be lazy, tired’ (see the discussion in Aikhenvald 2003:235–41).

Categories of verbs are as follows: person, number, and gender of A/Sa (for prefixed “active” verbs), tense fused with evidentiality, aspect, manner of action, valency-changing derivations, and negation. The verb in Tariana has up to ten suffix positions and a further eleven enclitic positions (Aikhenvald 2003:253–55, 2017, 2018c). In Traditional Tariana, enclitics are “floating”: they attach to a focused constituent, or to the verb. In Innovative Tariana they tend to attach to the verb (just as do markers of corresponding categories in East Tucanoan languages).

A verbal predicate in Tariana may consist of a simple verb, or it may consist of a serial verb construction. Serial verb constructions may contain up to seven verbs (they are underlined throughout this paper). They share subject (A/S) marking, tense, aspect, evidentiality, and polarity values and are strictly contiguous. They cannot be separated by a pause. Serial verb constructions fall into two categories, following well-established cross-linguistic principles (see Aikhenvald 2006a, 2018b, 2018d). Asymmetrical serial verbs consist of two components, one of which comes from a closed class of verbs (such as verbs of motion, direction, volition, posture, causation). The verb from a closed class (called the “minor” verb) imparts a directional, aspectual, or causative meaning to the whole construction. An example is in (7) (further examples are in 4 and 5).⁸ The minor verb *-nu* ‘come’ provides directional specification to the serial verb construction.

- (7) Nu-na pa-ira-nipe=nuku phita pi-nu
 1sg-OBJ IMP-drink-NOM=TOP.NON.A/S 2sg:take 2sg-come
 ‘Bring (lit. ‘take-come’) me the drink!’

Symmetrical serial verbs consisting of two or more verbs from open classes are in a sequential, manner, or cause-effect relationship. Example (8) shows a sequential symmetrical serial verb construction (as does 6).

- (8) [Na-thaka na:na]_{MC}ll
 3pl-go.across 3pl:go=REM.P.VIS
 ‘They went across going on’ (lit. ‘go across-go’).

Symmetrical serial verb constructions may form noncompositional units (see Aikhenvald 2018b:82–84). For instance, a serial verb construction ‘stand want’ in (4) means ‘outdo; be better than someone else’. Importantly, the two major types of serial verb constructions in Tariana behave differently with regard to recapitulating linkage—as we will see in 4.1.

3.2. Clause types and sentence structure. Constituent order within main clauses, and word order within noun phrases containing adjectives and modifiers from closed classes, is pragmatically determined. There is a preference for a verb-final order, but this is not the rule, as we saw in the first clause of (5). A strong tendency toward verb-final constituent order among speakers of Innovative Tariana is a sign of Tucano influence (see Aikhenvald 2003).

⁸ Further details on serial verb constructions and other complex predicates in Tariana can be found in Aikhenvald (2003:423–26, 449–59, 2006a, 2006b). Serial verb constructions in Tariana have typical properties of serial verb constructions in general (Aikhenvald 2006a, 2006b, 2018b; and a comprehensive bibliography in Aikhenvald 2018d).

The main criteria for the end of a sentence in Tariana are:

- (i) falling intonation on the last syllable of the final word of a sentence; and
- (ii) the option of inserting a pause or a segmental marking of a pause (*-nha*, *-hã*) (e.g., 22a).

A grammatical sentence has to be specified for tense and evidentiality if declarative or interrogative. The marking always appears on the main clause. An imperative has its own categories, which include distance in space and time, evidentiality, and politeness.

Major clause types are main clauses, complement clauses, sequential clauses, and relative clauses. Clause types differ in (a) separate marking of tense and evidentiality, (b) switch-reference marking, (c) relative tense, (d) intonational properties, (e) position with respect to a main clause, (f) person-marking prefixes, and (g) fixed constituent order. Clause types and their properties in Tariana are summarized in table 3. As we saw in examples (3)–(8), a full clause typically contains core and oblique NPs. In this way, Tariana differs from Papuan languages described by de Vries (2005, 2006), which also display recapitulating linkage but use noun phrases sparingly.

Note that falling intonation is a feature of a sentence boundary. Rising intonation characterizes sequential clauses when they precede the main clause. It is not uncommon, typologically, to mark syntactic linkage and non-main clause types by intonation. See, for instance, Aikhenvald (2009) for a similar phenomenon in Manambu, especially for juxtaposed clauses; Mithun (2009) on Mohawk; Bolinger (1984) on English and in general. De Vries (2006:817) mentions specific intonation patterns in clause linking in a selection of Papuan languages.

We now turn to the general properties of sequential clauses in Tariana. In 4.2, they will be contrasted with recapitulating and summary clauses (exemplified in table 1 and briefly discussed in 2). Sequential clauses in Tariana are of two types. They can be marked by sequencing enclitics and intonation, type A.⁹ Or they may be marked just by intonation, type B.¹⁰

3.2.1. Sequential clauses marked by sequencing enclitics and intonation. The sequencing enclitics can be switch-reference sensitive. Then, when clauses are joined to form one sentence, the predicate of a dependent clause takes different markers depending on whether its subject is the same as that of the main clause or is different from it (see Haiman and Munro 1983 and also de Sousa 2016 for the definition of switch-reference). The action or state of

⁹ We will not mention clauses marked with postpositions and cases as they do not play any role in sentence linkage discussed here.

¹⁰ Sequential clauses may be considered instances of subordination. There is no clause coordination in the language.

TABLE 3
 CLAUSE TYPES IN TARIANA: A COMPARISON

Clause type	Property						
	(a) Marking of tense- evidentiality	(b) Switch reference marking	(c) Relative tense	(d) Intonational properties	(e) Position with respect to a main clause	(f) Person marking prefixes	(g) Fixed constituent order
Main Complement	yes	no	no	falling	n/a	full verbal set	no
Sequential	no (some exceptions)	yes (most)	yes: simultaneous or preceding	rising	Type A with an enclitic: before or after the main clause; Type B marked just by intonation: strictly before the main clause		yes: strictly verb-final
Relative		no	yes: simultaneous, preceding, or following	no special contour	before or after the common argument	relative prefix <i>ka-</i> replaces person prefixes	

TABLE 4
SWITCH-REFERENCE-SENSITIVE SEQUENCING ENCLITICS

Action in relation to the action of the main clause	Same Subject	Different Subject
Action prior to the main clause	= <i>hyume</i> 'after, because'	= <i>kayami</i> 'after'
Action simultaneous with the main clause	= <i>nikhe</i> 'during, while'	= <i>nisawa</i> , = <i>kanada</i> , = <i>kapua</i> 'while, during'

the dependent clause can be prior to that of the main clause, or simultaneous with it. The predicate of a dependent clause keeps its person marking. The most frequent switch-reference-sensitive enclitics in the language are listed in table 4 (see Aikhenvald 2002:158–59; Aikhenvald 2003:516 contains the full list).

The same subject enclitic =*hyume* 'after, because' is illustrated in (9). This example shows that a sequential clause marked by an enclitic can appear after the main clause (see property (e) in table 3).

- (9) [Na-na di-pusua di-nua di-ni=nhina]_{MC} [wheru
3pl-OBJ 3sgnf-suck 3sgnf-pour 3sgnf-do=REM.P.INFR snuff
di-eme=*hyume*]_{SC}
3sgnf-sniff=after:ss

'He (shaman) did suck and pour (poison) out, after he sniffed snuff.'

Example (10) illustrates the different subject enclitic =*kayami*. The dependent clause is preposed to the main clause.

- (10) [Diha haniri hado di-yāmi=*kayami*]_{SC}
he father mother 3sgnf-die=after.DS
[*kherunikana* di-rena di-ña=*pidana*]_{MC}||
miserable 3sgnf-feel 3sgnf-cry=REM.P.REP

'After his father (and) mother died, he felt unhappy crying.'

A number of sequencing enclitics are not switch-reference sensitive. These are =*ka* 'general sequential' and also =*kaya* 'while', =*khe*, =*kheya* 'despite'. The general sequential marker =*ka* is high in frequency, and polysemous. A clause marked with =*ka* can express temporal sequence, cause, and condition. In (11), =*ka* marks temporal sequence.

- (11a) [Pi-na nu-ka=*ka*]_{SC} [nu-kale matfa=*pu=naka*
2sg-OBJ 1sg-see=SEQ 1sg-heart be.good=AUG=PRES.VIS
di-rena]_{MC}||
3sgnf-feel

'Having seen you, my heart feels fine.'

- (11b) [Nu-kale nu-wara=ka]_{MC} [kawalikupeda
 1sg-heart 1sg-diminish=REC.PAST.VIS be.sorry
 nu-rena=ka]_{SC}||
 1sg-feel=SEQ

‘My heart is sad (lit. ‘has shrunk’), as I am sorry (or ashamed).’

These examples show that a sequential clause marked with =ka can precede (in 11a) or follow (in 11b) the main clause, depending on what is in focus. Innovative speakers of Tariana tend to place a dependent clause marked with sequencing clitics before the main clause (following the East Tucanoan pattern: see Waltz 1976, 2007; Ramirez 1997; Stenzel 2014).

The majority of sequential clauses containing an enclitic can take the topical non-subject case marker =nuku showing that the clause itself is the topic of the stretch of discourse. In (12) the sequential clause marked with =ka is highly topical; note its possible conditional reading (in agreement with Haiman 1978, but see further discussion in Aikhenvald 2003:529–30).

