The Semantics of Clause Linking in Manambu
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Linking clauses in Manambu involves a variety of means, including clause chaining, speech reports, conjoined dependent clauses, nominalizations, connectives, and apposition. Many clause linking techniques are polysemous; and some can be disambiguated if necessary. I start with an outline of typological features of Manambu, focusing on the parameters relevant for clause linking. I then turn to the clause linking techniques and their correlations with semantic types. The last section contains a brief summary.

1. Background

Papuan languages—or, more precisely, non-Austronesian languages of the New Guinea area—are renowned for their diversity. Within the New Guinea area, the Sepik River Basin is perhaps the most linguistically diverse region, with more than a dozen families and numerous isolates. Manambu is a member of the Ndu language family—the largest in the Sepik area in terms of numbers of speakers. The language is spoken by about 2,500 people in five villages in East Sepik Province, Ambunti District.¹

¹ See Aikhenvald and Stebbins (2007) on linguistic diversity in the New Guinea area; and Aikhenvald (2004; 2008a: chapter 22) on the position of Ndu family in the Sepik River Basin, and of Manambu within it. Broader genetic links of the Ndu family have so far been unsubstantiated. Other languages of the family are: Abelam-Wosera dialect continuum (over 40,000 speakers), Boikin (with over 30,000 speakers), Iatmul, a dialect continuum spoken by over 50,000 people, Yelogu (or Kaunga) spoken by about 200 people, and Gala (or Ngala), with about 150 speakers.

About 200-400 speakers of Manambu live in the cities of Port Moresby, Wewak, Lae, and Madang; a few people live in Kokopo and Mount Hagen. My fieldwork is predominantly based on the Avatip variety (I have also worked with speakers in other villages—Yawabak, Malu, and Apa:n, and to a lesser extent Yambon (Yuanab)). The dialectal differences between villages are minimal (see Aikhenvald 2008a). I am indebted to my Manambu family, especially Yuamali Jacklyn Benji Ala, Pauline Agnes Dixon and Aikhenvald / The Semantics of Clause Linking 05-Dixon_and_Aikhenvald-chap05 Page Proof page 118 10:12:10pm
1.1. **Word classes and their features**

Manambu is one of the most morphologically complex languages of the family. In terms of its typological profile, it is nominative-accusative, predominantly suffixing and agglutinating with some fusion. Nouns and verbs are clearly distinguished in terms of their categories and inflectional possibilities. There are two classes of adjectives: one closed (which consists of agreeing adjectives ‘small’, ‘big’, and ‘fine’), and one semi-open (which includes over twenty non-agreeing adjectives, covering colour, physical properties, and so on).

Nouns have two covert genders (feminine and masculine, marked via agreement in singular only) and three numbers (singular, dual, and plural) marked on modifiers and on verbs. Gender assignment for humans is sex-based; for other groups of nouns it is based on size and shape. So, a small location will be referred to as feminine, and a large one as masculine; a short stretch of time is feminine, and a long one masculine (cf. (3) below). Nouns distinguish nine case forms: a zero-marked subject case (with the same form employed in a number of other functions, including copula complements and second arguments of some extended intransitive verbs); definite object and locational case -VmA; dative-aversive (‘for fear of’) -Vk; comitative -wa; terminative (‘up to a point’) -Vb; transportative ‘via transport’ -say, -sap; allative-instrumental -Vr; and substitutive ‘instead’ -yæy. These latter forms are versatile: they can also occur with verb roots. The substitutive -yæy marks ‘alternative’ linking, ‘instead of’ and ‘rather than’, and the allative-instrumental -Vr marks ‘manner’ linking (see §3.4). The suffix -pök ‘like’, one of five non-word-class-changing derivational suffixes, occurs with nouns and pronouns (e.g. wapi kudi-pök (bird language-like) ‘like bird’s language; (something) similar to bird’s language’). With inflected verbs it expresses manner linking (see §3.4). This same suffix marks comparatives with adjectives (e.g. numa-do-pök (big-masc.sg-like) ‘bigger’).

Verbs can be intransitive, or ambitransitive (most are of S = A type; but there are some S = O); there are rather few strictly transitive or ditransitive verbs. Verbal categories in main clauses include personal cross-referencing fused with tense; a variety of aspects, including habitual, completive, repetitive, etc; mood and modalities, including irrealis (distinguishable from future only in negative clauses), imperative, purposive, desiderative, etc.; and a complex system of marking negation. Action nominals are derived via full reduplication of verbal roots, e.g. war- ‘go up’, warwar ‘going up’. They take
fewer cases than underived nouns and are used as complementation strategies. Their argument structure and marking is the same as that of any inflected verbal form. Nominalizations marked with -V*k ‘dative/aversive case’ mark complements of verbs of fear and refusal, and occur in ‘possible consequence’ clause linking (§3.5). They can also occur in main clauses as uninflected predicate heads (with the meaning of weak probability). This is one of numerous instances in Manambu whereby a dependent clause acquires the status of a main clause.

A member of any word class can head the predicate of an intransitive main clause. Verbs then take tense-sensitive verbal cross-referencing suffixes. Depending on clause type and mood, modality, and aspect, either just the subject (A or S) or the subject and an additional constituent can be cross-referenced (see §1.2). Other word classes take nominal cross-referencing enclitics with no tense distinctions. Only verbs can head transitive clauses.

Clause chaining is a notable feature of many languages in New Guinea. Manambu is no exception: the major strategy for linking clauses involves a chain of medial dependent clauses marked for switch reference—that is, whether or not the subject of the preceding supporting clause is the same as that of the main, focal, clause. Constituent order in main clauses is predominantly verb final; the order of A/S, O, and obliques is pragmatically determined. Constituent order in medial clauses is strictly verb final. This is one aspect in which various clause types in the language differ from each other—see the next section.

1.2. Verbal cross-referencing and clause types

1.2.1. Cross-referencing on verbs Each verb can be fully inflected, partially inflected, and uninflected. Fully inflected verbs potentially cross-reference two arguments: the subject and any other argument (except copula complement and speech reports: §4) which is more topical than the subject.

The verb vọ- ‘see, look’ in (1) and (2) cross-references just one argument, the subject. This verb, an S = A ambitransitive, is used intransitively in (1) and transitively in (2).

