Yolŋu
Matha
??
i.e.
see
also
cyclic
tense
asym-
met-
ric
nega-
tion
FIRST
pos.prs
pos.yp
THIRD
dis-
con-
tin-
u-
ous
CYCLIC
TENSE
Temporal
ref-
er-
ence
and
ver-
bal
in-
flec-
tion
in
West-
ern
Dhuwal
[djr]
-
PRESENT
ma
IPFV.I
ACC
SAME
DAY
PAST
-
ŋal
ACC
PRE-
TODAY
PAST
-
ma
ACC
SEC-
OND
FOURTH
dhu
balaŋ
e.g.
Verbal
in-
flec-
tion
and
modal
par-
ti-
cles
in
West-
ern
Dhuwal
[djr]
FU-
TURE
ŋu
ACC
COUN-
TER-
FAC-
TUAL
-
nha
ACC
bäyŋu
e.g.
e.g.
e.g.
in-
com-
pat-
i-
ble
ASYM-
ME-
TRY
Negation
in-
ter-
act-
ing
with
in-
flec-
tion
cat-
e-
gory
in
West-
ern
Dhuwal
[djr]
PRESENT
-
ŋu
NEG
SAME-
DAY

meta-
phys-
i-
cal
non-
veridi-
cal-
ity
branch-
ing
times
??
bam-
bai
??

4
$[w,t]_{\text{FUT}}\ p =$
$\{1 \leftrightarrow \forall w' \big[w' \approx_t w \rightarrow \exists t'[t \prec t' \wedge p(w')(t')]\big] 0 \leftrightarrow \forall w' \big[w' \approx_t w \rightarrow t'[t \prec t' \wedge p(w')(t')]\big] undefinedotherwise$
FUT
p
t'
w
t
p
w
t

e.g.
§**??**
p.
??*ff*
$\cap \widetilde{\approx}_{\cdot}$

5
RE-
ALISED
qnr
i.e.

Interactions between negation and mood marking in Gurgoni

CLASSSTEM		9	
		nanya	**ya**
	i	**nha**	**-iya**
	ru	**na**	**rá**
ŋ	**lu**	**(la)ra**	**la**
-n	**-ru-**	**na**	**-ra**
B	**-ma-ŋu-wala/-violetnha-wa**		

PAST
PO-
TEN-
TIAL
not
§**??**

11
??12

```
FirstSecondThirdFourth
Bas  Fut    1       2
```

e.g.[16]

Imperative force with II

a prior dry season

REMOTE PAST

sc.

changes.[20]
§**??**

??

Temporal contributions of I and III (non-today frame)

RECENT PAST a

REMOTE PAST na

25
GA
??
PRESENT
PER-
FEC-
TIVE
e.g.
ff
LEX-
I-
CAL
CON-
STRAINT
Ak-
tion-
sart

28
t̲hirr(i)
k̲um(a)
t̲hun/-
ʼyun
djäl

marŋgi
marŋgithirr(i)
≈

cates.[29]

So far in this section, we have seen evidence of an organising principle in W. Dhuwal(a) where all verbal (inflecting) predicates lexically encode eventive (dynamic) situations which are temporally bound (*i.e.*, have endpoints). This principle is formulated in ().

verbal stems as inherently eventive in

‘ipfv.I’ when referring to a presently-holding state.

Modelling pred-i-

‘caus’[30]
—
de-
rives
in-
flect-
ing
ver-
bal
pred-
i-
cates
with
ac-
cord-
ingly
even-
tive
se-
man-

tics.[31] Wilkinson1991 demonstrates the paradigmatic relation between these predicates. A number of examples of these verbal derivations are given in Table **??** below (predominantly from Wilkinson's description) and formal proposals for the contributions of a number of these operators are given in () below.[32]

ii.