- (12) [Naha dekina pi-na pa-ira-nipe nheta
 they afternoon:ADV 2sg-OBJ IMP-drink-NMLZ 3pl:take
 na-nu na:=ka=nuku]_{SC} [mhāida pira]_{MC}||
 3pl-come 3pl:give=SEQ=TOP.NON.A/S PROH 2sg:drink

‘If (or when) they bring you a drink in the afternoon, don’t drink (it).’

A sentence typically contains not more than two sequential clauses. This is very different from clause-chaining in Papuan languages, with lengthy clause chains encompassing up to seven, or more, dependent clauses (see Longacre 1985:283 on the issue of an “endless sentence”). Sequential clauses with the clitic =ka look similar to recapitulating clauses in (4) (option Ib), and summary clauses in (6) (option IIb). We will return to their similarities, and differences, in 4.2.

Sequences of several events in temporal succession with overlapping actions are handled with sequential clauses of type B.

3.2.2. Sequential clauses marked just by intonation. Clauses with no segmental marking are characterized by (i) absence of any enclitics and (ii) sharply rising intonation on the last verb of the clause (typical of all sequential clauses). The last vowel can be lengthened, iconically reflecting the duration of an action. The clauses are typically short and rarely include an overt subject.¹¹ They may include a locational (e.g., *wyaka* ‘far’), a short speech report (as in 13), or an oblique (*diha-pua* (he-CL:RIVER) ‘this (river)’ in 19). The corpus contains half a dozen examples of a one-word NP object included in sequential clauses without segmental marking.

¹¹ The only three examples in the corpus where the overt subject is included in such a clause come from an innovative speaker. When transcribing the story, a more traditional speaker omitted the subject.

We can recall (from 9 and 10) that sequential clauses marked with an enclitic can be preposed or postposed to the main clause. Clauses marked just by intonation offer no choice: they always come before the main clause. There can be one, two, or three clauses following each other, in a contiguous sequence—see (13) and (14). One sentence cannot contain a sequential clause marked by an enclitic and another one marked just by intonation. All sequential clauses within one sentence have to be either segmentally marked or segmentally unmarked.

In 91.2% of all sequential clauses marked just by intonation, the subject of the sequential clause is the same as that of the main clause, as in (13). This example comes from a story about the water spirit telling a man off for trying to catch too many fish and instructing him to go back to his mates and also tell them not to do this. The man is upset because he thought that the water spirit (who appeared in the form of a big beautiful white woman who spoke Tucano) would marry him. Instead, all she had for him was an environmental message.

- (13) [[Haw]_{SR} di-a↑]_{SC} [thepe di-wa↑]_{SC} [[matfi nu-rena
yes 3sgnf-say fed.up 3sgnf-enter bad 1sg-feel
nuha↑]_{SC}
I

‘As he said “yes,” as he got fed up, “I felt bad.”’

- [phepa nu-ña-ka=tha]_{MC=SR} [di-a
one:CL.HUMAN 1sg-live-DECL=FRUST 3sgnf-say
di-hmeta=pidana]_{MC||}
3sgnf-think=REM.P.REP

‘“I am staying alone in vain,” he thought.’

If a sentence contains a series of clauses marked just by intonation, their subjects are always the same. The subject of the last dependent clause can be different from that of the matrix (main) clause, as in (14), from the same story as (13). Here, the actions—he said yes, he went down, he took (his [own] foot)—follow each other and show temporal overlap. The clauses are separated with a brief pause each and are marked with intonation rise. Inserting a pause (and an intonation rise) between components of a serial verb construction (such as *pi-a phipa* in the first clause of 14) would have been ungrammatical: serial verbs in Tariana are always pronounced as one intonation unit without a break or a pause, in contrast to sequences of clauses.

- (14) [Pi-a phipa phepama]_{Speech Report} [du-a=pidana]_{MC||}
2sg-go 2sg:grab 2sg:foot 3sgf-say=REM.P.REP
‘“Go and grab your own foot,” she (the water spirit) said.’
[[Haw]_{SR} di-a↑]_{SC} [di-ruku di-a↑]_{SC} [dhipa↑]_{SC}
yes 3sgnf-say 3sgnf-go.down 3sgnf-go 3sgnf:grab

[pi-a ita-whya pi-tutu pi-rahte]_{SR}
 2sg-go canoe-CL.CANOE 2sg-tie 2sg-float:CAUS

[du-a=pidana duha-ne]_{MC||}
 3sgf-say=REM.P.REP she-FOC.A/S

‘As he said “yes,” as he went down, as he grabbed (his foot), she (not anyone else) said, “go, tie and make float the canoe.”’

In other words, sequential clauses marked just by intonation follow the same-subject principle with respect to each other. There is no same-subject or different-subject requirement with respect to the matrix clause. Sequential clauses marked just by intonation appear similar to recapitulating clauses marked just by intonation in (3) (option Ia), and summary clauses in (5) (option IIa).

This way of marking clause linking in Tariana is remarkably similar to what Longacre (1983, 1985:278–79) called “implicit chains” in Wanano, an East Tucanoan language in which many of the extant speakers of Tariana are proficient.¹² Similar constructions were also described by Waltz (1976, 2007:475), and later by Stenzel (2016). This type of clause linking has been attested in other East Tucanoan languages, including Desano (Miller 1999:155–56) and Barasano-Taiwano, an East Tucanoan language in the Colombian Vaupés (Jones and Jones 1991:178–79); numerous examples are found in texts in Ramirez (1997, vol. III). Clause-linking involving dependent (nominalized) verb forms marked for switch-reference in East Tucanoan languages has been referred to as an “explicit chain” by Longacre (1985), Waltz (1976), Miller (1999), and Jones and Jones (1991); see also Stenzel (2016).

The formally unmarked dependent clauses in Wanano (and other East Tucanoan languages) tend to have the same subject as the main clause. Such dependent clauses whose subject is different from that of the main clause are “extremely rare” (Stenzel 2016:432, and her fig. 1, based on Longacre 1983:197–98). In Tariana, a dependent clause marked just by intonation tends to share the same subject with the subsequent clause, no matter whether it is dependent or main.¹³

The lack of a special morpheme on the predicate of a dependent clause and the same-subject principle correlate, cross-linguistically. The lack of a special morpheme tends to imply that the subjects of the two clauses are the same. This agrees with the iconicity principle: the conceptual distance

¹² The Wanano (or Kotiria) are the preferential marriage partners for the Tariana of Periquitos, and the Piratapuya (whose language is very close to Wanano: see Waltz 2002) are the preferential marriage partners for the Tariana of Santa Rosa.

¹³ Dependent clauses marked just by intonation in Tariana always denote temporal overlap between events (in contrast to Wanano, where they appear to denote events that overlap if their subject is different from that of the main clause, and events in succession if their subjects are the same: Stenzel 2016:432).

between conjoined clauses is greater when they are separated by additional markers and are thus “disassociated” from each other (Haiman 1983a:789–90; further discussion of correlations between formal marking and conceptual proximity are offered by Haiman 1985:120–24). In many languages with switch reference, the formal distinction between same subject and different subject on a verb could be that between zero and an overt morpheme (e.g., Mithun 1999:269, and examples in Haiman 1983b). Conjoined clauses that are formally less marked, or unmarked, tend to express event continuity, or even present the actions as components of the same event (as demonstrated in Mithun 1993 for Central Pomo). Sequential clauses marked only by intonation in Tariana and unmarked sequential clauses in East Tucanoan languages are no exception: they show temporal overlap between the actions of the dependent and main clauses.¹⁴

4. How recapitulating and summary clauses are special. We have now seen that two kinds of sentence-linking devices in Tariana illustrated in 2 appear to contain sequential clauses. Examples (3) and (5) are very similar to sequential clauses marked by intonation only (type B, or “implicit” chains, discussed in 3.2). Sentence sequences in (4) and (6) appear to contain sequential clauses marked with enclitics (type A in 3.2). The structural similarity with sequential clauses accounts for the differences in the meanings of the recapitulating and summary clauses (see also table 1).

Recapitulating and summary linkages marked just by intonation in (3) and (5) reflect a temporal overlap between the actions in two adjacent sentences, similar to what we find in the examples of sequential clauses marked just by intonation in (13) and (14). Recapitulating and summary clauses (marked with enclitics in 4 and 6) are used if actions in two adjacent sentences follow each other (without temporal overlap), similar to the examples of sequential clauses containing enclitics in (9) through (12). Figure 2 sums up these correlations (numbers refer to examples).

Recapitulating and summary clauses are similar to sequential clauses in the way they are marked, their meanings, and their intonational features. However, this similarity is misleading. We now turn to the content of recapitulating and summary clauses and then contrast each of them with sequential clauses.

4.1. What recapitulating and summary clauses consist of. As we saw in (3) and (4), a recapitulating clause is composed of the last verb of the preceding sentence (that is, its “reference” clause). In just a few examples, an adjectival modifier to the omitted subject can be repeated—see (15).

¹⁴ The corpus contains no examples of predicates of prefixless stative verbs (see 3.1) in dependent clauses marked just by intonation. This may be due to the fact that such verbs do not express actions, and no Tariana stories consist of enumerating states. In contrast to Wanano (Waltz 1977; Longacre 1985:279), reported dialogues in Tariana are presented as a sequence of main, rather than dependent, clauses (and so “implicit chains” are not used).