(1) vọ-na-d
see/look-ACT.FOC-3MASC.SGBAS.NPAST
He sees/looks (S=A ambitransitive)

(2) kọ ja:p vọ-na-d
this:FEM.SG thing see/look-ACT.FOC-3MASC.SGBAS.NPAST
He sees/looks at this thing
If a non-subject argument or oblique is more topical than the subject, it is cross-referenced on the verb, in the second cross-referencing position (following the subject markers). As shown in (3), a second cross-referencing position can correspond to (a) a topical O, (b) location, (c) time, or (d) beneficiary. (3) is polysemous:

(3) \( \text{və-la-d} \)
see/look-3fem.sgsu.npast-3masc.sgbas.npast
(a) She sees/looks at him/it—topical human masculine O ‘him’ or ‘it’ (large non-human thing) is cross-referenced
(b) She sees/looks (at someone/something) in a large (‘masculine’) location—topical location cross-referenced
(c) She sees/looks (at something) for a long (‘masculine’) time—topical time cross-referenced
(d) She sees/looks (at something) for his benefit—topical beneficiary (‘for his benefit’) cross-referenced

**Partially inflected verbs** cross-reference only the subject, as does the different-subject purposive form of ‘know’ in (4). The purposive marker is in bold.

(4) \( \text{[laku-dəmən-kək]}_{\text{SC}} \, \text{[karya-tua-d]}_{\text{FC}} \)
know-2masc.sg-purp.ds bring-1sgsu.npast-3masc.sgbas.npast
I brought him, for you to know (him)

**Uninfllected verbs** take no cross-referencing. This is exemplified with the same-subject purposive form of ‘take’ in (5):

(5) \( \text{[wun mən-a:m karda-k]}_{\text{SC}} \)
I you:masc-link + obj take + down-purp.ss
[war-na-dəwun]_{\text{FC}}
go.up-act.foc-1masc.sgbas.npast
I have come up to take you downwards

Examples (4–5) illustrate one important principle: all same-subject dependent clauses involve non-inflected verbs, and all different-subject clauses involve partially inflected verbs. Fully inflected verbs are found just in main clauses, and conjoined dependent clauses (which are not switch-reference sensitive).

This is not to say that uninfllected verbs do not occur in main clauses: for instance, a verb is uninfllected when it occurs in desiderative modality or completive aspect, e.g., \( \text{wun kə-kər} \) (I eat-desid) ‘I want to eat’, \( \text{wun rəpə-m} \) (I full-compl) ‘I am completely full’.
Apart from that, grammatical relations are marked in the same way in all clauses. Any clause, main or dependent, can be in apposition with another clause of the same type. We now turn to a comparison of different clause types.

1.2.2. Clause types: a comparison  Table 1 features a comparison between main clauses and major subtypes of dependent clauses, in terms of their constituent order; the option of having a non-verbal predicate head; tense, aspect, and mood; negation; applicability of content questions; and focus.

In addition, dependent medial clauses have a slightly rising intonation at the end. A striking feature of conjoined dependent clauses is their sharply rising intonation contour with the pitch going up on the last syllable of the predicate. These suprasegmental features are distinct from those of a main clause.2

Some dependent medial clauses always mark switch reference, while others are non-switch-reference sensitive. Purposive clauses are strictly different subject, or same subject.

Of thirteen distinguishing properties listed in Table 1, five are shared by all dependent clauses, and may justify postulating a binary opposition of ‘dependent clause’ versus ‘main clause’. A rather striking property which sets main clauses apart from dependent clauses is negation (with a proviso that same-subject purposive clauses cannot be negated at all: if they have to be, a biclausal structure is used). A negated declarative verb in a main clause is uninfluenced and is either equal to a stem, or contains a reduced vowel. Tense (future versus non-future) is expressed by the position of the negator: ma: və (neg see: neg. stem) means ‘(I/you/she/he/we . . . ) do not/did not see’, and və ma: (see: neg.stem neg) means ‘(I/you/she/he/we...) will not see’. (Positive verbs have a future suffix -ka-) A negated verb in a dependent clause just takes the suffix -mər- immediately after the root, as in (8–9) below.

In same-subject dependent clauses the shared argument (the subject) tends to be ellipsed. Any argument can be ellipsed in other multiclusal structures.

2. Grammatical means for linking clauses, and their semantics

Table 2 summarizes the varied grammatical devices employed in clause linking in Manambu, and their correlations with semantic types. These include: (i) clause chaining via medial clauses; (ii) conjoined clauses; (iii) purposive clauses; (iv) clause linking with case markers and the suffix ‘like’; (v) nominalizations

