

Chapter 4

Bridging constructions in Tsezic languages

Diana Forker

University of Jena

Felix Anker

University of Bamberg

This paper treats bridging constructions in the Tsezic languages (Bezhta, Hunzib, Khwarshi, Hinuq, and Tsez) of the Nakh-Daghestanian language family. We describe the syntactic and semantic properties of bridging constructions based on corpus data from all five Tsezic languages. Bridging constructions are defined as bipartite constructions that consist of a finite reference clause, which is followed by a non-main adverbial clause that functions as the bridging clause. The adverbial clause contains a variety of temporal converbs with general perfective converbs being more common than other types of temporal converbs. Reference and bridging clauses are both a target for additions, omissions, modifications and substitutions. Bridging constructions are primarily found in traditional oral narratives such as fairy tales where they index the genre and function as stylistic devices to express parallelism. Within the narratives they are often used to indicate episode changes and can be accompanied by switches of subject referents or locations.

1 Introduction

The Tsezic languages form one branch of the Nakh-Daghestanian (or North-East Caucasian) language family and are traditionally grouped into two sub-families, the East Tsezic languages comprising Bezhta and Hunzib and the West Tsezic languages comprising Hinuq, Khwarshi and Tsez. Tsezic languages are mainly spoken in the northern part of the Caucasus in the Republic of Daghestan in



the Russian Federation. Tsezic languages are dependent marking and morphologically ergative. They are famous for their rich case systems, especially in the spatial domain, and their gender systems. For most of the Tsezic languages there are grammatical descriptions or at least sketch grammars (see Forker 2013a for Hinuq; Khalilova 2009 for Khwarshi; van den Berg 1995 for Hunzib; Comrie et al. 2015 for Bezhta; Kibrik & Testelec 2004 for a sketch grammar of Bezhta and Alekseev & Radžabov 2004 for a sketch grammar of Tsez). Further syntactic descriptions of Tsez are Radžabov (1999) and Polinsky (forthcoming).

We assume that bridging constructions can be found in all Nakh-Daghestanian languages. We will, however, concentrate on the Tsezic languages in this paper because for this subgroup we have more data at our disposal than for any of the other subgroups. The most common type of bridging construction in Tsezic is recapitulative linkage, while summary linkage is only used rarely and mixed linkage is not found at all (for a definition and classification of the three possible bridging constructions see the introductory chapter to this volume and §3 below).

The paper is structured as follows: in §2 we will outline formal properties of bridging constructions in Tsezic languages, i.e., syntactic properties of the reference clause and the bridging clause. §3 deals with the two types of bridging constructions, recapitulative linkage and summary linkage. In §4 we discuss the discourse functions of bridging constructions, and in §5 we look at further strategies of bridging constructions in other languages of the Nakh-Daghestanian language family.

Because bridging constructions are a strategy of natural discourse they cannot be easily elicited. The data analyzed in this paper originate from texts gathered by various researchers. For Tsez, Hunzib and Khwarshi published corpora exist (van den Berg 1995; Abdulaev & Abdullaev 2010; Karimova 2014). Around 42,500 words of the Tsez corpus have been glossed by André Müller, and have been employed for this paper. Most of the Khwarshi examples cited in this paper originate from texts gathered, glossed and translated by Zaira Khalilova. The Hinuq corpus is currently unpublished. It has been gathered by Forker and contains around 43,000 words. The Bezhta corpus (around 38,000 tokens) consists of the memories of Šeyx Ramazan, written down by himself at the end of the 20th century (thus they were composed in the written medium), translated and edited by Madžid Khalilov and glossed by Forker. In sum, all data used in this paper originate from written corpora, but the majority of them were oral narrations originally. Only for some of the Hinuq texts we have audio recordings at our disposal. For the Tsez, Khwarshi and Hunzib texts we do not have the relevant recordings and therefore cannot judge how much the texts have been edited and changed when the written versions were prepared.