If the predicate of the reference clause consists of an asymmetrical serial verb construction, the whole asymmetrical serial verb gets repeated, as in (17) (and 21f). The asymmetrical serial verb ‘come back’ (lit. ‘return arrive’) is in curly brackets (both examples are from the same story as 15).

- (17) [Te {wa-dia waka=na}_{Asymmetrical SVC}]_{MC}||
 up.to.that.point 1pl-return 1pl:arrive=REM.P.VIS
- [nese {wa-dia waka}_{Asymmetrical SVC}][↑]_{RecapC}
 then/there 1pl-return 1pl:arrive
- [ñama-pikeri wa-ña[↑]]_{SC} [wa:=na=pita
 two-CL.MONTH 1pl-stay 1pl:go=REM.P.VIS=again
- nese=aya]_{MC}||
 then/there=EMPH

‘At that point **we came back**, then as **we came back**, as we stayed two months, we went right there.’

The difference in how serial verb constructions are repeated within a recapitulating clause is intuitively plausible. The symmetrical serial verb construction (overflow go) in (16) consists of two verbs reflecting different facets of a complex motion event. In contrast, the asymmetrical serial verb in (17) consists of two verbs, a major and a minor (return arrive). The minor verb (return) provides directional specification to the asymmetrical serial verb construction (the overall meaning of the construction is ‘come back’). Only the major verb in a symmetrical serial verb construction in (16) gets repeated. In (17), the whole asymmetrical serial verb undergoes repetition. In other words, recapitulating linkage offers an additional criterion for differentiating between the two major types of serial verb constructions in the language.

A reduced clause in recapitulating function does not add any further information to the reference clause. In (18), one recapitulating clause marked just by intonation is followed by another one. The latter contains a locational ‘far’, not found in the recapitulating clause.

- (18) [Pa-kada di-musu=pidana]_{MC}|| [Di-a=khani=pidana]_{MC}||
 one-CL.DAY 3sgnf-go.out=REM.P.REP 3sgnf-go=away=REM.P.REP
- ‘One day he went off. He went away.’
- [Hinipu di-a=pidana]_{MC}|| [Di-a][↑]_{RecapC} [wyaka di-a]_{SC}[↑]
 road 3sgnf-go=REM.P.REP 3sgnf-go far 3sgnf-go
- [yakare hanu-yakare-se di-musu=pidana]_{MC}||
 village big-CL.VILLAGE-LOC 3sgnf-go.out=REM.P.REP

‘He went by the road. **As he went**, as he went far, he went out into a big village.’

Recapitulating and summary clauses never contain any overt noun phrases (either arguments or obliques). They typically include the similative adverb *kay(u)* ‘thus, this way’—see (4), (5), and (6). The adverb may, occasionally, be omitted, as in (24) (the corpus contains five tokens of such omission). The recapitulating clause in (17) contains the adverb *nese* ‘then, there’. In this regard, Tariana differs from other languages, such as Cavineña (Guillaume 2011:127–28), where a recapitulating clause may contain repeated arguments and obliques, either in the same form as they occur in the reference clause or with an anaphoric pronoun.

4.2. Contrasting sequential, recapitulating, and summary clauses. Recapitulating and summary clauses differ from sequential clauses in the following properties, summed up in table 5. We will now go through the properties of sequential, recapitulating, and summary clauses one by one.

(i). Both recapitulating and summary clauses occupy a fixed position within the sentence: they precede the main clause. This is similar to sequential clauses marked just by intonation, but different from sequential clauses with enclitics: we can recall, from (9) and (11b), that those can be postposed to the main clause within a sentence.

(ii). Unlike sequential clauses marked with enclitics, recapitulating and summary clauses only take the sequential marker =*ka*. They cannot take any other marker (of those listed in table 4).

(iii). Neither recapitulating nor summary clauses can be marked for the topical non-subject case (unlike sequential clauses, which can be marked for the topical non-subject case if the content of the clause is the topic: see 12).

(iv). Unlike sequential clauses, neither recapitulating nor summary clauses can be independently negated, nor can they be questioned.

(v). The main clause following a summary or a recapitulating clause cannot be cast in interrogative or imperative mood; it always has to be cast as declarative. So does the reference clause for a recapitulating and for a summary clause.

(vi). There can be only one summary clause or one recapitulating clause per sentence. In contrast, as we can recall from 3.2, a sentence can contain more than one sequential clause.

(vii). A summary clause and a recapitulating clause cannot occur in the same sentence.

(viii). Sequential clauses marked by enclitics and by intonation can contain arguments and obliques as required (see 3.1, on transitivity of Tariana verbs), whereas sequential clauses marked just by intonation can contain one oblique at most and rarely have an object. In contrast, recapitulating and summary clauses cannot contain either objects or obliques.

We can conclude that recapitulating and summary clauses of both type A (marked by an enclitic and intonation) and type B (marked just by intonation) are quite distinct from superficially similar sequential clauses (type A and type B). Both recapitulating and summary clauses can be considered

TABLE 5
 RECAPITULATING AND SUMMARY CLAUSES VERSUS SEQUENTIAL CLAUSES: A COMPARISON

Properties	Sequential clauses		Recapitulating and summary clauses	
	Type A. Marked by enclitics and intonation	Type B. Marked just by intonation	Type A. Marked by enclitics and intonation	Type B. Marked just by intonation
(i). Fixed position within the sentence	no	yes	yes	
(ii). Sequential marker	one of many (see 3.2)	none	only = <i>ka</i>	none
(iii). Case marking (if topical)	yes, as necessary	none		none
(iv). Negated or questioned		yes		no
(v). Main clause cast in interrogative or declarative mood		possible		no
(vi). More than one clause of this type within a sentence		possible		no
(vii). Co-occurrence with a recapitulating or a summary clause		possible		no
(viii). Arguments and obliques (3.1, 4.2)	yes, as required	one oblique at most; rarely an object		no

“reduced” clauses with rather limited possibilities. We now turn to further special features of summary clauses, and of recapitulating clauses.

4.3. Recapitulating clauses, constituent order, and clause skipping. Recapitulating clauses as described here appear to presuppose a verb-final constituent order. This is in fact not the case. Many speakers follow the principle of pragmatically determined constituent order—a focused NP will follow the verb. This does not stop them from employing recapitulating linkage (contrary to a general belief that languages with recapitulating and summary linkage have to be verb-final: see de Vries 2005). This is illustrated with (19), from a life story account by an innovative speaker (a similar example is in 22b–c).

- (19a) [Diha-pua wa-wa wa:↑]_{SC}
 he-CL.RIVER 1pl-enter 1pl:go
 [te diha-pua pamuña wa-dia=na]_{MC||}
 until he-CL.RIVER middle 1pl-return=REM.P.VIS
 ‘As we went by this river (into the jungle), we returned to the middle of the river.’
- (19b) [Ne=na wha iri **wehpani** pa:-kamuyapi]_{MC||}
 then=REM.P.VIS we rubber 1pl:work one-CL.YEAR
 [**Wehpani**↑]_{RecapC} [nese=nuku tuki-tuki
 1pl:work then=TOP.NON.A/S little-little
 wehpani=na mēda]_{MC||}
 1pl:work=REM.P.VIS really
 ‘Then we worked on rubber for a year, **working** on rubber, then we really worked a little bit (that is, one year rather than two or three).’

A clause which provides background information can intervene between the reference clause and the recapitulating clause. Example (20) comes from an eyewitness story about Leonardo Brito visiting a Yanomami village. The skipped clause (‘women also so’) offers a side comment and is positioned between the two bolded verbs: the predicate of the first sentence and the repeated one in the reduced clause. It is placed in parentheses in the translation.

- (20) [Nha yawithepu-pe nha kwaka=nha nha
 they bow-PL they what=PRES.VIS.INTER they
 na-muru-nita-pe heku-pada-pe
 3pl-pierce-TOP.ADV:CL.INAN-PL WOOD-CL.PIECE-PL
na-de=na]_{MC||}
 3pl-have=REM.P.VIS
 ‘They had their bows, what else? their spears, pieces of wood.’

temporal overlap or of sequentiality are consistent with the general meanings of clause linking with enclitics or without them (as we saw in 4.2). In terms of their discourse semantics, both devices contribute to discourse cohesion (in line with general properties of recapitulating and summary constructions, outlined in Guérin and Aiton 2019:2, Thurman 1975:342). Recapitulating linkage and summary linkage are not the only techniques for linking sentences in Tariana. Sentences can be juxtaposed, as in (18) (first, second, and third). Or they can be linked with conjunctions—such as *ne* ‘then (often to refer to a new event, or new place or time)’, *nese* ‘then (often to refer to an event within an established place or time); there’, *kayu-maka* (thus-AFFIX) ‘so, thus, because of this’, and *di-wese-w(h)ya* (3sgnf-?-EXTRALOCAL) ‘just then, so (could be unexpectedly so)’. Conjunctions can be used in the same clause or sentence sequence as recapitulating linkage (as in 19). In contrast to recapitulating linkage, conjunctions always mark a new action or a new episode in the narrative, or, using de Vries’s (2006) term, “discontinuity.”

Example (21), from a tale by José Luis Brito, an innovative speaker, illustrates this: every time we see a conjunction, there is a change in participants or a break in continuity.