-THi $_{\langle\langle\varepsilon_s,t\rangle,\langle\varepsilon_\epsilon,t\rangle\rangle} = \lambda P^s.\lambda e[\text{BECOME}(P^s)(e)]$

-THi 'inch' is a situation operator which takes a property of states $P^s \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ and returns the set of events BECOME $P^s \subseteq \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$. A semantics for -*ku*~-THa 'transitiviser'

-THu$_{\langle\langle\varepsilon_s,t\rangle,\langle e,\langle\varepsilon_e,t\rangle\rangle\rangle} = \lambda y\lambda P^s.\exists e[\text{CAUSE}(y, \text{BECOME}(P^s)(e))]$

-THu 'tr' is a situation operator which takes a property of states P^s and returns

(ear-
lier
to-
day).’[DB 20190405]//

ŋarra
barpuru
munh-
agu
ŋarra
l̪uka
djiny-
d-
jalma’
ga
roŋanmara-
ŋala
bä-
pawa
märr
ŋayi
dhu
l̪uka
dhiyaŋu
bala
go̱dar-
rmirri//
1s
yes-
ter-
day
night
1s
eat.I
crab
and
return.caus-
III
father-
dat
so
3s
fut
eat.I
prox.erg
mvtawy
morn-
ing//
‘I
ate
some
crab
last
night

[49]Cover2010.[34]
A
con-
se-
quence
of
an
anal-
y-
sis
of
this
type
would
be
that,
past-
referring
ut-
ter-
ances
with
I-
morphology
must
be
un-
der-
stood
“not
[as
lo-
cat-
ing]
a
sit-
u-
a-
tion
at
some
def-
i-
nite
point
in
the
past,
but
only
to
of-
fer
it
as
rel-
e-
vant
to
the
cur-
rent
sit-
u-
a-
tion”,
a
se-
man-
tic
do-
main
tra-
di-
tion-
ally
as-

pro-
noun/presupposition
re-
gard-
ing
the
re-
la-
tion
be-
tween
a
contextually-
provided
ref-
er-
ence
time
and
the
time
of
speech),
we
are
left
with
dis-
junc-
tive
lex-
i-
cal
en-
tries
for
each
of
I
and
III;
se-
man-
tics
for
which
are
sketched
be-
low
in
().

**A pol-
y-
semy
treat-
ment
of
the
tem-
po-
ral
con-
tri-
bu-
tion
of
I
and
III**poly-
tns $\mathbf{I}^{c} =$
$\lambda t :$
$\{ t \in$
$today' \leftrightarrow$
$t \circ$
$t_0 . t$ [NONPAST]

along with a (more vague) subjective distinction between 'RECENT' and 'NON-RECENT' [see also][]Botne2012. Both of these thresholds appear to be grammaticalised in WD.

The translation of the "Glaswegian" semantics for tense systems of this type given in (polytns), then, appears to be

([*e.g.*,][]Cable2013,Klecha2016,Hayashi2015.)[37]
That
is,
gram-
mars
that
pay
at-
ten-
tion
to
tem-
po-
ral
dis-
tinc-
tions
that
are
more
fine-
grained.
Grammaticalised
re-
mote-
ness
dis-
tinc-
tions,
at-
tested
across
a
wide
sam-
ple
of
world
lan-
guages,
are
par-
tic-
u-
larly
well
rep-
re-
sented
in
Bantu
Dahl1983,Botne2012.
As
an
ex-
am-
ple,
Gikũyũ
([kik]
Bantu:
Cen-
tral
Kenya)
is
de-
scribed
as
hav-
ing
a
sys-
tem
of
trm:
four
for
the

frame devices and contextual support. She also suggests "relevance" as a potential criterion requiring further investigation. We will have more to say about this in the next section (§**??**).

This subsection has considered how wd handles predication about events instantiated **before the day of utter-**

(dis-
cont)
be-
low.