2 Formal characteristics

Bridging constructions consist of two parts, the reference clause and the bridging clause. Reference clauses are main clauses that express an action or an event. The bridging clause immediately follows the reference clause and recapitulates the events given in the reference clause while being syntactically dependent on the following clause, i.e., bridging clauses are non-main clauses. An example for this kind of construction is given in (1) from Hunzib. Note that the bridging clause in (1b) contains the postposition *muɣaλ*, which follows the converb. We are not in the position to judge whether the postposition functions as a complementizer in this example; its use in combination with the converb is optional.

(1) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 234)

a. *uhu-n lo abu*
die-CVB be.PRS.I father(I)

‘Father died.’

b. *abu uhu-n muɣaλ bišsu iq’u is eλe-n lo q’arawulti*
father die-CVB after very big sibling go-CVB be.PRS.I guard(v)

r-uw-a diya

V-do-INF BEN

‘After father died, the eldest son went to guard the grave.’

It is also possible for another clause to intervene between the reference clause and the bridging clause but this does not seem to be very common, see example (2).

(2) Hinuq (Forker, unpublished data)

a. *hoboži y-iq-no obu-zo baru-s ked.*
now II-become-PST.UW father-GEN2 wife-GEN1 daughter(II)

haytu kede-s iyo y-uh-en zoq’e-n

this.OBL girl.OBL-GEN1 mother(II) II-die-CVB be-PST.UW

‘Then the daughter of the stepmother was born. The mother of this girl had died.’

b. *obu-zo baru-s ked y-iq-no, haw idu*
father-GEN2 wife-GEN1 daughter(II) II-become-CVB she home

y-iči-r-ho zoq’e-n

II-be-CAUS-ICVB be-PST.UW

‘After the daughter of the stepmother was born, the (other) girl had to stay at home.’

2.1 Syntactic properties of the reference clause

Reference clauses are always main clauses and the majority of them are in the declarative mood. Theoretically, there are no restrictions concerning tense, aspect, modality and negation but since bridging constructions are very frequent in narratives, the most common strategy is the use of the unwitnessed past tense (3), the present tense (13) and the perfect tense as illustrated in (1) above, since those are the preferred tenses found in Tsezic narratives ¹.

(3) Khwarshi (Z. Khalilova, p.c.)

- a. *k'ut'idin* *ãq'^hwa=n* *b-oq-un,* *l-ek'-x-un*
suddenly mouse(III)=ADD III-catch-CVB IV-fall-CAUS-PST.UW
‘He took the mouse quickly and made her throw it (the ring).’
- b. *l-ek'-x-uč* *l-oq-un* *ise*
IV-fall-CAUS-IMM.ANT IV-catch-PST.UW 3SG.ERG
‘When he made her drop it, he took it (the ring).’

Occasionally, the reference clause is a non-declarative clause. The reference clause in example (4) from Hunzib is an interrogative clause, marked by the interrogative marker *-i* and as opposed to the typical use of the perfect tense it is in the simple future tense. The interrogative clause in (4), however, is a kind of rhetorical question that the speaker asks after implying that somebody tried to frighten the cock by shooing it and the speaker immediately gives the answer by recapitulating the verbal predicate of the interrogative clause. It therefore rather functions as a declarative clause within the narrative. The form of the clause as a question has probably been chosen to raise the interest of the addressee in the continuation of the story and to involve her/him more intensively in the narration.

(4) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 157)

- a. *bed* *ħeleku* *deno* *m-uq'-oys-i?*
then cock(IV) back IV-turn-FUT.NEG-INT
‘Would not the cock then turn around?’
- b. *bed* *deno* *m-uq'e-n* *ħali-t-do* *nuu-n* *lo*
then back IV-turn-CVB Ali-CONT-DIR come-CVB be.PRS.IV
‘Then having turned, it went to Ali.’

¹Hinuq, Tsez and Khwarshi formally and semantically distinguish between the unwitnessed past and the perfect. By contrast, in Hunzib and Bezhta (with some restrictions) there is only one such tense-aspect form that functions as indirect evidential (unwitnessed past) or as perfect depending on the context (Khalilova 2011).