- (21a) [Espada pa-ita dhita↑]_{SC}
 sword one-CL.ANIM 3sgnf:take
 [di-a=pidana=khani]_{MC} [wyaka=pidana di-a]_{MC||}
 3sgnf-go=REM.P.REP=away far=REM.P.REP 3sgnf-go
 ‘He taking one sword, went away, went far.’
- (21b) [Di-a↑]_{SC} [maka-nai awakada pamuña-se=pidana
 3sgnf-go GEN.ROOT-CL.LAKE jungle middle-LOC=REM.P.REP
 di-keta=pidana]_{MC||}
 3sgnf-meet/find=REM.P.REP
 ‘Going, he found a lake in the middle of the jungle.’

Recapitulating linkage marked just by intonation between (21a) and (21b), within (21e), and within (21f) indicates continuity of actions within the story-line. Subsequent actions are signaled by juxtaposed clauses in (21f) and (21g).

In (21c) and then in (21d) something new and unexpected happens. The conjunction *nese* ‘then’ is used (this form cannot mean ‘there’, unlike the adverb *nese* ‘then, there’).

- (21c) [Nese di-a=ka kumada ñama-kapi ñama-da *new event*
 then 3sgnf-go=SEQ duck two-hand two-CL.ROUND
 di-yanata=pidana na-rahta=ñhi]_{MC||}
 3sgnf-surpass=REM.P.REP 3pl-float=ANT
 ‘Then as he went, twelve ducks (lit. ‘two hands two surpass’) had been floating.’

- (21d) [Nese=nuku di-ka=ka=nuku]
 then=TOP.NON.A/S 3sgnf-look=SEQ=TOP.NON.A/S
 [na-ita=ka=nuku]_{SC} *new event*
 3pl-go.up=SEQ=TOP.NON.A/S
 [kaida=pidana hã yarumakasi-pe=misini di-swa
 just=REM.P.REP DEM clothing-PL=also 3sgnf-stay
 haiku-kena wika-se]_{MC||}
 tree-branch on-LOC
 ‘Just then as he was looking as they went up, just the clothing
 was hanging on a tree branch.’
- (21e) [Kwe=mha na-ni=sõ=nha?]_{SR} [di-a↑]_{SC}
 what=PRES.INTER 3pl-do=doubt=PAUS 3sgnf-say
 [Ne di-dawa di-ka↑]_{SC} *new event*
 then 3sgnf-hide 3sgnf-look
 [wyume-maka-se=pidana dy-uka **dhita**]_{MC||}
 last-CL.CLOTHING-LOC=REM.P.REP 3sgnf-arrive 3sgnf:take
 [**Dhita**↑]_{RecapC} [di-dawe=pidana]_{MC||}
 3sgnf:take 3sgnf-hide:CAUS=REM.P.REP
 ‘‘How did they do (this)?’’ he saying, **then** hiding to look, got
 and took the last clothing. **Taking (it)**, he hid (it).’
- (21f) [Ne=pidana nha **neyu** **na-nu**]_{MC||} *new event*
 then=REM.P.REP they 3pl:go.up 3pl-come
 ‘Then they **came up**.’
 [**Neyu** **na-nu**↑]_{SC} [diha-maka-pe nheta
 3pl:go.up 3pl-come he-CL.CLOTHING-PL 3pl:take
 ná-ñã=ka=pidana]_{MC} [nawiki na-matfika na:]_{MC||}
 3pl-put.on=SEQ=REM.P.REP people 3pl-turn 3pl:go
 [Matfã-ma-pe=pidana hiku]_{MC||}
 nice-CL.F-PL=REM.P.REP appear
 ‘As they **came up**, they put the clothes on, they turned into
 people. They looked beautiful.’
- (21g) [Ne na-uku na:=pidana na-yale=khana]_{MC||} *new event*
 then 3pl-go.down 3pl:go=REM.P.REP 3pl-disappear=away
 ‘Then they went away going downstream disappearing.’

(21) illustrates the functions of recapitulating linkage and the conjunction. The functions of a summary clause containing the generic verb ‘do’ are different from both of these. A summary clause with the generic verb ‘do’ sums up the preceding sentence as the background for what is to come

in the following sentence. (22), from a story about a widow who married an evil spirit (a common motif for many peoples of the region), illustrates this.

- (22a) [Nha-tupe nha na-kesi-du-tiki-se pa:-yawa
 they-DIM:PL they 3pl-relative-f-DIM-CONTR one-CL.HOLE
nha-misini nha hīdapada-yawa-pe=pidana
 they-too they each-AFFIX-CL.HOLE-PL=REM.P.REP
nheka-hā_{MC}||
 3pl:dig-PAUS

‘They the small ones, with their little relative (i.e., sister), were digging a hole each.’

- (22b) [**Kay** na-ni[↑]_{SUM.CL} [daikina na-dia=ka naka[↑]_{SC}
 so 3pl-do afternoon 3pl-return=SEQ 3pl:arrive
[nu-yenipe kani-se=nihka i-uka ihia_{SR}
 1sg-children where-LOC=PRES.VIS.INTER 2pl-arrive you
[du-a=pidana du-yā=nihi naha hado_{MC}||
 3sgf-say=REM.P.REP 3sgf-stay=ANT they mother

‘After they did so, when they returned home in the afternoon.
 “My children, where are you coming from?” their mother kept saying.’

- (22c) [Kayu du-a=ka[↑]_{RecapC} [waha waka=ka_{MC.SR} [ya:ka
 so 3sgf-say=SEQ we 1pl:arrive=REC.P.VIS shrimp
whepa wama=nihka_{MC.SR} [na:=pidana
 1pl:catch 1pl:look.for=ANT:REC.P.VIS 3pl:say=REM.P.REP
na-yā=nihi_{MC}||
 3pl-stay=ANT

‘As she said so, “We have arrived, we have been playing at catching shrimp,” they kept saying.’

- (22d) [**Nese**=pidana hipe di-eru di-yā=nihi *new event*
 then=REM.P.REP mud 3sgnf-stick 3sgnf-stay=ANT
duha du-kapi-pe-se_{MC}||
 she 3sgf-hand-PL-LOC

‘**Then** there was mud stuck on her hands.’

The widow’s new husband, the evil spirit, was mistreating her children from her first marriage; they got upset and managed to poison him. They then decided to leave their mother and were digging a hole to hide from her (22a). Summary linkage in (22b) sums up their actions, providing a background for the continuation of the story: the children come back home, and the mother asks them where they had been (using a direct speech report). Her questioning them highlights a climax in the story: it is going to put the children on the

spot and bring about the denouement of the story. This is what is achieved through recapitulating linkage marked by an enclitic in (22c).

Then, in (22d), a new event takes place: the mother discovers dirt under the little daughter's fingernails, realizes that the daughter was up to no good, and starts scolding her. As a consequence, the daughter and the other children get upset, turn into guan birds, and fly away. The conjunction *nese* signals a new turn of events: this is when the mother discovers that something is wrong, and the story turns to the children's escape.

Here and elsewhere, a conjunction introduces a new event—a function shared with connectives in other languages, including Murui (Wojtylak 2015). Summary linkage synthesizes the preceding sentence and provides a link between the previous stretch and a further episode in discourse. This is similar to the functions of the Kombai summarizing conjunction *mana* 'thus', from the generic verb *ma-* 'to do/to be' (de Vries 1993:71–73, 2006:819, and 1).¹⁷

Some speakers of Tariana use conjunctions more frequently than others; many of these are younger and innovative speakers whose storytelling practices have been influenced by Portuguese. In 2000 and 2012, during pedagogical workshops for teachers and learners of Tariana, the Tariana-speaking participants were asked to write down some stories. Speakers who did so (all of them under forty) did not use any kind of bridging linkage. In all likelihood—given that just about all teaching is done in Portuguese—this is an instance of how Portuguese writing habits may influence the emergent written language.

Recapitulating and summary linking devices are attested in narratives and procedural texts told by innovative speakers of the language (influenced by Tucano and other East Tucanoan languages). We find these in narratives about real-life events (such as hunting and fishing stories, and stories about encounters with evil spirits of the jungle), biographies, and tales shared with Tucanoan-speaking neighbors, or influenced by European missionaries. In contrast, speakers of Traditional Tariana hardly ever use these; there are no examples of bridging constructions of any sort in traditional myths or narratives about traditional times. This takes us to the next section.

6. Contact-induced change in bridging linkage in Tariana. Tariana has undergone substantial restructuring due to its interaction with

¹⁷ Recapitulating linkage and summary linkage in other languages, including Manambu, a Ndu language from Papua New Guinea (Aikhenvald 2008:463–64, 544–48), reveal a similar pattern. Bridging linkage is a mark of thematic continuity across sentences, allowing the audience to keep track of the storyline. Summarizing clauses may have a different function, indicating full completion of an event (see Sarvasy 2015 on noncanonical medial clauses, and Dixon 2017 on Jarawara, an Arawá language of Southern Amazonia); a somewhat similar meaning appears to be conveyed via sentence-final repetition of a verb in Hup, spoken outside the language-exogamy-based network in the Vaupés River Basin area (Epps 2008:824–25).

neighboring unrelated East Tucanoan languages, in its morphology, syntax, and discourse organization (as mentioned in 2). The switch-reference system in Tariana is another case in point. It is shared with East Tucanoan languages (Aikhenvald 2002:159–60). The forms of switch-reference markers are different, but the patterns are replicated—as is often the case in the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area. Other North Arawak languages of the area do not have any switch-reference, nor do they have any cognates to any of the Tariana switch-reference-marking enclitics listed in table 4. There are thus strong reasons to believe that switch-reference in Tariana is a result of areal diffusion (see also Aikhenvald 2012:338–344 on the spread of switch-reference systems across Amazonia).