**Tem-
po-
ral
dis-
con-
ti-
nu-
ity:
Ref-
er-
ence
times
fe-
lic-
i-
tous
with
III
do
not
strictly
pre-
cede
those
fe-
lic-
i-
tous
with
I.**discont

().[40]

i.[41]

ous.[42] Effectively, it is an identity function that "passes" a reference index i, provided by context (c), up the derivation. The contextual parameter c is assumed to be a tuple containing relevant contextual information. On this approach, temporal reference is provided by a pronoun-like

–

(6,0);

[nearly
trans-
par-
ent,gray!60](3,0)
el-
lipse
[x
ra-
dius=2cm,y
ra-
dius=.9cm];
(2.75,.5)
node[color=blue]
i;
[nearly
trans-
par-
ent,gray!80,xshift=0.52cm](3.5,0)
el-
lipse
[x
ra-
dius=1cm,y
ra-
dius=.6cm];
(4.45,.25)
node[color=forest]
j;
[semi-
trans-
par-
ent,gray!80,xshift=0.45cm](1.8,0)

time.[44] From this, we can simply derive the incompatibility of III with PRESENT-referring event descriptions: all non-final subintervals of $(today, i*]$ forcibly exclude $i*$. As a result, $\textsc{NfInst}(P, [today, i*), j)$ yields the TODAY PAST distribution for III.

[Prehodiernal]The NON-TODAY frame Further, the "subjective" nature of the RECENT v. REMOTE distinction (shown

and
TO-
DAY
PAST
in-
stan-
ti-
a-
tion
times
then
emerges
as
a
re-
sult
of
prag-
matic
block-
ing.
It
is
well
known
that
op-
po-
si-
tions
be-
tween
spe-
cific
and
gen-
eral
mean-
ings
give
rise
to
a
di-
vi-
sion
of
prag-
matic
labour
in
which
the
gen-
eral
form
is
con-
ven-
tion-
ally
re-
stricted
to
the
com-
ple-
ment
of
the
do-
main
of
the
spe-
cific
form

tional cat- e- gories in the ver- bal paradigm (I and III.)

The tem- po- ral dis- con- ti- nu- ity of the ref- er- ence in- ter- vals li- censed by each of these in- flec- tions (schema- tised in Fig- ures **??/??/??**) is un- der- stood in terms of a no- tion of a (PRE)CONTEMPORARY dis- tinc- tion which op- er- ates over ei- ther a hodier- nal or pre- ho- diernal "ref- er- ence

verb forms locate an event within the P-domain (accounting for futurate and historical present uses, where Ø-inflection is apparently compatible with non-present time.) That all Ø-marked predicates involve reference to events that occur "within the timespan of the cognitive world [that includes the deictic center]" (152). En-

d'énonciation).[47] To take one example, Duchet2016's Duchet2016 study of the usage domains of the Albanian [sqi] AORIST and PERFECT suggests the possible utility of this broad *"énonciative"* dichotomy in understanding the distribution of these

forms.[48] While past-referring event descriptions in narrative contexts are the *locus classicus* of the *Aorist*, Duchet2016 show that, in discourse contexts, this form is associated with a number of other uses — including the description of present-holding result states and "immediate future" accomplishments. The *Perfect* — tradi-

overview.[50] A similar usage of the PRES (or NON-FUTURE) is also pointed out by Stirling2012a, who shows its extensive use in Kalaw Lagaw Ya [mwp], where it functions as a past perfective in narrative con-

texts.[51,52]

clause.[53]

Quoted dialogue in a narrative context inducing reference frame shift//
nhanŋu
ŋändi'mirriŋunydja
waŋa-
na-
na:
+
"Go,
gäma'kama-
na
nhuma
dhu
gir-
riny'tja
mala,
nhakuna
munhd-
hur-

cles.)[54] The development of this analytic TMA marking system in Dhuwal-Dhuwala is likely to be related to the emergence of a "cyclic tense" system where I (the erstwhile 'pres') now obligatorily co-occurs with *ga* 'ipfv' in order to encode present reference. Compare this fact to the incompatibility between present ref-

unmarked form, temporally neutral in its semantics compare to treatments of the present, *e.g.*, Fleischman1990,Carruthers2012.[55]

The following chapter extends the account to II and IV — the irrealis categories.