Examples of this kind, i.e., non-declarative reference clauses, are scarce in our data and therefore won't be treated further.

Since our data stem from written corpora, it is not possible to determine any prosodic differences between the reference clause and the bridging clause and therefore the prosodic properties of Tsezic bridging constructions must be left for future research.

2.2 Syntactic properties of the bridging clause

The only possible strategy to express bridging clauses in Tsezic languages is the use of converbs. Converbs are defined as a “nonfinite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination” (Haspelmath 1995: 3). Converbs are the main strategy to express subordinate clauses with adverbial function in Tsezic languages (for in-depth analyses of converbs see Comrie et al. 2012 and Forker 2013b). From a syntactic point of view the adverbial clauses in bridging constructions do not differ from other adverbial clauses.

Tsezic languages have a large number of converbs that can be divided into the following groups based on their semantics and their morphosyntactic properties (Comrie et al. 2012):

- general converbs
- specialized temporal converbs
- non-temporal converbs
- local converb/participle

General converbs can be characterized as contextual converbs that are semantically vague, in contrast to all other converbs that express particular semantic links. All Tsezic languages have at least two general temporal converbs: a perfective converb and an imperfective converb. They can be used together with copulas as auxiliaries for the formation of periphrastic verb forms that head main clauses. In this case, they form a single predicate together with a copula-auxiliary. In particular, in all Tsezic languages perfective converbs are used in periphrastic verb forms with the meaning of perfect or indirect evidential past (see footnote 1 in Section §2.1 above) as in (1a) and (2a). In Hunzib and Khwarshi, the imperfective converbs are identical to the simple present. In Hinuq and Tsez, they are used for the formation of periphrastic present tenses (by adding the copula as finite auxiliary) as in (2b).

The specialized temporal converbs express the major temporal meanings of posteriority, simultaneity, and anteriority. Each language in the Tsezic subgroup has several simultaneous and anterior converbs, but only one posterior converb. Non-temporal converbs form the largest group and include local, causal, conditional (realis and irrealis), concessive, and purposive converbs. In addition, all Tsezic languages have some local participle or converb that denotes locations where actions or situations take place.

Converbal clauses do not express their own absolute time reference, evidentiality, or illocutionary force. For these features, they are dependent on the form of the main clause. Applying Bickel's 2010 terminology we can describe them as "non-finite" and "asymmetrical" because they express fewer categories than main clauses. Temporal converbs express relative temporal reference whereby the event or situation referred to in the main clause serves as temporal anchor. Illocutionary force markers, i.e., imperative and interrogative suffixes, exclusively occur in main clauses. Their scope can be restricted to the main clause or extended to the converbal clause, depending on the construction in question. Evidentiality is only expressed in main clauses with past time reference and the scope of the evidential markers always extends to converbal clauses.

There are hardly any strict requirements of coreferentiality between converbal and main clauses. The most common way of expressing coreferential arguments between converbal clause and main clause is through zero arguments in at least one of the clauses. Coreferential overt nouns and pronouns are possible, but rather uncommon, and the precise restrictions are not fully understood.

Tsezic languages are predominantly head-final and converbal clauses commonly precede the main clause. However, center-embedding or a position after the main clause are also allowed. A few converbs such as posterior converbs or purposive converbs have a stronger tendency to occur after the main clause, which can be explained by their semantics and iconicity. Perfective converbs, anterior converbs, and to a somewhat smaller degree simultaneous converbs occur in the vast majority of examples before the main clause. This also has a semantic explanation: anterior converb clauses and most perfective converb clauses refer to situations that happened before the situation in the main clause. Therefore, if they precede the main clause their linear ordering reflects the temporal ordering of the situations, and the opposite ordering would sound rather unnatural. In the bridging constructions discussed in this paper the converbal clauses always precede the main clauses.