In contrast, the sequential enclitic =*ka* as a clause-linking device is very frequent in all the North Arawak languages of the area—including Baniwa-Kurripako and Piapoco, which are Tariana’s closest relatives, and Baré and Warekena of Xié, which are more remote. Each of these languages has a few other clause-linking enclitics (for Baniwa-Kurripako see Bezerra 2014, Ramirez 2001, and author’s own fieldwork; for Piapoco see Klumpp 1990 and Reinoso Galindo 2002; for Baré and Warekena see Aikhenvald 1995, 1998).

Tariana speakers of all generations use sequential clauses marked by enclitics and intonation (type A in 3.2). Examples of type B clauses marked just by intonation, or “implicit chains,” come almost exclusively from stories told by innovative speakers. The most traditional speaker, the late Cândido Brito, never used them (in about three hours of recordings). In stories told by other traditional speakers I found eight tokens, and then only in speakers’ life stories (e.g., 15 and 16 from the autobiography by the late Américo Brito, the oldest speaker of Tariana I encountered), and describing “real-life” adventures, but not in the descriptions of the traditional festivals and olden days. Those older speakers who used sequential clauses marked just by intonation were also using Tucano rather than Tariana in their day-to-day life. We can recall, from 3.2, that a number of East Tucanoan languages have sequential clauses with no special marking (or “implicit” chains, as Longacre 1983, 1985 called them).

Both types of bridging linkage are a feature of Innovative Tariana. This suggests that they have arisen relatively recently as a result of contact-induced change and the impact of East Tucanoan languages. The following arguments support this hypothesis.

6.1. Argument 1 in favor of recent adoption. Both recapitulating and summary sentence linkage are a prominent feature of Tucano and a few other East Tucanoan languages (e.g., Wanano) (see also Aikhenvald 2002:160–61). Compare (23), from Tucano (published in Welch and West 1976a:201, 1976b:185–86; glossing mine), and (24), from Tariana (told to the author by the late Cândido Brito, one of the oldest speakers of Tariana). In both

languages the unmarked predicates of dependent clauses—in bold—are pronounced with a rising intonation.

Tucano

(23) [cũ na ñocoa masa ya wi'i-pũ cũ
he they star people POSS HOUSE-LOC he

masũ wa'a-pĩ]_{MC||}
man go-REM.P.REP.3sgnf

[wa'a↑]_{RecapC} [to-pũ cũ wa'a↑]_{SC}
go there-LOC he go

[cũ ñocoa masa ya-wi'i-pũ wa'a↑]_{SC} [we'e↑]_{SUM.CL}
he star people POSS-house-LOC go do

[to-pũ ni-pĩ]_{MC||}
there-LOC be-REM.P.REP.3sgnf

'He, the man, went to the house of the star-people, **having gone**,
having gone there, having gone to the star people's house, he did
(thus), there he stayed.'

Tariana

(24) [Diha nha walipee nawiki-ya-dapana-se diha
he they star people-POSS-house-LOC he

nawiki **di-a=pidana**]_{MC||}
man 3sgnf-go=REM.P.REP

[di-a↑]_{RecapC} [ne-se diha
3sgnf-go there-LOC he

di-a↑]_{SC} [diha walipere nawiki-ya-dapana-se di-a↑]_{SC}
3sgnf-go he star people-POSS-house-LOC 3sgnf-go

[di-ni↑]_{SUM.CL} [nese alia=pidana]_{MC||}
3sgnf-do then/there be=REM.P.REP

'He, the man, went to the house of the star-people, having gone,
having gone there, having gone to the star people's house, he did
(thus), there he stayed.'

Only two sentence-final predicates, 'he went' (Tariana *di-a=pidana*, Tucano *wa'a-pĩ*) and 'he stayed' (Tariana *alia=pidana*, Tucano *ni-pĩ*), have full tense-evidentiality marking (as expected in main clauses: see table 3). This example contains both recapitulating linkage and summary linkage (with the verb 'do'—Tariana *di-ni*, Tucano *we'e*).

The following examples are from one of numerous stories about a man who went to the jungle (when he shouldn't have done so) and encountered an evil spirit who made him do weird things. The first clause—(25a) and

(26a)—ends with ‘he said’. The second clause—(25b) and (26b)—starts with ‘having heard him say thus. . . .’ The structures in Tariana and in Tucano are again very similar. This Tucano example comes from Ramirez (1997[III]:196).

Tucano

(25a) [yí'f̃ opâ-turi ba'â sī'ri-sa']_{SR}
 I GEN.ADJ-again eat want-NONTHIRD.P:PRES.NONVIS
 [nīi-pi']_{MC}||
 say-3sgnf:REM.P.REP

(25b) [toho nīi-kā↑]_{RecapC} [tí'ó-gi'↑]_{SC}
 thus say-DS hear-SS:MASC.SG
 [ake yaá ye'meturí-re miî o'ô-pi']_{MC}||
 monkey POSS liver-TOP.NON.A/S take give-3sgnf:REM.P.REP

(a) ‘I want to eat again, he (the spirit) said’; (b) ‘he (the man) having heard him (the spirit) say that, he (the man) took the liver of the monkey and gave (him, i.e., the spirit).’

Tariana

(26a) [Nuha maka-tulina nu-na=mha nu-n̄ha]
 I GEN.ROOT-again:ADV 1sg-want=PRES.NONVIS 1sg-eat
 [di-a=pidana]_{MC}||
 3sgnf-say=REM.P.REP

(26b) [Kay di-a=ka↑]_{RecapC} [dhima=ka↑]_{SC}
 thus 3sgnf-say=SEQ 3sgnf:hear=SEQ
 [pu:we i-kaletana=nuku dhita
 monkey INDF-liver=TOP.NON.A/S 3sgnf:take
 di-a=pidana]_{MC}||
 3sgnf-give=REM.P.REP

(a) ‘I want to eat again, he (the spirit) said’; (b) ‘he (the man) having heard him (the spirit) say that, he (the man) took the liver of the monkey and gave (him, i.e., the spirit).’

Similar examples from Wanano are discussed by Longacre (1983:199–200) and Stenzel (2016:436–38; see also Aikhenvald 2002:170–71).¹⁸ This offers additional evidence in favor of their diffusional origin in Tariana.

6.2. Argument 2. Neither recapitulating nor summary linkage is found in any of the Arawak languages of the area (including Tariana’s close relatives Baniwa-Kurripako and Piapoco). In these languages, sentence linking

¹⁸ Stenzel (2016:428, 430) mentions the possible use of “a summarizing verb ‘do’, involving particular types of verbs and emphasizing notions of perfectivity and agentivity.” The exact discourse differences between bridging and summary linkage in Wanano require further study.

tends to be done via juxtaposition. Conjunctions can be used to introduce a new event. Conjunctions in Tariana have cognates in related languages—for instance, Baniwa-Kurripako *hneette*, Piapoco *né-ise* are cognates of Tariana *nese* ‘then, there’ (in 17) (Klumpp 1990:233; Ramirez 2001). None of these languages have sequential clauses marked just by intonation, nor the rising intonation at the end of sequential clauses. Neither language has summary linkage nor a generic verb ‘do’. The verbs meaning ‘do, make’—Baniwa-Kurripako *-dzeekata*, *-deenhi*, Piapoco *-manica*—do not have the same functions as the Tariana generic verb *-ni* ‘do’ (or its Tucano equivalent *we’e*): they are not employed as generic verbs and cannot substitute any other verb: we return to this in 8.

6.3. Argument 3. Both recapitulating and summary linkage are absent from Kumandene Tariana, an outlier dialect of Tariana. The Kumandene Tariana moved away from the area where Tariana is now spoken early in the twentieth century (see Aikhenvald 2014 for a discussion). They now live further inland, off the Vaupés River, and are in close contact with Hohôdene Baniwa (and little contact with Tucano). There are some traces of the erstwhile influence of Tucano (e.g., evidentiality and case). However, sentence linkage is not one of these—sentences are linked via juxtaposition and conjunctions, in a way similar to Hohôdene Baniwa.

Discourse patterns, ways of saying things, and telling stories are highly diffusible in a situation of intensive language contact. The Tariana–East Tucanoan multilingualism goes back several hundred years, and so it is no wonder that discourse-organizing devices have been diffused into Tariana. Argument 3 points to the fact that this diffusion is of a relatively recent origin. We can also recall that bridging linkage is not used by traditional speakers.

Recapitulating linkage is a feature of Kakua, from the small Kakua-Nukak family and a member of the “Makú” cultural group. The Kakua are in contact with a number of East Tucanoan-speaking groups, and are a marginal member of the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area on the Colombian side (as they do not intermarry with speakers of East Tucanoan languages). The function of the linkage is said to be maintenance of temporal continuity within discourse (Bolaños 2016:355–58).¹⁹ The presence of recapitulating linkage in Kakua suggests potential diffusional impact from East Tucanoan languages.