Modal interpretation & NEGATIVE ASYMMETRY distinguishing $\langle I, III \rangle$ from $\langle II, IV \rangle$

The basic distributional facts for II and IV were

that
re-
ceive
I-
marking
in
pos-
i-
tive
sen-
tences
—
en-
cod-
ing
tem-
po-
ral
ref-
er-
ence
to
the
present
or
re-
cent
past
(Ch. **??**)
—
in-
stead
re-
ceive
II-
marking
un-
der
the
scope
of
nega-
tion.
Each
ex-
am-
ple
con-
tains
a
pred-
i-
ca-
tion
about
the
present
or
about
the
re-
cent
past
(nor-
mally
the
do-
main
of
I,
as
de-
scribed
in
the
pre-
vi-

se-
lec-
tion
in
**neg-
a-
tive
clauses**
(*cf.*
Fig. **??**,
p. **??**.)
[h][TEMPORAL
SCHEMA.
wd
neg-
a-
tive
clauses]Apparent
in-
ter-
ac-
tions
be-
tween
tem-
po-
ral
re-
la-
tions
and
re-
al-
ity
sta-
tus
in
Djam-
bar-
rpuyŋu:
cyclicty
and
met-
ri-
cal-
ity
un-
der
nega-
tion.
[scale=1.2]
[<-
>,
line
width=.5mm]
(0,0)
–

(12,0);
[left
color=violet!15!white,
right
color=orange!15!white]
(0,0.02)
rect-
an-
gle
(4.8,1.5);
[vi-
o-
let!10!white]
(4.8,0.02)
rect-
an-
gle
(6.8,1.5);
[left

i-
cal
read-
ings.
In
all
these
con-
texts,
we
can
model
dhu
as
uni-
ver-
sally
quan-
ti-
fy-
ing
over
(a
sub-
set
of)
a
cir-
cum-
stan-
tial
modal
base.

***dhu* 'fut' encoding future tense with I- and II- inflections**

barpuru goḏarr ŋarra **dhu** nhä-**ŋu**// funeral tomorrow 1s fut see-II// 'I'll watch the funeral tomorrow.'

dhu-fut// mukul **dhu** **gi** nhin-**i** raŋi-ŋur goḏarr// aunt

—
namely
a
circumstantial
modal
base
CIRCm
and
some
type
of
ordering
source
o.
The
function
BEST
selects
the
"best"
worlds
in
a
circumstantial
modal
base,
according
to
how
well
they
conform
with
whatever
set
of
propositions
is
returned
by
o.
Depending
on
which
ordering
source
is
provided
by
context,
these
conversa-

recorder
mod
break-
II//
‘I’m
al-
ways
wor-
ried
that
the
recorder
will/could
break.’[DhG 20190417]//
ŋarra
bal-
aŋu
(bäynha)
dhiŋg-
uŋu
ŋawalul’yusmoke//
1s
mod
(mod)
die-
II
smoke.erg//
‘I
could
die
from
the
smoke.’[DhG 20190405]//
ŋayi
balaŋ
dhu
djaṉṉar-
thicat//
3s
mod
fut
hunger-
inch.II//
‘It
(the
cat)
might
get
hun-
gry.’[AW 20190429]//
Predications
about
“past
pos-
si-
bil-
i-
ties”
are
in-
di-
cated
by
the
co-
occurrence
of
balaŋ(u)
and
IV
as
seen
in
().
A
coun-
ter-

[violet!10!white]
(0,0.02)
rect-
an-
gle
(6.8,1.5);
[or-
ange!10!white]
(6.8,0.02)
rect-
an-
gle
(12,1.5);
(3.675,0)
node[below=3pt]
node[above=15pt]
IV;
(5,0)
node[circle,fill,label=below:$\lfloor today$]
node[below=3pt]
node[above=3pt]
;
(7,0)
node[diamond,shade,inner
color=ochre,outer
color=black,label=below:$t*$]
node[below=3pt]
node[above=3pt]
;
(9.5,0)
node[below=3pt]
node[above=15pt]
II;
(9.5,0)
node[circle,fill,label=below:$today\big)$]
node[below=3pt]
node[above=3pt]
;