Table 1 shows the converbs that we found so far in our data. When we compare the range of converbs used in bridging constructions in the texts at our

disposal, Tsezic languages differ to some extent. Because we did not elicit bridging constructions we cannot judge if more converbs can be used (although this is very likely). The converbs listed in Table 1 belong to the general and specialized temporal converbs. Non-temporal converbs and the local converb/participle are not found in our data, although such constructions seem theoretically possible. All converbs in Table 1 express temporal simultaneity ('when, while') or anteriority/immediate anteriority ('after, immediately after'). Anterior converbs are used when the event expressed in the bridging clause takes place before the event in the following main clause. The immediate anterior converb serves the same purpose although the time span between the two events is shorter ('immediately after'). The simultaneous converb is used to express that the two events, the one in the bridging clause and the one in the following main clause, happen at the same time. The reason why predominantly (or exclusively) simultaneous and anterior converbs are used lies in their semantics, i.e., the iconicity of linear order of the clauses and temporal order of the events as explained above. The bridging clause is a converbal clause that normally precedes the main clause, and this syntactic ordering fits well the simultaneous and anterior semantics of the converbs given in Table 1.

Table 1: Converbs in Tsezic bridging constructions

	Hinuq	Khwarshi	Tsez	Bezhta	Hunzib
PFV.CVB	<i>-n(o)</i>	<i>-un</i>	<i>-n(o)</i>	<i>-na</i>	<i>-(V)n</i>
SIM.CVB	<i>-(y/o)λ'o</i>	<i>-q'arλ'a</i>	<i>-λ'orey</i>		
ANT.CVB	<i>-nos</i>		<i>-nosi</i>		
ANT.CVB	<i>-at̪i</i>	<i>-aλa</i>			<i>-ot̪</i>
IMM.SIM		<i>-uč̣</i>	<i>-run</i>		

As can be seen in Table 1, the only converb that is found in bridging constructions in all Tsezic languages is the perfective converb. This converb is also used for the formation of complex finite verb forms (e.g., perfect, pluperfect). The general meaning of the perfective converb is anteriority, but it can also express simultaneity and occasionally manner of action. It is typically found in narrative sequences in chaining constructions as can be illustrated by means of examples (4) and (5a) (see also 24). In (5a), the main clause (containing the verb *b-ac*- 'eat') is preceded by two adverbial clauses which contain perfective converbs (*k'oλ*- 'jump' and *λux*- 'remain') that refer to events that took place before the event described in the main clause.

In addition to the converbial suffixes, the dependent clauses often contain some argument or modifier marked with an additive enclitic enhancing cohesion in a narrative sequence, e.g., *lači=n* ‘clothes(v)=ADD’ and *hōgo-li-i-n* ‘coat-OBL-IN=ADD’ in (24). The additive enclitic also occurs in the converbial clauses in bridging constructions that are formed with the perfective converb, e.g., (5b), (13), and (18). In example (5) from Khwarshi the action expressed in the reference clause is almost identically repeated in the bridging construction and the only expressed argument in the bridging clause bears the additive enclitic (*kad-ba=n* ‘girl-PL=ADD’).

(5) Khwarshi (Z. Khalilova, p.c.)

a. *c'odora-y bala-l k'oλ-un, y-ac'-bič lux-un*
clever-II corner-LAT jump-CVB, II-eat-PROH remain-CVB

lux-u-so golluč kad-ba b-ac'-un
stay-PST.PTCP-DEF all girl-PL HPL-eat-PST.UW

‘In order not to be eaten the clever one jumped into the wooden trunk, (the wolf) ate the rest of girls.’

b. *kad-ba=n b-ac'-un, m-ok'-še b-eč-un boc'o*
girl-PL=ADD HPL-eat-CVB, III-go-ICVB III-be-PST.UW wolf(III)

yon-o-t-yul
forest-OBL-INTER-ALL

‘Having eaten the girls, the wolf went to the woods.’

If we take a look at the reference clause in (5) we notice that the unwitnessed past and the perfective converb are formally identical (*-un*). Despite the homophony, they are functionally different, e.g., the perfective converb is not used to express evidentiality. The same homophony applies to Hinuq, Tsez, and partially to Bezhta (cf. Forker 2013a: 244; Khalilova 2009: 391; Khalilova 2011; Comrie et al. 2016).