¹⁹ Kakua employs clauses marked by intonation only and clauses marked with an explicit morpheme; however, no information is available as to the differences between the two techniques. A preliminary description of bridging linkage in Hup, another marginal member of the area, shows some similarities with Wanano (Epps 2017). We have no information on bridging linkage in Yuhup, closely related to Hup (the two languages are spoken on both the Brazilian and the Colombian sides of the border, and the people do not intermarry with Tucanoans or with the Tariana) (Epps 2008; Silva and Silva 2012).

Recapitulating linkage was described for Siona, from the Western branch of the Tucanoan family, spoken outside the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area (Wheeler 1987:179–80). The linkage involves repeating the predicate of the reference clause in a bridging clause, in the form of a dependent verb. As Wheeler (1987) puts it, the function of the device is that of maintaining “temporal and logical relations” between the two sentences. This points toward possible Tucanoan origins of recapitulating linkage.

The presence of recapitulating linkage in the languages spoken in the Caquetá-Putumayo River Basin area, neighboring the Vaupés River Basin, remains a question for further study. This technique is absent from Murui and other Witotoan languages (Wojtylak 2015) and was not mentioned by Seifart (2010) for Bora. However, it appears to occur in some Bora texts (Thiesen and Weber 2012:490, 494, 501, 511).

Switch reference and patterns of bridging linkage are known to be diffusible in language contact situations (see Jacobsen 1983:172–74 on the areal diffusion of switch-reference and sentence linking patterns in North American Indian languages). Bridging linkage appears to be a truly areal phenomenon in Papuan languages of New Guinea, as it occurs across many languages, “irrespective of typological or genetic boundaries” (de Vries 2005:264–65). The Tariana data offer a further instance of a relatively recent spread of bridging constructions as a contact-induced development.

7. Bridging constructions in Tariana: What can we conclude? Tariana has two kinds of bridging constructions for linking sentences within a narrative—recapitulating constructions and summary constructions. The two differ in their structure and in their functions, along the following lines.

(i). A recapitulating construction consists in repeating the last verb of the preceding sentence (or a “reference” clause) in the form of a “reduced” clause. It serves to highlight an important event within a narrative and can be interpreted as a mark of thematic continuity between sentences.

(ii). Summary linkage consists in using the generic verb *-ni* ‘do’ (often accompanied by the adverb *kay(u)*) which agrees in person/number/gender with the last verb of the preceding sentence (the reference clause), in a reduced clause. This is a way of summarizing and backgrounding the action of the preceding sentence and going on to an event linked to the previous one (see 5).

(iii). Both bridging constructions involve reduced clauses. They can be marked with the sequencing enclitic =*ka* if the action of the reference clause is finished before that of the main clause begins (as in examples 4 and 6). If the action of the reference clause and that of the recapitulating or summary clause overlap, no special enclitic is used, and the rising intonation

on the clause boundary signals clause linking. Both recapitulating and summary clauses share the rising intonation with all other sequential clauses (contrasted to other clauses in table 3). However, in contrast to sequential clauses, recapitulating and summary clauses cannot include any arguments or obliques (in contrast to other languages, including Cavineña; Guillaume 2011). They have a fixed position within a sentence and can occur with just one sequencing enclitic (see table 5 for a comparison). A sentence can contain more than one sequential clause, but no more than one recapitulating or summary clause.

(iv). Summary clauses and recapitulating clauses in Tariana have a number of cross-linguistically unusual features. A bridging clause can be separated from its reference clause by another clause which expresses an aside comment (see 4.4).

(v). Both types of bridging linkage contrast with sentential conjunctions, which indicate the start of a new series of events.

(vi). Bridging linkage is a feature of the Innovative Tariana. There are strong reasons to believe that both kinds of bridging linkage are the result of relatively recent areal diffusion from East Tucanoan languages into Tariana.

We now turn to an additional issue—the ways in which the summary function of the generic verb and repetition in recapitulating linkage fit in with the rest of the grammar of the language.

8. Envoi: The many facets of the generic verb and the repetition in Tariana. The generic verb *-ni* employed in the summary linkage has further functions in the language. This is an S=A ambitransitive verb with a lexical meaning ‘make (something), do (something)’. Within asymmetrical valency-increasing serial verb constructions it marks benefactive. In biclausal periphrastic causative constructions, *-ni* marks indirect causative. It is also used in “anticipatory” verb sequences such as that in (27):

- (27) [Kwe=sika di-ni ma-nu-kade]_{MC}||
 what=INTER.INFR 3sgnf-do NEG-come-NEG
 ‘Why didn’t he come? (lit. ‘What he did not come’)’

It is also used in “recapitulating” serial verbs, as in (28).

- (28) [Puhwi nu-wa nu-ni=de]_{MC}||
 be.joyful 1sg-enter 1sg-do=FUT.CERT
 ‘I will become joyful, this is what I will do.’

The verb *-ni* ‘do, make’ can replace any A/Sa verb (that is, an active verb) if the speaker cannot quite remember the exact lexeme or chooses to avoid using the same verb. That the same verb appears in the summary linkage fits in with its other uses as a verb with generic meaning and as a proverb. A summary with the generic verb ‘do’ in Tariana sentence linking can be

viewed as just one of the ways in which the multifaceted generic verb is employed.²⁰

Tariana discourse may strike one as highly repetitive. In Tariana, as in many other languages, both recapitulating and summary constructions are a feature of narratives and procedural discourse (see Thompson and Longacre 1985:210; de Vries 2005:364–65). In just a few languages, recapitulating linkage also occurs in conversations: Bromley (1981:314–17) reports that recapitulating linkage in the Lower Grand Valley Dani is a regular device for linking utterances produced by different speakers, whereby the second speaker starts their turn by repeating the last verb of the previous speaker.

A somewhat similar pattern of conventionalized repetition in Tariana involves the pattern known as conversation sustainer (Barnes 1984; Aikhenvald 2003:588–90). When A (speaker) tells a story, B (listener) is expected to give feedback, after just about every sentence, by repeating the predicate (or the last verb within a serial verb construction) accompanied by an interrogative evidential. These pseudo-questions do not have question intonation. A typical example, from Tariana, is in (29).

- (29) A: Haw di-a=ka
 OK 3sgnf-say=REC.P.VIS
 ‘He said, OK.’
- B: Di-a=nihka
 3sgnf-say=REC.PAST.VIS.INTER.VIS
 ‘He said it?’

The matching of question-response patterns in Tariana and in East Tucanoan languages is also quite striking; see, for instance, Barnes (1984) on Tuyuca, an East Tucanoan language of the Colombian Vaupés, and the discussion in Gomez-Imbert and Stenzel (2018). In all likelihood, the conversation sustainer in Tariana is the result of areal diffusion. This feature is absent from related North Arawak languages.

Another common instance of repetition involves what is known as “constituent overlay” (Grimes 1972, 1975). In (30), a constituent gets repeated to introduce a new participant:

- (30) [Duha paita=pidana uphe-do]_{MCll}
 she one:NUM.CL.ANIM=REM.P.REP long.ago:parent-F
 [uphe-do=pidana duha]_{MCll}
 long.ago:parent-F=REM.P.REP she
 ‘There was a widow, she was a widow.’

²⁰ The etymology of *-ni* is not known (there are no cognates in related languages). The range of meanings of *-ni* appears to correspond to the range of meanings of Tucano *we'e* ‘do, make’, which may reflect the impact of contact-induced change.

Repetition of a verb appears to be a way of stressing a point—as in (31). This is the ending of a story about the origin of tobacco, by the late Cândido Brito, the most traditional speaker of the language.

- (31) [Hĩ na: na–kalite pedalia–pe]_{MC||}
 DEM:ANIM 3pl:say 3pl–tell old–PL
- [hiku=nhina na:]_{MC||}
 appear=ANT:REM.P.VIS 3pl:say
- [wa–na wa–thani–na–se=naku na:
 1pl–OBJ 1pl–start–AFFIX–LOC=TOP.NON.A/S 3pl:say
- na–kalite=na]_{MC||} [kaida=naka]_{MC||}
 3pl–tell=REM.P.VIS ready=PRES.VIS

‘This is what old people tell, this is how it appeared to us in the beginning, they tell us. This is all.’

In many languages, repetition and reduplication share similarities and can be viewed as part and parcel of the same phenomenon. Along similar lines, recapitulating linkage in Tariana can be viewed as just one manifestation of a pervasive phenomenon of repeating a constituent, to make a story flow, and keep the listener on track.

Appendix. Terminology used for different types of bridging linkage. Recapitulating linkage of sentences (whereby the last clause of a preceding sentence is repeated as the first, dependent, clause of the following one) has been variously referred to as:

1. tail-head or head-tail linkage (e.g., Longacre 1968:8–9; Thompson and Longacre 1985:208–11; de Vries 2005, 2006; Thompson, Longacre, and Hwang 2007; Guillaume 2011 for Cavineña, a Tacana language from Bolivia, and in general, van Gijn 2014, for Yuracaré, an isolate from Bolivia; Zhang 2013:688–93 for Ersu, a Tibeto-Burman language of China),
2. backgrounding repetition (McKay 2007, for Rembarrnga, an Australian language), and
3. recapitulation (Genetti 2007:438, for Dolakha Newar, a Tibeto-Burman language).