---

2 Table 1 does not include relative clauses, since they are irrelevant for this topic. Manambu has no complement clauses as a special type. Medial clauses, purposive clauses, speech reports, nominalization, and apposition of main clauses can be used as complementation strategies (Chapter 19 of Aikhenvald 2008a). The choice depends on the verb in a matrix clause.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th>Medial clauses</th>
<th>Conjoined clauses</th>
<th>Purposive clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Constituent order in clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb-final tendency; some freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictly verb final: no freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Position in sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fixed; sentence-final tendency</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to be preposed to main clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- or postposed to main clause</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Verbal cross-referencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully or partially inflected, or uninflected</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially inflected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-inflected</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially inflected or uninflected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully inflected</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially inflected</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninflected</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Predicate head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any word class</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uninflected modal and aspectual forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can head the predicate</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot head the predicate; require a support verb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clausal negation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future negation; past negation; habitual negation expressed</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffix -mar- 'dependent clause negation'</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot be negated</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute; present/recent past; remote past; future</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative tense meaning fused with dependent clause marking in all clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute; present/recent past; remote past; future</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No tense</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Habitual aspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (except causal clauses)</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NSRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th>Dependent clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Imperative</td>
<td>regularly expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Generic verb</td>
<td>not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>napā-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Focus</td>
<td>any constituent can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Content questions</td>
<td>any constituent can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be questioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in most types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. FC or SC</td>
<td>FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FC or SC depending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: SS - same subject; DS - different subject; NSRS - non-switch-reference sensitive.
Table 2  Summary of semantic types of clause linking and their expression in Manambu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic type</th>
<th>Clause linking device</th>
<th>Marker; its meaning; section; examples</th>
<th>Supporting clause</th>
<th>Focal clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is, Temporal succession</td>
<td>Clause chaining</td>
<td>-taka 'immediate sequence': §3.1 -kəb 'as soon as': §3.1: (6)</td>
<td>Medial clause SS</td>
<td>Final clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir, Relative time</td>
<td>Clause chaining</td>
<td>-n 'simultaneously, while': §3.1: (7)−(9) -ku/-k 'completive: after': §3.1: (10)−(12) -ta:y 'contemporaneous: before, while and after': §3.1: (6)</td>
<td>Medial clause SS/DS</td>
<td>Final clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conjoined clauses</td>
<td>rising pitch: simultaneous: §3.2, (15) with adverb ta:y 'before' in SC: §5, (38)</td>
<td>Clause with ta:y</td>
<td>Second clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apposition of MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ic, Conditional</td>
<td>Clause chaining</td>
<td>V-gay 'unlikely condition': §3.1: (13) -ku/k 'completive: real/possible condition': §3.1: (11), (13)</td>
<td>Medial clause SS</td>
<td>Final clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conjoined clauses</td>
<td>rising pitch; possible/counterfactual condition: §3.2, (15)−(18)</td>
<td>Medial clauses SS/DS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apposition of MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iic, Cause</td>
<td>Clause chaining</td>
<td>-ku/k 'completive: reason': §3.1: (10)−(11), -lək 'causal clause': §3.1: (8) wa- 'say' preceded by SR: §4: (28) ałk 'this is why', ałk tə-ku 'because of that, so': §5.1, (14), (30-1)</td>
<td>Medial clauses SS/DS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech report Connectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apposition of MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIr, Result</td>
<td>Connectives</td>
<td>ałk tə-ku 'because of that, so': §5.1, (32); atawatay; a 'then/so': §5.2: (34) §5.2, (31c), (39)</td>
<td>First MC</td>
<td>ałk təku MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apposition of MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second MC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IIp, Purpose</th>
<th>Purposive forms</th>
<th>Either clause</th>
<th>Either clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech report</td>
<td>-k/-kək 'purposive': §3.3, (4), (5), (19) wa- 'say' preceded by SR: §4</td>
<td>Speech report NSRS</td>
<td>Clause with 'say'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Possible consequence</td>
<td>Speech report</td>
<td>wa- 'say' preceded by SR: §4, (29)</td>
<td>Speech report NSRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action nominalization</td>
<td>Dative/aversive marked nominalization and case and 'in the event' clause: §3.5, (25–7)</td>
<td>Nominalization NSRS</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVs, Same-event addition</td>
<td>Clause chaining</td>
<td>-n 'simultaneously, while': §3.1</td>
<td>Medial clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVc, Elaboration</td>
<td>Apposition of MC</td>
<td>of main clauses: §5.2: (36); (27); (40)</td>
<td>First clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVc, Contrast</td>
<td>Connectives</td>
<td>aw 'contrast; or; in turn': §5.1: (27), (33) a 'then/so; contrast': §5.1: (35)</td>
<td>First clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vd, Disjunction</td>
<td>Connective</td>
<td>aw 'contrast; or; in turn': §5.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vr, Rejection</td>
<td>Case marking on verb</td>
<td>-yæy 'substitutive case instead of': §3.4: (21) of main clauses: §5.2</td>
<td>DC marked with -yæy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apposition of MC</td>
<td>First clause</td>
<td>Second clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vs, Suggestion</td>
<td>Case marking on verb</td>
<td>(i) -yæy 'substitutive case rather than': §3.4: (21) (ii) 'in turn': §3.4: (22) of main clauses (one of these may be a command): §5.2: (37)</td>
<td>DC marked with -yæy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apposition of MC</td>
<td>First clause</td>
<td>Second clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIr, Real manner</td>
<td>Clause chaining</td>
<td>-n 'simultaneously, while': §3.1: (8), (9)</td>
<td>Medial clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case marking on verb</td>
<td>-Vr 'allative-instrumental': §3.4: (20)</td>
<td>DC marked with -Vr</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffix 'like'</td>
<td>-pək 'like': §3.4: (23)</td>
<td>DC marked with -pək</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIh, Hypothetical manner</td>
<td>Suffix 'like'</td>
<td>-pək 'like': §3.4: (24)</td>
<td>DC marked with -pək</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
marked with dative-aversive case and ‘in the event’ clauses; (vi) speech reports;
(vii) clause linking involving connectives; (viii) apposition of main clauses.
Devices (i)–(iv) involve dependent clauses (whose properties are contrasted
with those of main clauses in Table 2). Nominalizations and ‘in the event’ clauses
(v) can be interpreted as a type of dependent clause. Speech reports (vi) involve a
special construction type. Devices (vii) and (viii) involve main clauses. In each
case, there can be more than one supporting clause (cf. (27)), and just one focal
clause.

Those devices which involve dependent clauses are discussed in §3. Speech
reports are addressed in §4, and devices involving main clauses in §5.

3. Clause linking involving dependent clauses

3.1. Medial clauses

The properties of medial clauses are outlined in Table 1. A segmentally marked
medial supporting clause is not necessarily sentence final. A typical sentence
contains one focal clause and a chain of supporting clauses, many of them
sensitive to whether their subject is the same as that of the following clause or
not. Unlike many languages with switch reference, the identity of the subject is
strictly controlled by an adjacent clause (which may, or may not, be the main
clause). The same principle applies to relative time and temporal succession.

Medial clauses are the main means of expressing Temporal linkage (I).
Markers of temporal succession, -taka (SS) ‘immediate ‘back-to-back’ se-
quence’ and -k@b (DS) ‘as soon as; shortly thereafter’, and one marker of
relative time -ta:y ‘contemporaneous’, are semantically straightforward. The
contemporaneous -ta:y refers to an activity which has started before that of the
following clause (this can be focal or supporting), and now overlaps with it.
This marker, possibly related to the temporal adverb tay ‘prior, before’ (see
§5.2), is the only way of expressing a meaning of ‘before’ through clause
chaining: the equivalent of English ‘put your hat on before you go out’
would be [aba-wapwi kusu-ta:y]SC [awakw]FC (head + link-dress put.on-
cotemp imp.go.out), lit. ‘Having put the hat on and having it on, go out’.
(6) comes from a story about orphaned children mistreated by their uncle’s
wife, the A of the two supporting clauses (stated overtly in the second clause):

(6) [yarakara yi-pakwu-ta:y]SC [d@y-a batay well TRS-hide-cotemp they-poss + fem.sg uncle’s.wife
yi-pakwu-l@-k@b]SC, [kapmonary r@-kwa-da-di]FC
trs-hide-3fem.sg.as.sooon.as wait-sim sit-hab-3psu.past-3plbas.past
While the uncle’s wife had been hiding (the food) well, as soon as she
had hidden the food, they (the children) kept on waiting
In contrast, the clause chaining marker -n 'simultaneously, while' is polysemous. It may indicate relative time, as in (7).

(7) \[væki-n]_{SC} [ap]_{FC} 
go.across-sim IMP.look
Look as you go across!

This same marker can refer to ‘real manner’ (VIr), that is, a way in which an activity is performed (or a ‘means’ to achieve it).

(8) (a) \[mæy tə-mar-da-lək]_{SC} [kamna:gw yapi:n]_{SC} 
garden have-NEG.DEP-3PL-CAUSAL food buy + SIM
(b) \[kə-kwa-na-di]_{FC} 
eat-HAB-ACT.FOC-3PLBAS.NPAST
Since they do not have gardens, they buy their food (lit., they eat by buying food)

A manner clause in (8) can be questioned by atawa 'how' ('How do they eat? Buying food'). This would not be appropriate for a clause with a temporal reading, as in (7).