3 Types of bridging constructions

In Tsezic languages we find two types of bridging constructions. The first and most common construction is recapitulative linkage that will be discussed in §3.1. In these constructions, the action expressed in the reference clause is repeated immediately in the bridging clause. Strictly verbatim repetition is rare and bridging constructions are frequently a target for modification, i.e., we have omissions, additions and substitutions that distinguish the bridging clause from the reference clause.

The second possibility is summary linkage, i.e., the use of a dedicated verb to recapitulate the events expressed in the reference clause. This strategy is commonly used to summarize the content of direct speech. It will be treated in §3.2.

3.1 Recapitulative linkage

(Almost) verbatim repetition is occasionally found and (3) provides an example. Generally, reference clauses and bridging clauses slightly differ in terms of formal make-up and consequently usually also in content. As mentioned in §1, there are four subtypes of recapitulative linkage. All four are found in Tsezic languages:

Modifications: reference clause and bridging clause contain the same information, i.e., there are no omissions or additions but word order might be changed or lexical NPs can be replaced by corresponding pronouns in either the reference clause or the bridging clause

Omissions: reference clause and bridging clause differ in terms of content, i.e., the bridging clause contains less information than the reference clause

Additions: reference clause and bridging clause differ in terms of content, i.e., the reference clause withholds information which is then provided in the bridging clause

Substitutions: information given in the reference clause is substituted in the bridging clause by (near) synonyms in order to broaden or narrow the semantics of the verbal predicate or in order to change the point of view

3.1.1 Modifications

Modifications are not as common as omissions and additions and are often accompanied by those. Possible modifications are different word order or replacement of lexical NPs by pronouns in the bridging clause and vice versa. The reference clause in (6) differs from the bridging clause in some aspects. The subject of the reference clause is encoded by a pronoun *ite* in the ergative case whose referent, *y^wade* ‘raven’ was introduced by a lexical NP in the preceding clause. In the bridging clause, the subject is repeated as a lexical NP. Furthermore, reference clause and bridging clause differ in their constituent order due to the diverging position of the verb: VOS (verb-initial reference clause) vs. OSV (verb-final bridging clause). A similar example with changed constituent order from verb-initial to verb-final is (1). The constituent order in the clause preceding the reference clause

(VS) and in the reference clause itself (VOS) is typical for introducing new referents into the discourse in the position of subject and object respectively. Both noun phrases denoting new referents ('raven' and 'chicken') occur after the verb. In the bridging clause the constituent order has been changed to verb-final since the clause does not serve to introduce a new referent.

(6) Khwarshi (Z. Khalilova, p.c.)

- a. *šari coλ-še idu eč-u-q'arλ'a, b-ot'q'-un y^wade*
 butter stir-ICVB this be-PST.PTCP-SIM.CVB III-come-PST.UW raven(III)
y-ez-un *hos huho* *iṭe*
 v-take-PST.UW one chicken(v) 3SG.ERG

'When he was sitting and stirring the butter, a raven came and took one chicken.'

- b. *hos huho y^wad-i y-ez-aλa, l-oc-un*
 one chicken(v) raven.OBL-ERG v-take-ANT.CVB NPL-tie-PST.UW
oč'e-č huho oču-lo k'ak'a-qa-l
 nine-INTS chicken hen-GEN2 leg-CONT-LAT

'When the raven took one chicken, he tied all nine chickens to the leg of the hen.'

The opposite can be observed as well, i.e., the reference clause contains a lexical NP that is pronominally repeated in the bridging clause as in (7). As mentioned above, modifications regularly go hand in hand with additions, omissions and substitutions. Thus, in (7) not only the linguistic form of the subject differs, but the goal expression in the referent clause has been omitted in the bridging clause.

(7) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 164)

- a. *bəda: eče-r-α-α koro r-oχ-on=no, č'eq*
 so stay-PST.PTCP-OBL-IN hand(v) v-take-CVB=ADD bird(IV)
gič'-en *lo* *kα-λ'o*
 sit.down-CVB be.PRS.IV hand.OBL-SPR

'While he was sitting, holding his hand out like this, a bird alighted in his hand.'