The
dis-
tinc-
tion
be-
tween
the
tem-
po-
ral
in-
ter-
pre-
ta-
tions
in
II-
and
IV-
inflected
clauses
then
in
ef-
fect
re-
flects
the
dis-
tinc-
tion
drawn
by
Con-
do-
ravdi2002
be-
tween
present

base.)[61,62]

Following treatments of English modals (*e.g.*, WOLL and *may*, compare Condoravdi2002,Condoravdi2003), wd modals are treated as quantifiers over contextually supplied conversational backgrounds that "uniformly expand the time of evaluation [i'] forward" [12]Condoravdi2003.

Armed with a semantics for the modal particles with which the "irrealis-aligned" II and IV

chotomous reality status category.[63] In an analytic decision perhaps emblematic of this difficulty, [467]Portner2012 appeal to a necessity to "invoke grammaticalization" in their analysis of subjunctive-selecting predicates in Romance — suggesting that in at least some cases (*sc.* for some predicates) the

Palmer2001.[64]

main.[65] On the basis of this generalisation, Gian2016 (*e.g.*, Gian2016; Giannakidou2020 *i.a.*) takes the subjunctive to indicate "non-veridicality" with respect to a proposition — that is, it indicates that there exists at least one world in a given set of worlds (a modal base, M) in which that proposition is not true (G-

clause.[66]

An IRREALIS mood

The discussion above draws on the literature on VERBAL MOOD, an enterprise which attempts to capture intuitions about the meaning contrasts between the INDICATIVE and SUBJUNCTIVE categories of (almost exclusively) European languages.[67]

In his comparison of IRREALIS and

lan-
guages,
we
have
rea-
son
[fol-
low-
ing][]Palmer2001
to
treat
the
mood
cat-
e-
gory
in-
flected
on
WD
verbs
as
IR-
RE-
ALIS.
The
na-
ture
of
the
ir-
re-
alis
mood
and
its
re-
la-
tion
to
modal
op-
er-
a-
tors
is
fur-
ther
de-
vel-
oped
in
the
re-
main-
der
of
this
chap-
ter;
the
ques-
tion
of
syn-
tac-
tic
sub-
or-
di-
na-
tion
is
in-
ves-
ti-
gated

assertable at the superset (because otherwise S would have done so) — follows naturally from basic Gricean principles ([see][]Horn1984 a.o.)[68]

A non-veridical semantics for IR-RE-ALIS

In §?? above, following Giannakidou1995 (Giannakidou1995,Giannakidou1998

tors.)[69]

Given that II and IV are only felicitous in the presence of one of these nonveridical operators, their distribution is apparently restricted to irrealis claims. On the basis of its distributional facts in addition

son)[71]
holds
of
in
a
sub-
set
of
branches
in
the
meta-
phys-
i-
cal
modal
base
$\cap\approx_{e(i_c)}$
Q-
implicates
that,
in-
deed,
this
pred-
i-
cate
does
not
hold
at
all
branches.
That
is
to
say
that
dhu
claims
sat-
isfy
IRR.

Below
we

i.[72] This is shown in ().

A lexical entry for wd negationden:neg

sue.[73]

Apparent inability readings of *bäyŋu*inab CONTEXT.

My nephew's broken his leg. I ask if he's going out tonight:waku//
bäyŋu ŋarra dhu marrtji discolil bili
bäyŋu ŋarra gi marrtji//
neg 1s fut go disco.all cplv
neg 1s ipfv.II go.II//
'I won't go to the disco because I can't walk.'[MG 20180802]//CONTEXT.