Nevertheless, the medial clauses whose predicate is marked with -n are often ambiguous between manner and simultaneous concomitant action—see (9):

(9) (a) \[kwasabi kusu-mar-ən]_{SC} 
string.bag wear-NEG.DEP-SIM
(b) \[a gwa:m da:n]_{SC} 
DEM.DIST.fem.sg water + LINK + LOC go.down + SIM
(c) \[kwakə-da-d]_{FC} 
look.for-3PLSU.PAST-3MASC.SGBAS.PAST
They looked for him going down into the water/by going into the water without wearing (their) stringbags

The -n marked medial clauses often describe different aspects of the same event—this is the closest Manambu ever comes to expressing same-event addition. The verb forms in -n are highly versatile. They are frequently reinterpreted as manner adverbs (similarly to other languages with clause chaining, such as Manambu’s close relative Iatmul (Jendraschek forthcoming), and Aguaruna), e.g., səbən-ən (return-SIM) ‘returning (verb); back (adverb: see (31))’, yi-n (go-SIM) ‘going (verb); on and on (adverb)’. They also participate in the formation of anterior and durative complex predicates, and monoclausal passive-like structures with a support verb, e.g. wiyugw
kasapwi-n tɔ-na (door open(tr)-sim stand-act.foc + 3fem.sgbas.npast) ‘the door is open’ (lit., (someone) having opened the door it stands).

Clause chaining markers -ku (SS)/-k (DS) ‘completive: after’ are also polysemous. Their major meaning is to do with relative time ‘after’, but they often have causal overtones. (10) allows for two readings: ‘after we were worried, we cried’ or ‘because we were worried, we cried’.

(10) [ata wukə-ku]\textsubscript{SC} [gra-dian]\textsubscript{FC}
then worry-compl.ss cry-1plbas.past

Then, after we were worried/because we were worried, we cried

If the focal clause is cast in future, the supporting clause has a further overtone of real condition. (11) allows for three readings, each of which can be disambiguated by the context. In the story, the conditional reading was the preferred one: the man was not sure he was going to hit the mysterious woman since he knew she was a spirit:

(11) [amæywa nɔbi-ar vya-tuə-k]\textsubscript{SC}
bow + comit arrow-link + inst hit-1sg-compl:ds
[kiya-k-na]\textsubscript{FC}
die-fut-act.foc + 3fem.sgbas.npast

After/because/if I hit (her) with a bow and arrow, she will die

The generic completive verb napa—used exclusively in dependent medial clauses (see Table 1, row 10)—helps disambiguate the pervasive polysemy of -ku/-k forms. The verb napa- forms a complex predicate with a verb marked with the simultaneous -n. Such a complex predicate can only have a temporal reading of ‘after’, and there is a strong overtone of activity being over and done with. Compare (12) and (10):

(12) [ata {wukə-n napa-ku}]\textsubscript{SC} [gra-dian]\textsubscript{FC}
then worry-sim compl:vb-compl:ss cry-1plbas.past

Then, after we were worried/*because we were worried, we cried

The complex predicate in \{ \} in (12) is strictly monoclausal synchronically, though it obviously originates in a biclausal structure.

In addition to conditional overtones of structures like those in (11), Manambu has a special medial form -gə:y with the meaning of ‘unlikely condition’. It cannot be negated and always occurs followed by another supporting clause, expressing real condition, as in (13) and (27c), or possible consequence (§3.5). The focal clause is cast in future or contains a command.
If (in the unlikely event that) they (the bush people) come, when/if they come we will buy sago (from them)

A -gay clause can be introduced with the contrastive connective aw (27c). The marker -gay is a rare instance of a morpheme whose one and only meaning is ‘unlikely condition’ (see §4.2 of Dixon, Chapter 1). The semantic type of ‘unlikely condition’ (itself cross-linguistically rare) spans both possible and counterfactual condition (a -gay clause can occur followed by a counterfactual conjoined clause). Unlike any other dependent clause, a -gay clause does not occur as the only supporting clause: it always needs to be contextualized as belonging to the domain of possible or counterfactual condition, or possible consequence.

Clauses marked with -gay are rare and somewhat problematic: a -gay-marked verb is always contiguous with the following verb and they form one intonation unit. They could be analyzed as forming one clause with the subsequent dependent clause predicate; or they could be regarded as separate supporting clauses.

Clause chaining is also used to express cause: then, the predicate of a dependent clause takes the suffix -bok, as in (8). This suffix is a product of recent grammaticalization of the (functionally unmarked) distal demonstrative feminine dative a-l-bok ‘for that-feminine’. The form albok ‘this is why, because of that’ is also used as a clausal connective (see §5.1), and the two can occur in one sentence (14).

Unlike all other ‘medial’ verb forms, causal forms can take habitual aspect and action focus markers. This is a feature they share with main clauses.

In (14), the connective is optional. As shown in §5.1, it can occur as an ‘afterthought’ after the focal clause.

3.2. Conjoined clauses

Conjoined clauses have no segmental marking: unless negated, they are marked just by the intonation on the Supporting clause. Unless the Supporting clause is marked with irrealis, the sentence is inherently polysemous: it can have a
temporal or a real condition reading (similar to (11) above). The Focal clause may, or may not, be cast in future.

(15) \[lap \ k\-k\-kwa-bana\]_{SC} \ [gu banana \ eat-HAB-inf\+3fem.sgbas.npast + 3fem.sgbas.npast \ water yasa-kwa-na] \ [experience.thirst-HAB-act.foc + 3fem.sgbas.npast]

When/if we eat banana, we feel thirsty (lit., ‘there is experience of thirst with respect to water’)

If the Supporting clause is marked as future/irrealis, and the Focal clause is not, the preferred reading is that of Possible condition. The Focal clause may or may not be cast in future.

(16) \[bap \ war-k-la\]_{SC} \ [moon \ go.up-fut/irr-inf\+3fem.sgbas.npast + 3fem.sgbas.npast]

[wa:l \ ja \ ma:]_{FC} \ [rain \ fall:NEG \ fut:NEG]

If the moon comes up, it won’t rain

Marking both Supporting and Focal clauses as irrealis ensures a Counterfactual conditional reading:

(17) \[k\- \ tami: \ dem.prox.fem.sg \ area \ kur\-k\-dana\]_{SC}

\[a \ nan \ akas \ ra-k\-kwa-bana\]_{FC}

then \ we \ neg.irr \ stay-irr-inf\+3fem.sgbas.npast + 3fem.sgbas.npast

If they (Japanese) had taken this area (New Guinea), then we would not have been here

We can recall, from §1.1, that future and irrealis have the same marking in the positive form, but are distinguished under negation, if in main clauses (we can recall that dependent clauses are negated in the same way: see Table 1). Examples like (16) and (17) are ideal for distinguishing possible and counterfactual condition. However, if a Focal clause contains a positive future/irrealis form, the resulting sentence is ambiguous: the condition can be possible, or counterfactual.