Linking together two parts of a discourse, by repeating material from a previous sentence as first clause in the subsequent one, was termed “transitional paragraphs” by Stout and Thompson (1971:250, 252; see also Thurman 1975:343–44 for a discussion of Chuave, a Papuan language of the New Guinea Highlands). Similar phenomena have been described for languages in many other parts of the world, including languages of the Philippines (Longacre 1968); Konso and Bedja, both Cushitic (Vanhove 2005; Mous and Oda 2009); and also for Kashaya, a Pomoan language (Oswalt 1976:300, 1983).

Summary linkage, whereby clauses are linked with a generic verb, has been described for a number of Papuan languages (e.g., van Kleeef 1988:150–51 on Siroi, and Aikhenvald 2008:458–59 on Manambu), and for Kham, a Tibeto-Burman language (Watters 2009:115–16). A similar phenomenon has been addressed for a few languages in North America. The discussions include Oswald (1976:300, 1983:175–76) on Kashaya and Walker (n.d.) on Southern Pomo, both Pomoan; Martin (1998, 2011) on Creek, a Muskogean language; and Broadwell (2006:266–68) on pro-verbs as markers of sentence linkage in Choctaw. Jacobsen (1983:169–70) offers a general perspective on this phenomenon in North American Indian languages, and the ways in which the summarizing verb can grammaticalize into a sentence-linking conjunction.

Summary linkage is often subsumed under the umbrella term “tail-head” or “head-tail” linkage (e.g., de Vries 2005, 2006; Overall 2017a, 2017b), obscuring the distinction between recapitulating and summary linkage. This is particularly problematic for languages that have both techniques—as does Tariana and a number of other languages mentioned throughout this paper.

The generic verb in summary linkage may grammaticalize into a conjunction. As suggested by Thompson and Longacre (1985:226), “a verb of highly generic meaning” used in summary linkage may develop into a sentential conjunction. This path has been described for Cayapa, a Barbacoan language from Ecuador (Wiebe 1977; Thompson and Longacre 1985:228) and a number of Chibchan languages. Similar developments have been detected in Galo (Post 2009:85–87) and Korean (Sohn 2009; see summary in Aikhenvald 2009:398). In Kashaya, the summarizing “utility” verb *mensin* ‘while doing so’ ‘is becoming a conjunction matching English ‘and’” (Oswald 1983:275–76; see also Payne 1980:111–12 on the transparently verbal origin of sentential conjunctions in Chickasaw). Jacobsen (1983:170) lists further instances of sentence-linking conjunctions developed out of summarizing verbs in a selection of North American Indian languages. No such grammaticalization path has been attested for recapitulating linkage.

The summarizing conjunction *mana* ‘thus’ in Kombai comes from the generic verb *ma-* ‘to do/to be’: it is a fossilized third person singular different subject non-future form (de Vries 1993:59, 71–73, 2006:819). The conjunction signals the boundary of a paragraph, marking discontinuity between the preceding and the following discourse. In contrast, recapitulating linkage in Kombai marks a continuous event line: it does quite a different job from that of summary linkage.

The term “bridging linkage” as a cover term for recapitulating linkage and summary linkage was defined in Dixon (2009:8) and Aikhenvald (2009).²¹ The terms “tail-head” or “head-tail” linkage imply that one clause or sentence

²¹ The notion of “bridging” is employed in a different meaning in the literature on pragmatics with special relevance to definiteness (see Clark 1977; Wilson and Matsui 2000; Abbott 2004:135), and in the studies of cross-reference anaphora (Huang 2000:2–7).

is “head” with regard to the other, with the undefined notion of “head” in this case being different from that of “head” of a noun phrase or a clause (see, for instance, Dixon 2010:229–32). In order to reflect the nature of the linkage, we refer to this kind as recapitulating linkage.

REFERENCES

- ABBOTT, BARBARA. 2004. Definiteness and indefiniteness. *The handbook of pragmatics*, ed. Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward, 122–50. Oxford: Blackwell.
- AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 1995. *Bare. Languages of the World/Materials 100*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- . 1998. Warekena. *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, ed. Desmond C. Derbyshire and Geoffrey K. Pullum, vol. 3, 215–439. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 1999. The Arawak language family. *The languages of the Amazon*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 65–105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. *Language Contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2003. *A Grammar of Tariana, from North-west Amazonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2006a. Serial verb constructions in a typological perspective. *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon, 1–87. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2006b. Serial verb constructions in Tariana. *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon, 178–201. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2006c. Complement clauses and complementation strategies in Tariana. *Complement Clauses and Complementation Strategies: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 178–203. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2008. *The Manambu Language of East Sepik, Papua New Guinea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2009. Semantics and grammar in clause linking. *Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 380–403. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2012. *The Languages of the Amazon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2013. Shifting language attitudes in north-west Amazonia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 222:195–216.
- . 2014. Language contact, and language blend: Kumandene Tariana of north-west Amazonia. *IJAL* 80:323–70.
- . 2017. Tariana, an Arawak language from north-west Amazonia. *The Oxford Handbook of Polysynthesis*, ed. Michael Fortescue, Marianne Mithun, and Nicholas Evans, 713–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2018a. Disentangling a versatile prefix: The nature and development of a polysemous marker in Arawak languages. *IJAL* 84:1–49.
- . 2018b. *Serial Verbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2018c. How to copy your neighbours’ ways: A cross-generational perspective on nominalizations in Tariana (Arawak, Brazil). *Language Typology and Universals* 71(1):73–98.
- . 2018d. *Serial Verbs*. *Oxford Bibliographies in Linguistics*, ed. Mark Aronoff. New York: Oxford University Press (updateable electronic resource).
- BARNES, JANET. 1984. Evidentials in the Tuyuca verb. *IJAL* 50:255–71.
- BEZERRA, ZENILSON. 2014. *Uma gramática da língua Kurripako*. Novas Tribos, São Gabriel da Cachoeira.

- BOLAÑOS, KATHERINE. 2016. *A Grammar of Kakua*. Amsterdam: LOT.
- BOLINGER, DWIGHT. 1977. *Meaning and form*. London and New York: Longman.
- . 1984. Intonational signals of subordination. *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 401–13.
- BROADWELL, GEORGE AARON. 2006. *A Grammar of Chocktow*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- BROMLEY, H. MYRON. 1981. *A Grammar of Lower Grand Valley Dani*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- CLARK, HERBERT H. 1977. Bridging. *Thinking: Readings in Cognitive Science*, ed. P. N. Johnson-Laird and P. C. Wason, 411–20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CRUSE, ALAN. 2006. *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- DE SOUSA, HILÁRIO. 2016. Some non-canonical switch reference systems and the fundamental functions of switch reference. *Switch Reference 2.0*, ed. Rik van Gijn and Jeremy Hammond, 55–92. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- DE VRIES, LOURENS. 1993. *Forms and Functions in Kombai, an Awyu Language of Irian Jaya*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 2005. Towards a typology of tail-head linkage in Papuan languages. *Studies in Language* 29(2):363–84.
- . 2006. Areal pragmatics of New Guinea: Thematization, distribution and recapitulative linkage in Papuan narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38:811–26.
- DIXON, R. M. W. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in typological perspective. *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, pp. 1–55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2010. *Basic Linguistic Theory, vol. I: Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2017. Summarizing clauses in Jarawara. *Anthropological Linguistics* 59:105–15.
- EPPS, PATIENCE. 2008. *A Grammar of Hup*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2017. Investigating small-scale multilingual communities: An ethnographic perspective from the Vaupés (Northwest Amazonia). Paper presented at the Wellsprings Forum Dialogues, February 13. Canberra: ANU. Slides available at <https://cloudstor.aarnet.edu.au/plus/index.php/s/zKy8EcaOeqUChOn/>
- GENETTI, CAROL. 2005. The participial construction of Dolakhā Newar: Syntactic implications of an Asian converb. *Studies in Language* 29:35–87.
- . 2007. *A Grammar of Dolakha Newar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GOMEZ-IMBERT, ELSA. 1988. Construcción verbal en barasana y tatuyo. *Amerindia* 13:97–108.
- GOMEZ-IMBERT, ELSA, AND KRISTINE STENZEL. 2018. Evidentiality in Tukanoan languages. *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, ed. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 357–87. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GRIMES, JOSEPH. 1972. Outlines and overlays. *Language* 48:513–23.
- . 1975. *The Thread of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- GUÉRIN, VALÉRIE. 2015. Demonstrative verbs: A typology of verbal manner deixis. *Linguistic Typology* 19:141–200.
- GUÉRIN, VALÉRIE, AND GRANT AITON. 2019. Bridging constructions in typological perspective. *Bridging Constructions*, ed. Valérie Guérin, 1–43. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- GUILLAUME, ANTOINE. 2011. Subordinate clauses, switch-reference, and tail-head linkage in Cavineña narratives. *Subordination in Native South American Languages*, ed. Rik van Gijn, Katharina Haude, and Pieter Muysken, 109–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HAIMAN, JOHN. 1978. Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54:564–89.
- . 1983a. Iconic and economic motivation. *Language* 59:781–819.
- . 1983b. On some origins of switch-reference marking. *Switch-Reference and Universal Grammar*, ed. J. Haiman and P. Munro, 105–28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- . 1985. *Natural Syntax: Iconicity and Erosion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HAIMAN, JOHN, AND PAMELA MUNRO. 1983. Introduction. *Switch-Reference and Universal Grammar*, ed. J. Haiman and P. Munro, pp. ix–xv. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HEINE, BERND, AND TANIA KUTEVA. 2002. *The World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HUANG, YAN. 2000. *Anaphora: A Cross-Linguistic Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- JACOBSEN, WILLIAM H. JR. 1983. Typological and genetic notes on switch-reference systems in North American Indian languages. *Switch-Reference and Universal Grammar*, ed. John Haiman and Pamela Munro, pp. 151–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- JONES, W., AND P. JONES. 1991. *Barasano Syntax*. *Studies in the Languages of Colombia 2*. Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington Publications in Linguistics 101. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- KLUMPP, DOROTHY. 1990. *Piapoco Grammar*. Colombia: SIL.
- LONGACRE, ROBERT E. 1968. *Philippine Languages: Discourse, Paragraph, and Sentence Structure*, vol. 1. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- . 1983. Switch-reference systems in two distinct linguistic areas: *Wojokeso* (Papua New Guinea) and *Guanano* (Northern South America). *Switch-Reference and Universal Grammar*, ed. John Haiman and Pamela Munro, pp. 185–207. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 1985. Sentences as combinations of clauses. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. II: *Complex Constructions*, ed. Timothy Shopen, pp. 235–86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MARTIN, JACK. 1998. Notes on switch-reference in Creek. *Workshop on American Indigenous Languages* 98:97–107.
- . 2011. *Grammar of Creek (Muskogee)*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- McKAY, GRAHAM. 2007. Cohesive features in Rembarrnga narratives. *Selected Papers from the 2007 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, ed. Timothy Jowan Curnow. <http://www.als.asn.au.2008>.
- MILLER, MARION. 1999. *Desano Grammar*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- MITHUN, MARIANNE. 1993. “Switch-reference”: Clause combining in Central Pomo. *IJAL* 59:119–36.
- . 1999. *The Languages of Native North America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2009. Re(e)volving complexity: Adding intonation. *Syntactic Complexity: Diachrony, Acquisition, Neuro-cognition, Evolution*, ed. Talmy Givón and Masayoshi Shibatani, pp. 53–80. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MOUS, MAARTEN, AND ONGAYE ODA. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in *Konso*. *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, pp. 336–55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- OSWALT, ROBERT L. 1976. Switch reference in *Maiduan*: An areal and typological contribution. *IJAL* 42:297–304.
- . 1983. Interclausal reference in *Kashaya*. *Switch-Reference and Universal Grammar*, ed. John Haiman and Pamela Munro, pp. 267–90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- OVERALL, SIMON E. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in *Aguaruna*. *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, pp. 167–92. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2016. Switch-reference and case-marking in *Aguaruna* (Jivaroan) and beyond. *Switch Reference 2.0*, ed. Rik van Gijn and Jeremy Hammond, pp. 453–72. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2017a. *A Grammar of Aguaruna (Iniá Chicham)*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- . 2017b. Chaining chains: Tail-head linkage and other devices for linking clause chains in *Aguaruna* (Chicham). Paper presented at Association for Linguistic Typology Conference, Canberra, December 12.