We see an injured wallaby.weti//
ŋunha weti (#?*yaka*/)
bäyŋuny (dhu) gi djumurr'djumurr'yurr//
dist wal-

,
line
width=1.5pt,style=dashed]
(3.5,1.25)
–

(5,1.5)
;
[-
>,
line
width=1.25pt,style=dashed]
(5,1.5)
–

(6,1.75)
node[label=right:b_1]
(7,1.75)
;
[-
>,
line
width=1.25pt,style=dashed]
(5,1.5)
–

(6,1.375)
node[label=right:b_2]
(7,1.375)
;
[-

,
line
width=1.5pt,style=dashed]
(3.5,1.25)
–

(5,1);
[-
>,
line
width=1.25pt,style=dashed]
(5,1.5)
–

(6,1.75)
;
[-
>,
line
width=1.25pt,style=dashed]
(5,1)
–

(6,1.125)
node[label=right:b_3]
(7,1.125)
;
[-
>,
line
width=1.25pt,style=dashed]
(5,1)
–

(6,.75)
node[label=right:b_4]
(7,1.125)
;
(6.5,0)
node[circle,fill=forest,label=below,align=left:*now*]
node[below=3pt]
node[above=3pt]
;

[see][70,109]Givon1975.[74]

In this chapter, we have seen data which shows how negative operators appear to

tion.[75] In terms of the branching times framework, then, the function of NEGATIVE operators can in a sense be assimilated with modals. As an example, in the case of negated predications about the past, indices at which the basic proposition holds are not ones that are consistent with, or $\prec$-accessible to speech time $(i*)$,

phe-
nomenon
is
il-
lus-
trated
by
the
data
in
(–
).

Negated same-day future predi-cations fail to li-cense

(II).[78] The same-day future, in which *dhu* and I co-occur, can in effect be understood as a **grammaticalised futurate construction**. *Dhu* requires an evaluation index (*c* provides *i*∗, which, again, is "passed up" into the derivation by I) and obligatorily advances the instantiation time of the eventual-

events.)[79]

ity.[80]

The analysis of the same-day future, then, is based on the hypothesis that predications about the same-day future — even if

dex.[81] The distinctive contribution of the IRREALIS inflections, then, is that they impose a **presupposition** on the (contextually-supplied) index of evaluation: namely that there exists some conceivable, metaphysically consistent alternative "branch" at which their prejacent is false.

An analysis of the wd paradigm

the domain of each inflection is superimposed.[82] Note the general domain of I; due to MAX-PRESUPP, where domains intersect, that which "presupposes the most" (fig. **??**) is felicitous.

[h]
[Partition of T: the WD in-

[*e.g.*,][]Lunn1995.[83]
That
is,
pre-
vi-
ous
anal-
y-
ses
have
sug-
gested
that,
for
ex-
am-
ple,
SUB-
JUNC-
TIVE
in-
flec-
tion
on
P
is
taken
to
in-
di-
cate
that
the
speaker
is
not
as-
sert-
ing/willing
to
com-
mit
them-
selves
to
P.

text.[84]

ing.[85] Examples are given in (mak).

a.o.[86] This perspective has been formulated as a communicative convention, *e.g.* (), following [105]Lauer2013, [157]Condoravdi2011:[87]

clause.[88]

ter.[89]
Ideas
about
the
il-
lo-
cu-
tion-
ary
force
and
norms
of
as-
ser-
tion
are
for-
malised
by
mod-
elling
$\vdash$
as
com-
pris-
ing
a
covert
dox-
as-
tic
modal
an-
chored
by
the
ac-
tual
world
($\sim_\alpha$
)
Kauf-
mann2005
or
an
up-
date
func-
tion
on
a
speaker's
pub-
lic
com-
mit-
ments/beliefs
and
(ul-
ti-
mately)
the
com-
mon
ground
Krifka2015,Lauer2013.