(18) \[væki-ma:r-k-la\]_{SC} \ [go.across-NEG,dep-fut/irr-inf\+3fem.sgbas.npast + 3fem.sgbas.npast]

[da-k\-na-wun]_{FC} \ [go.down-fut/irr-act.foc-inf\+3gbas.npast]

If she does not go across, I will go down (to meet her)—Possible condition

If she had not gone across, I would have gone down (to meet her)—Counterfactual condition
This polysemy can be disambiguated by context (or by negating the focal clause). Having more meanings distinguished in negative than in positive clauses is typologically unusual (see Aikhenvald and Dixon 1998).

3.3. **Purposive clauses**

Purposive clauses differ from other dependent clauses in that they can be pre- or postposed to the main clause. They distinguish different-subject and same-subject form (the latter cannot be negated, possibly, because of their nominal origin: Aikhenvald 2008a: 466–506). These clauses are straightforwardly used for purpose linking—see (4), (5), and (19).

(19) \[də-kə-k kamaṅagw kui-kə-tua]_{SC} \[kə-da-kəkək]_{FC} 

he-link-dat food give-fut-1sgSu.npast + 3fem.sgBas.past

eat-3masc.sg-purp.ds

I will give him food (for him) to eat

Whether the purposive-marked dependent clause or the main clause is focal depends on the context. This property sets it apart from other medial clauses. In (5), the main activity is the Water spirit’s journey, that is, his ‘coming up’. In (19), the rest of the extract of the text is about the starving man eating: the purpose is the main activity, and can thus be considered the focal clause. This is reminiscent of Akkadian (examples (25–6) in Chapter 2) where pragmatic considerations help determine which clause is supporting and which is focal in structures involving purpose.

3.4. **Clause linking with case markers, and suffix ‘like’**

In a number of languages of the world, case markers are used as clause linking devices (see a typological overview in Aikhenvald 2008c; Genetti 1991). Table 2 in §3.5 of Chapter 4 illustrates numerous clause linking usages of locational cases in Kham. Akkadian (Chapter 2) and Konso (Chapter 14) employ some adpositions to link clauses. Only two of nine case forms in Manambu are uncontroversially used this way. Following the general principle in Table 1, if subjects of dependent and main clause are the same, the predicate of the dependent clause is uninflected, and the case marker attaches directly to the verb root. The allative-instrumental -\(V_r\) can only occur in same-subject clauses expressing Real Manner or ‘means’ linkage.

(20) \[nam kuyar]_{SC} \[kui-kwa-na]_{FC} 

chewed.food give+all/inst give-hab-3fem.sgBas.past

She used to give (food to children) by giving (them) chewed food
The substitutive -yæy attaches to the root without the subject marker if the subjects of the two clauses are the same (21), and to the root plus the subject marker if they are different (22).

(21) [awarwa warya-yæy]_{SC} [aka kəp lakati-dana]_{FC}
   recip fight-subst:ss then just sort.out-3plsu.npast + 3fem.sgbas.
   npast
   Instead of fighting each other, they just sorted it out

   The meaning is that of Vr, rejection (‘instead of’), or Vs, suggestion (‘rather than’). However, in a different context a more appropriate interpretation is ‘in exchange for’. (22) comes from a story about a man who had killed the snake’s children. The snake says (22), before she kills the man as a revenge for what he had done to her little ones:

(22) [wun-a-di ñanugw vya-mña-yæy]_{SC}
   I-link-pl children kill-2masc.sgsu.npast + 3fem.sgbas.npast-subst:ds
   [wun-abə:b mən-a:m vya-kə-na-wun-ək]_{FC}
   I-too you.masc-link + obj hit-fut-act.foc-1fem.sgbas.npast-conf
   In exchange for you killing my children, I will also kill you

   Out of context, this could be understood as ‘Instead of you killing my children I will kill you’. But within the story this makes no sense: the snake’s children have already been killed. We conclude that this type of linking may be interpreted as a new, ‘quid pro quo’, subtype of ‘alternative’ linking. Examples of linking with -yæy are rather rare in texts, and in conversations.

   Not so with the derivational non-word-class-changing suffix -pək ‘like’ (see §1.1). This very frequent suffix attaches to a fully inflected verb, and expresses manner—both real, as in (23), and hypothetical (24):

(23) [kwasa-ñanugwa:k kamna:gw
   small-children + pl + link + dat food
   kui-kwa-bana-pək]_{SC}
   give-hab-1plsu.npast + 3fem.sgbas.npast-like
   [kui-la-d]_{FC}
   give-3fem.sgsu.npast-3masc.sgbas.npast
   She gave (him food) like we give food to children (chewing it in her mouth and putting it in his)

(24) [kwə:m ta-mar-na-pək]_{SC}
   crazy be-neg.dep-act.foc + 3fem.sgbas.npast-like quiet
   rə-na]_{FC}
   sit-act.foc + 3fem.sgbas.npast
   She is sitting quietly as if she were not crazy (we know she is)
A manner clause marked with -p@k differs from other non-main clauses in that it can head an intransitive predicate, as in (36). It can also be inserted within a focal clause, as in (31). A manner adverb would be used in the same way.

3.5. Nominalizations marked with dative-aversive case, and ‘in the event’ clauses

Nominalizations marked with dative-aversive case express Possible Consequence (III), which is always negative in itself. A nominalization cannot be negated. The focal clause is often, but not always, negative. The supporting clause can precede or follow the focal clause.

(25) [akatawa k@tay-k@ti v@en t@-di]_{FC}
    like.that look.around-REDUP see + SIM be-3PLBAS.PAST
    [siapan d@ya-di j@bor w@r-w@r@k]_{SC}
    Japan they + LINK-PL ship go.up-REDUP.NOMZ-DAT

They were looking around like that, lest the Japanese ships come up(river)

This usage is consistent with the aversive meaning of the dative case: for instance, a dative marked noun asa:k (dog + LINK + DAT) may mean either ‘for a dog’, or ‘for fear of a dog’; in its latter meaning, asa:k can be used as a short warning ‘beware of a dog!’