- PAYNE, DORIS L. 1980. Switch-reference in Chickasaw. *Studies of Switch-Reference*, ed. Pamela Munro. 89–118. UCLA Papers in Syntax 8.
- . 1992. Narrative discontinuity versus continuity in Yagua. *Discourse Processes* 15:375–94.
- POST, MARK W. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in Galo. *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, pp. 74–95. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- RAMIREZ, HENRI. 1997. A fala Tukano dos Yepâ-masa. Tomo I: Gramática. Tomo II: Dicionário. Tomo III: Método de aprendizagem. Manaus: Inspecoria Salesiana.
- . 2001. Uma gramática do Baniwa do Içana. Manaus: Universidade Federal do Amazonas.
- REESINK, GER P. 1983. Switch reference and topicality hierarchies. *Studies in Language* 7:215–46.
- REINOSO GALINDO, ANDRÉS EDUARDO. 2002. Elementos para una gramática de la lengua piapoco. Bogotá: Ministério de cultura.
- SARVASY, HANNAH. 2015. Breaking the clause chains. Non-canonical medial clauses in Nungon. *Studies in Language* 39:664–96.
- SEIFART, FRANK. 2010. The Bora connector pronoun and tail-head linkage: A study in language-specific grammaticalization. *Linguistics* 48(4):893–918.
- SILVA, CÁCIO, AND ELISÂNGELA SILVA. 2012. A língua dos Yuhupdeh: introdução etnolinguística, dicionário Yuhup-Português e glossário semântico-gramatical. São Gabriel da Cachoeira: Pró-Amazônia.
- SOHN, HO-MIN. 2009. The semantic of clause linking in Korean. *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 285–317. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- STENZEL, KRISTINE. 2007. The semantics of serial verb constructions in two Eastern Tukanoan languages: Kotiria (Wanano) and Waikhana (Piratapuyo), *Proceedings of SULA 4: Semantics of Under-represented Languages in the Americas*. University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 35:275–90.
- . 2014. *A Grammar of Kotiria (Wanano)*. Lincoln: Nebraska University Press.
- . 2016. More on switch-reference in Kotiria (Wanano, East Tukano). *Switch Reference 2.0*, ed. Rik van Gijn and Jeremy Hammond, 425–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- STOUT, MICKEY, AND RUTH THOMPSON. 1971. Kayapó narrative. *IJAL* 37:250–56.
- THIESEN, WESLEY, AND DAVID WEBER. 2012. *A Grammar of Bora with Special Attention to Tone*. Dallas: SIL International.
- THOMPSON, SANDRA A., AND ROBERT E. LONGACRE. 1985. Adverbial clauses. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. II: Complex Constructions, ed. Timothy Shopen, 169–234. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- THOMPSON, SANDRA A., ROBERT E. LONGACRE, AND SHIN JA J. HWANG. 2007. Adverbial clauses. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. II: Complex Constructions, ed. Timothy Shopen, 237–300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- THURMAN, ROBERT C. 1975. Chuave medial verbs. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17:342–52.
- VAN ENK, GERRIT J., AND LOURENS DE VRIES. 1997. *The Korowai of Irian Jaya: Their Language in its Cultural Context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- VAN GIJN, RIK. 2014. Repeated dependent clauses in Yurakare. *Information Structure and Reference Tracking in Complex Sentences*, ed. Rik van Gijn, Jeremy Hammond, Dejan Matić, Saskia van Putten, and Ana Vilacy Galucio, 291–308. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- VANHOVE, MARTINE. 2005. Du lien entre propositions temporelles et anaphore en bedja. *Studi Afroasiatici. XI Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camitosemiyica*, Marzo 2005, Milano, Italie, pp. 153–66. Francoangeli.
- VAN KLEEF, SJAAK. 1988. Tail-head linkage in Siroi. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 20:147–56.
- WALKER, NEIL ALEXANDER. n.d. Switch-reference in Southern Pomo.

- WALTZ, CAROLYN. 1977. Some observations on Guanano dialogue. *Discourse Grammar: Studies in Indigenous Languages of Colombia, Panama and Ecuador II*, ed. R. E. Longacre and F. Woods, part 3, 67–110. Dallas: SIL.
- WALTZ, NATHAN. 1976. Discourse functions of Guanano sentence and paragraph. *Discourse Grammar: Studies in Indigenous Languages of Colombia, Panama and Ecuador II*, ed. R. E. Longacre and F. Woods, part 1, 21–145. Dallas: SIL.
- . 2002. Innovations in Wanano (Eastern Tucanoan) when compared to Piratapuyo. *IJAL* 68:157–215.
- . 2007. *Diccionario bilingüe wanano o guanano-español, español-wanano o guanano*. Bogotá: Editorial Fundación para el Desarrollo de los Pueblos Marginados.
- WATTERS, DAVID E. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in Kham. *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 96–117. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WELCH, BETTY, AND BIRDIE WEST. 1976a. Tucano (translation of a traditional Tucano text Star people told by Joaquín Restrepo). *Folclor Indígena de Colombia*, vol. 2, 200–32. Bogotá: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- . 1976b. Ñocoa masa – gente estrella. *Texto del Tucano. Estudios Tucanos IV*:185–226. *Série Sintáctica* 8. Bogotá: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- WHEELER, ALVA. 1987. *Gantëya Bain. El Pueblo Siona del río Putumayo, Colombia, tomo 1: Etnología, Gramática, Textos*. Bogotá: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- WIEBE, N. 1977. The structure of events and participants in Cayapa narrative discourse. *Discourse Grammar: Studies in Indigenous Languages of Colombia, Panama and Ecuador II*, ed. R. E. Longacre and F. Woods, vol. 2, 191–227. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- WILSON, DEIRDRE, AND TOMOKO MATSUI. 2000. Recent approaches to bridging: Truth, coherence, relevance. *Lengua, Discurso, Texto*, ed. J. de Bustos Tovar, P. Charaudeau, J. Alconchel, S. Iglesias Recuero, and C. Lopez Alonso, vol. 1, 103–32. Madrid: Visor Libros.
- WOJTYLAK, KATARZYNA I. 2015. Bridging linkage in Murui (Witotoan, Northwest Amazonia). Paper presented at a special workshop of the Language and Culture Research Centre, February 24, 2015. James Cook University, Queensland, Australia.
- ZHANG, SIHONG. 2013. *A reference grammar of Ersu, a Tibeto-Burman language of China*. PhD thesis, James Cook University, Queensland, Australia.