[12]Krifka2021.[90]
Given
its
ap-
par-
ent
vari-
able
modal
force,
maku
takes
an
ac-
cess-
si-
bil-
ity
re-
la-
tion
(*e.g.*,
AS-
SERT)
as
its
sis-
ter
and
re-
turns
a
sub-
set
of
the
modal
base
it
picks
out.
Fol-
low-
ing
Matthew-
son2010,Rullmann2008
a.o.,
force-
variable
modal-
ity
is
mod-
elled
as
uni-
ver-
sal
quan-
tifi-
ca-
tion
over
a
a
(contextually-
determined)
sub-
set
of
the
modal
base
(as
de-
ter-
mined

censed.[91]
ccls
Ma-
trix
pred-
i-
cates
which
en-
tail
non-
veridi-
cal
com-
ple-
ments
do
not
li-
cense
the
ir-
re-
alisembed
ŋurik
ŋarra
djäl
guya-
w
[ŋunhi [
(ŋayi)
d̲arrkthu-
rr
wämut-
nha
]]want//
texd.dat
1s
want
fish-
dat
texd
(3s)
bite-
III
malk-
acc//
‘I
want
that
that
fish
bit
Wä-
mut/I
want(ed)
the
fish
to
have
bit-
ten
Wä-
mut.’[22]Wilkinson//
ministay
nyäl̲’yurr
[ŋunhi [
gap-
man’dhu
ga-
n
gurrupa-
r
djä-
malie//
min-
is-

a tool with which to understand this claim.

Broadly speaking, given an utterance index, *dhu* 'fut' displaces a predicate into the *potential* domain, *bäyŋu/yaka* into the *counterfactual domain* and *balaŋ* into either of these (the "*irrealis* domain" more broadly, following Von-Princea).

In all of these cases, the common ground in a given dis-

native to utterance index $\cap\approx_{i*}$ [86]Condoravdi2002.

Consequently, **"objective"** non-veridicality requires an "anchor" at which metaphysical alternatives to the *actual present* ($i*$) are considered (this is implied by von Prince's trichotomy §**??**, see also fig **??**.) IRR is licensed if, relative to $i*$, P **is not** a historic neces-

eties (including, for example, Ritharrŋu-Wägilak, compare § **??**.)

As suggested by the glossing decisions summarised in Table **??** above, existing descriptions of Eastern *(Miwatj)* Dhuwal(a) varieties Morphy1983,Heath1980 do not appear to exhibit the cyclic tense or mood neutralisation effects described above for WD.[93] Additionally, Melanie Wilkin-

split), speakers split between the two past forms (pst & pst) documented by Heath — glossed here according to each inflection's cognacy with wd, *i.e.*, III and IV respectively. That is, in elicitation, a distinction between and appears for speaker RN but *not* for AL, pointing to a near-complete merger of and in Ritharrŋu-Wägilak.

Interspeaker vari-

same
way.)

This
dif-
fer-
ence
might
be
mod-
elled
as
a
con-
trast
in
the
scope-
taking
be-
haviour
of
RW
-
'may'
as
against
wd
bäyŋu/yaka
—
[]Mithun1995

??.[96] What's more, (geographically) intermediate Dhuwal-Dhuwala varieties, particularly the Galiwin'ku Djambarrpuyŋu varieties described in Wilkinson1991 (and perhaps the Djapu' (Eastern Dhuwal variety) spoken in Yirrkala and described in Morphy1983) exhibit possible transition phenomena.

bours.[97,98]

*Lexical reorganisation. A potential hypothesis underpinning this change is that, with the advent of cyclic temporal reference, I — the erstwhile PRESENT tense — comes to fail to reliably encode a distinction between past and present temporal reference. Consequently, there is a greater reliance

sup-
po-
si-
tion
that
a
contextually-
supplied
ref-
er-
ence
in-
dex
has
one
or
both
of
these
tense/mood
prop-
er-
ties.
This
se-
man-
tics
in
tan-
dem
with
a
gen-
eral
prag-
matic
prin-
ci-
ple
(MaxPresupp,
it-
self
an
im-
ple-
men-
ta-
tion
of
Gricean
rea-
son-
ing
about
co-
op-
er-
a-
tion
in
com-
mu-
ni-
ca-
tion.)

tion:[100] features exhibited (to varying degrees) in wd.

Chapter ?? comprised a formal treatment of the expression of temporal cat-