Dative-aversive marked nominalizations are also used in premonitions—that is, expressions of negative consequence which cannot be averted. (26) is the typical way of saying that cats pee inside the house as a sign of the possible negative consequence that people would die:

(26) [du-ta:kw kiy@-kiya-k]_{SC} [y@la-wi@ya:m wus man-woman die-REDUP.NOMZ-DAT belly + LINK-house + LINK + LOC pee y@i-kwa-na-di a-di pusi]_{FC}
go-HAB-ACT.FOC-3PLBAS.NPAST DEM.DIST-PL cat

Those cats pee inside the house as a portent of people dying (lit., With the possible consequence of people dying, those cats pee inside the house)

A possible consequence which is not necessarily negative is cast differently. A dependent clause—whose predicate has the same form as an aversive-marked nominalization except that it undergoes reduplication of the final syllable—is introduced with the linker k@pa:b ‘in the event’; both are underlined in (27):

3 Monosyllabic verbs undergo full reduplication and thus are undistinguishable from aversive-marked nominalization. Predicates of ‘in the event’ clauses can be negated, unlike the nominalizations.
4. Speech reports

The last three lines of (27d–f) contain a speech report, a highly frequent construction in Manambu (see Aikhenvald 2008b). Direct speech reports in Manambu may involve a speech act—that is, somebody saying something—as in (27) and (31). Or they may extend beyond this and express internal speech and thought, desire and intention of third person, warning, cause and purpose, similarly to Aguaruna and Galo (Chapters 3 and 7), and numerous other languages, especially from the New Guinea area. If a speech report does not imply an actual speech act, it is not introduced by the optional ata ‘thus’ (unlike in (31)). In (28), a speech report expresses cause.

(28) [du-a-k wa-ku]SR=SC [warya-dana]FC
man-LINK-DAT say- COMPLSS fight + come-3plsu.npast + 3fem.sgbas.npast
They are fighting because of a man (lit., Saying ‘for/because of man’ they fight)

In (29) a speech report expresses a warning, that is, possible consequence. The speech report itself contains an irrealis-marked independent clause meaning ‘might’. 

(27) (a) [və-jəbər tə-kə-tua]FC
look-cust be-FUT-1sgsu.npast + 3fem.sgbas.npast
(b) [kəpa:b ṇon wukəmar-marək]SC
in.event you.fem forget-redup + dat
(c) [aw wukəmar-gay]SC2 [wukəmar-ŋən-ək]SC
then:contr forget-cond forget-2fem.sg-compl.ds
(d) [wun wa-kə-tua-ŋən]FC
I say-FUT-1sgsu.npast-2fem.sgbas.npast
(e) [[ŋən-a hat you.fem-link + fem.sg hat kə-na-y aka tə-na]SC
this-curr.rel-dist there be-act.foc + 3fem.sgbas.npast
(f) [api-ŋəgam kwa-na]FC]SR
top-mosquito.net + link loc stay-act.foc + 3fem.sgbas.npast
I will be watching in the event you forget (to take your hat), but (contrast) in the unlikely event you forget, if you forget, I will say to you: “Your hat is over here (in a further location we both know about), it is on top of the mosquito net”
Then they ran away, so that the dogs may not attack them (lit., having said “Those dogs might attack us”)

In each case, the speech report is a supporting clause. Speech reports implying a speech act are questioned with ata or ata ata ‘what, how?’, while ‘extended’ speech reports (that is, speech reports which do not imply saying anything) are questioned differently, depending on their meaning. A question to the contents of speech reports in (28) and (29) would contain agwajap? ‘why?’

Speech reports are not direct objects of the verb of speech wa-. Unlike most types of grammatical relations, they are never cross-referenced on the verb (cf. (27); and see §1.1). Yet they are obligatory, in the sense that wa- requires a speech report (similarly to many languages of the world: Aikhenvald 2008b).

5. Clause linking involving main clauses

5.1. Connectives

Languages with extensive clause chaining tend to be poor in connectives. Manambu is of this type. The causal connective alok ‘this is why’ is a recent development (see (14) and discussion in §3.1). It typically occurs at the beginning of a focal clause, if the unmarked supporting clause provides an explicit statement of reason, as in (30):

(30) [wun-abab bagwum  tə-kə-dəwun-ək]SC
     I-too  ceremony  +  link  +  loc  be-fut-imasc.sgbas.npast-conf
     [alək  sər  yi-kə-bana]FC
     this.is.why  tomorrow  go-fut-1plsu.npast  +  3fem.sgnpast
     I too will be at the ceremony, this is why we will go tomorrow

It can occur in the focal clause, if the supporting clause is marked with the clause chaining -lok, as in (14) (but not if the supporting clause is marked with the completive clause chaining suffixes -ku (SS)/-k (DS) which can have a causal meaning, as in (10–11)).

The connective alok can occur after the focal clause in apposition to the supporting clause in ‘elaboration’ linking, as an additional confirmation that

---

4 Speech reports presupposing a speech act often have a ‘theatrical’ effect: the reporter imitates what the original speaker had said. There is no such option for extended speech reports.
this is the reason why. An example is within the speech report in (31). The connective is an afterthought (and is preceded by a pause).

(31)  (a) [yibunmi [naj Sepaywus tɔ-dɔ-1-pɔk]_{SC=manner}  
 chief uncle Sepaywus be-3masc.sgsu.past-3fem.sgbas. past-like  

(b) ata wa:d]_{RC}  
then say + 3masc.sgbas.past  

(c) [ĩ̱mɔ̱̃ na wa ta:kw you.masc dem.prox.addr + fem.sg woman  
 saŋɔn-ɔn akray]_{SC} [vya-kɔ-dana-dɔmɔn-ɔk]_{FC}  
return-sim imp + bring kill-fut-3plsu.npast-2masc.sgbas. npast-conf  

[PAUSE] alɔk]_{SR}  
pause this.is.why  
The chief, (who is) the same as uncle Sepaywus (former chief, that is, local member of Council) used to be, then said: “You bring this woman back, (because/or else) they will kill you, this is why”

A complex connective a-lɔ-k  to-ku ‘because, as a result of that’ combines the semantics of cause and result. Its etymology is transparent, and is reflected in the gloss in (32). This is an instance of a clause chaining construction grammaticalizing into a connective.

(32)  (a) [dɔ ta:kw maː kɔr]_{SC}  
he wife neg marry:NEG  

(b) [alɔk  to-ku that.is.why=dem.dist-fem.sg-dat be-compl.ss  
dɔ-ko waːn kusɔ-ɾəb]_{FC}  
he-obl + fem.sg line finish-fully  
He didn’t get married, as a result his genealogical line finished completely

The connective atawatay (from ata wa-ta:y ‘then say-cotemp’) is used in a similar way. This is an interesting example of grammaticalization of a medial clause form of the verb of speech, congruent with its marking cause in speech reports (see §4). This is strikingly similar to the grammaticalization of the speech verb ɔm- ‘say; tell’ as part of the connective translatable as ‘(being) thus, (that fact) being so; because of (that fact)’ (§3.1 of Chapter 10).

The connective aw expresses contrast, as in (27c), ‘in the unlikely event you forget’, where it appears on a supporting clause with a clause chaining marker.
Aw is widely used for linking independent clauses (e.g. ‘I live in Malu, but (aw) I am from Avatip’), and also marks unexpected subsequent information in the focal clause—combining the meanings of temporal succession and contrast:

(33) [kian kian kian wa-na]_{SC}  
INTERJ INTERJ INTERJ say-ACT.FOC + 3fem.sgbas.npast  
[aw kɔ-na-wur ya-na]_{FC}  
CONTR DEM.PROX-CURR.REL-UP come-ACT.FOC + 3fem.sgbas.npast  
(The hawk) says: kian kian kian, then (unexpectedly) she comes up  
(a tree)

The connective aw has another meaning: that of open disjunction and alternative (‘in turn’), linking NPs and clauses. Then it precedes each NP or each clause, as in aw kami: aw lau-lap (contr fish contr ripe-banana) ‘(we eat) sometimes fish sometimes banana (or both)’, and aw yi-n aw ya-n (contr go-sim contr come-sim) ‘either going or coming, going and coming to and fro in turn’. Nevertheless, the Tok Pisin disjunction o ‘or’ is used to link NPs (and more rarely clauses). We return to the functional motivation for this in §6.

The connective a ’then/so, but’ marks result, as in (34), and also contrast, as in (35).

(34) (a) [kɔ-dɔ tami: miyawa du-ta:kw adɔka]_{SC}  
DEM.PROX-masc.sg area all man-woman there:masc.sg  
sit + 3masc.sgbas.past  
(b) [a akas væra-k-na-di]_{FC}  
then/so neg.irr come.across.to.speaker-IRR-ACT.FOC-3plbas.npast  
All the people stayed in this area, so (the enemies) would have never come in

(35) [wun Malu-adɔwun]_{SC} [a ta:y wun Avatɔp-adɔwun-ɔ]_{FC}  
I Malu-1masc.sgnom.at but before I Avatip-1masc.sgnom.at -conf  
I am of the Malu village, but before I was from Avatip village

This connective is suspiciously similar to the feminine distal demonstrative ‘that’. Feminine is the functionally unmarked gender in Manambu, and the distal demonstrative has anaphoric functions of all sorts: this explains a possible link between it and the connective.

Unlike alɔk in (31), the connectives aw and a cannot be postposed to the clause or used as afterthoughts. The connectives alɔk and aw are primarily clause
linking devices (and aw can also link NPs), while a and atawatacy also link sentences within discourse. (Another connective, ata ‘then’, does just that.)

Connectives mark focal clauses: these clauses refer to the central activity of the sentence, and they are the ones which contain foregrounded information central for the subsequent discourse. This may be another definitional feature of focal clauses. But since sentence linking within discourse units lies outside our scope here, I will leave it at that.

5.2. Apposition of main clauses

Apposition of main clauses covers a number of semantic types, including elaboration, as in (36), an answer to a question ‘What is the clan name that I should use to address her?’ The second, focal clause, provides further details as to what to say:

(36) [wun-a:k wa-ka-ñana-pak-a]SC
I-LINK + DAT say-FUT-2fem.sgsu.npast + 3fem.sgbas.npast-like
-3fem.sgnom.at
[ł-ko-k bap aw]FC
she-OBL-DAT ‘Moon’ IMP.say

It is like (the same way as) you say to me, (that is) say ‘Moon’ to her (that is, address her as ‘Moon’ which is the totem of her clan)

Another example of elaboration is the speech report content in (27) (‘Your hat is over here, it is on top of the mosquito net’).

Apposition often marks consequence or cause, as in (31) (‘give the woman back, (because/or else) they will kill you’). This illustrates an additional point: in Manambu discourse, commands tend to be used in apposition to another clause, explaining the reason or the consequences. Or they appear in apposition reflecting ‘rejection’ or ‘suggestion’ linking—see (37).

(37) [nab-a:r waku-tukwa]SC [kuk-a-tañaka:m gu
ayakw]FC
Sepik.River-LK + ALL go.out-prohib back-tank + LINK + LOC water
IMP.wash

Don’t go out to the Sepik River (to bathe), wash at the back of the water tank!

Similar ‘contextualization’ of commands is a recurrent feature of the world’s languages: in Australian languages Yidiŋ, Warlbiri, and Western Desert language, a negative command (in the form of an imperative) is typically followed by a positive command (see Dixon 1977: 351-2). This
strategy is based on a common sense principle: the more explanation or reason is given for a command or a request, the more persuasive one sounds, and the more successful the entreaty is bound to be (see Cialdini 1993: 4; 138-40, for some amusing examples). Alternative ‘rejection’ and ‘suggestion’ linking does not always involve commands—this is just a pervasive tendency.

Apposition of clauses is used to express temporal succession corresponding to ‘before’—see the discussion of example (6) in §3.1, and (38):

\[(38) \text{[wun kiyau ta:y]} \text{SC} \quad \text{[də kukər kiya-kwa-d]} \text{FC}
\]

\[
\text{I die.perm.1sg before he after die-IMP-3masc.sg}
\]

Let me die before he dies (lit. ‘Let me die first, may he die after (me)’)

That the action of the first clause precedes that of the second clause is clear from the presence of \textit{ta:y} ‘before’ (used, with the same meaning, if two main clauses are linked with the connective \textit{a}; see (35)).

This takes us to the semantic wealth of apposition. The semantic relations between apposed clauses depend heavily on the context, the meanings, and the categories of the supporting clause. Consider the frustrative modality. It indicates that the activity was to no avail—that is, the desired result was not achieved. A frustrative clause is always accompanied by another main clause in apposition to it, indicating the actual consequence, or result—see (39).

\[(39) \text{[kwakə-yakəp]} \text{SC} \quad \text{[adiya kwaya-di]} \text{FC}
\]

\[
\text{wait-FRUST there:pl stay.in.mourning-3plbas.past}
\]

(They) looked (for him) in vain, (as a result, since they presumed him dead) they stayed in mourning

Frustrative is not a clause linking device; but it ensures a result reading for the apposition of clauses, acting ‘as if’ it were a connective.\(^5\)

Apposition can be used for contrast if one clause is negated or both involve antonyms (‘you are big, I am small’), and also for ‘alternating’ alternatives: then \textit{nak} ‘one; another, the other’ will appear in each clause. SC and FC are undistinguishable—but this ‘alternating’ linking can be seen as part of elaboration linking with the first clause in (40) as the focal clause:

\[(40) \begin{align*}
\text{(a) [du viti-abər]} & \text{FC} \\
\text{man two-3dunom.at} \\
\text{(b) [[nak swakwas kudi wa:d]} & \text{SC/FC} \\
\text{one wild.pigeon language speak + 3masc.sgbas.npast}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^5\) According to Sparing-Chávez (2003), in Amahuaca frustrative operates as a de facto clause or sentence connective. Similarly, in Iquito (Chapter 8) it appears in counterfactual conditional linkages, and in Aguaruna (Chapter 7) it appears in temporal linkages with the meaning of ‘before’. 
There were two men, one spoke wild pigeon’s language, the other one spoke hen’s language.

Apposition of main clauses involves a short pause between them. Unlike conjoined clauses and clause chains there is no special intonation contour associated with it.

6. Summary

We will now summarize the main points relevant for Manambu clause linking.

(a) Semantic types. Clause linking in Manambu is rich in terms of the semantic types—just about all the types discussed in Chapter 1 are attested in the language. An additional subtype of ‘Alternative’ linking is an ‘in turn’, or ‘quid pro quo’ linking discussed in §3.4 (example (22)). The language avoids unordered addition: any sequence of clauses tends to be interpreted as being related—most frequently in terms of temporal succession, relative time, or cause. This takes us to the issue of the pervasive polysemy between the semantic relations of relative time, cause, and condition.

(b) Semantic overlaps, and polysemy resolution. The overlap between semantic types of time, cause, and condition follows cross-linguistic tendencies. What makes Manambu unusual is the existence of regular mechanisms for disambiguating these if necessary. We saw in §3.1 that clauses marked with the completive -k/-ku can be used for any of these three meanings. But there is a dedicated mechanism for just relative time (generic completive verb napa-: (12)), a special causal clause (14), and a plethora of mechanisms to express conditions.

Speech reports are also polysemous: they express purpose, cause, and possible consequence. A variety of formal features differentiates those speech reports which do not imply an actual speech act from those that do.

Connectives—most of them products of recent grammaticalization—tend to be semantically simple. In contrast, apposition of main clauses covers a variety of semantic types of clause linking, and the exact meaning depends on the context and also the form of the predicate: we can recall that if the first clause in a sentence contains a frustrative form, the second one in apposition to it will convey result. Similarly to Iquito (Chapter 6), apposition of dependent clauses has a different semantic effect: if two or more dependent clauses of the same type are in apposition, the meaning is that of temporal succession...
or elaboration. But if dependent clauses are of different types, the meaning of temporal succession becomes more prominent. This topic in itself would require a separate study (see Aikhenvald 2008a: 446–506).

Generally speaking, the meaning of clause linking tends to be determined by the linking morpheme (be it a connective, or a clause chaining marker, or just the pitch, as in conjoined clauses) and also, at least potentially, by the categories expressed in the verb (see §3.2).

(c) **Areas of semantic wealth.** Just like in many other languages, clause chaining is predominantly used for temporal linking, and also for manner and cause. The semantic subtypes of temporal linking in Manambu reflect types of relationship in time which are not available in main clauses. And some of these relationships are more elaborate than others. Three markers express temporal contiguity and sequence, one refers to ‘after’, and one spans ‘before, while, and after’. The lack of a dedicated marker for ‘before’ is compensated for by apposition of clauses, with the Focal clause containing the adverb ‘before’.

Why is the semantic relationship ‘before’ less elaborate than ‘after’, ‘while’, and others? A partial reason may lie in the way sentences are linked within discourse, to ensure textual coherence. A highly frequent technique involves bridging repetition (cf. Chapter 7): the predicate of the last clause is repeated in a dependent medial clause, in a form marking simultaneity or completed action. An English equivalent would be: ‘He went. Having gone, he arrived in the village. Having arrived, he said . . .’ This pervasive sentence linking ‘glue’ leaves little space for ‘before’ linking. But this goes beyond linking clauses.

Some semantic types in Manambu are plainly richer than others. Real manner can be marked with a case on verb (§3.4), with polysemous clause chaining -n (§3.1), or the suffix -pak—which is the only one also used for ‘hypothetical manner’, ‘as if’. Real and potential condition is expressed with a polysemous completive -ku/-k (§3.1); polysemous conjoined clauses (§3.2) can express real, potential, or counterfactual condition, depending on whether the SC and/or FC contain an irrealis verb form. There is an additional option: an unlikely condition expressed with the clause chaining -gay. This has to be always specified by another clause with a conditional, or possible consequence, meaning which follows the -gay clause (cf. (13), (27)). The unlikely condition can thus be analyzed as a hierarchically overarching generic concept, whose reference has to be narrowed down by a more specific term.

(d) **Clause linking, and the influence of Tok Pisin.** Just like every area of Manambu grammar and lexicon, clause linking devices offer two extremes—some devices are highly polysemous, and others are highly specialized. And
this is where the influence of Tok Pisin, the national language of Papua New Guinea (familiar to every Manambu speaker), comes in.

Tok Pisin offers speakers an option of a ‘shortcut’, doing away with areas of complexity. The Tok Pisin *sapos* ‘if’ is gradually entering the language as a clause-initial adverb. *Sapos* (from English *suppose*) can be used for any condition: it does not exactly fill a ‘gap’, but provides a conveniently vague term.

Another recent borrowing, the disjunction *o* ‘or’, does the exact opposite. We saw in §5.1 that the connective *aw* can be used as an open disjunction. However, this is not its only meaning; examples (27) and (33) show that it expresses contrast and unexpected information in general. In contrast, the Tok Pisin *o* is a dedicated disjunction. In this meaning, it is gradually making its way into Manambu (where it links NPs, and occasionally clauses). Having *aw* as a marker of contrast is perhaps the reason why Tok Pisin *tasol* ‘but’ is very rarely used as a linker in Manambu.

An unusual feature of Manambu is the emergence of connectives, grammaticalized from dependent clauses marked for ‘same subject’. (This is in itself not universal: in Aguaruna (Chapter 7) conjunctions are grammaticalized from recapitulating verbs in dependent clauses which do not have to be marked for same subject.) The connective *alok tɔ-ku* ‘because, as a result of that’ consists of that.is.why (formed from *dem.dist-fem.sg-dat*) and be-compl ss, and would literally translate as ‘being for that (reason)’. The connective *atawata:y* comes from *ata wa-ta:y* (‘then say-cotemp ss’), literally ‘then saying’. In many Papuan languages with switch reference, same-subject marking has additional overtones of topic continuity, while different subject correlates with change in topic (see Reesink 1983). This tendency also holds for Manambu, and could be the reason why same-subject, rather than different-subject, switch-reference forms are being grammaticalized in this function. Most languages of the Sepik area with extensive switch-reference marking have no connectives at all—this is why Manambu is unusual in the area in which it is spoken.
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