- b. *ogu gič'-oł, rara-a=n gul-un, ēλ'e-n lo*
 that(IV) sit.down-ANT.CVB bosom-IN=ADD put-CVB go-CVB be.PRS.I
humutkurα-α hobolṭi-lα-α
 Garbutli-IN hospitality-OBL-IN

'When it alighted, he put it in his bosom and went to Garbutli as a guest.'

The repetition of a lexical NP as pronoun in the bridging clause is only rarely found in Tsezic languages. The preferred strategy is to leave the referent unexpressed in the bridging clause. This is not surprising because in clause linkage coreferent arguments are usually omitted in adverbial clauses. More generally, in Tsezic languages arguments that are retrievable from the context are often not overtly expressed, not even in main clauses.

3.1.2 Omissions

Omissions are found in a vast amount of recapitulative linkage constructions. Typical targets for omission are lexical NPs and adjectives as in (5) and (8), numerals in (10), pronouns, adverbs, locative arguments in (11) and other verbal complements like purposive clauses in (9) or infinitival clauses.

(8) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 207)

a. *əg buλii loder iʔer oʒe iq'lə-n lo*
 that.I home be.PRS.PTCP small boy(I) grow.up-CVB be.PRS.I

‘Now, that little boy who was at home had grown up.’

b. *iq'l-oʃ iyu-g nisə-n li “diye abu niyo*
 grow.up-ANT.CVB mother-AD say-CVB be.PRS.V 1SG.GEN father where

ēλ'e-r?”

go-PST

‘When he had grown up, he said to his mother, “Where did my father go?”’

The example in (8) displays the most radical type of omission, i.e., only the most important information given in the reference clause is repeated in the bridging clause, namely the verbal predicate, and all other information expressed by the lexical argument and the modifying adjective in the reference clause have been omitted. Example (9) from Tsez shows further possibilities of omission. Almost all information of the reference clause (adverb, lexical NPs and the purposive clause) has been left out in the bridging clause.

(9) Tsez (Abdulaev & Abdullaev 2010: 211)

a. *nelλ'osi k^waxa=tow habihan=n ziru=n xan-s kid*
 of.that.time soon=EMPH miller=ADD fox=ADD khan-GEN1 daughter

esir-anix b-ik'i-n
 ask-PURP.CVB HPL-go-PST.UW

‘Soon after that, the miller and the fox went to ask for the king’s daughter.’

- b. *ele-ayor b-ik'i-λ'orey ziru-de dandir ixiw*
 there-IN.VERS HPL-go-SIM.CVB fox-APUD together big
b'eλ'e-s reqen=no žeda-t tet=gon
 flock.of.sheep-GEN1 herd=ADD DEM.OBL-CONT inside=CNTR
b-ik'i-x ixiw y^way=no keze b-oq-no
 III-go-ICVB big dog(III)=ADD meet III-become-PST.UW
 'When they went there, the fox met a big flock of sheep and a large
 dog walking among them.'

Omission of subject-like arguments is common. In example (10), not only the ergative pronoun is absent from the bridging clause but also the numeral 'three'. Note that this changes the gender agreement prefix in the bridging clause; the omission of the numeral requires the P argument to be marked by the plural and thus the verb bears the neuter plural agreement prefix.

(10) Tsez (Abdulaev & Abdullaev 2010: 92)

- a. *zaman-λ'ay neła t^oono xexoy b-oy-no*
 time-SPR.ABL it.OBL.ERG three young.animal(III) III-hatch-PST.UW
 'After a while, it hatched three nestlings.'
- b. *xexoy-bi r-oy-no k^waxa=tow yun-xor=no*
 young.animal-PL NPL-hatch-CVB soon=EMPH tree-AD.LAT=ADD
b-ay-n ziru-a ayi-qor q^oaλi-n
 III-come-CVB fox-ERG bird-POSS.LAT shout-PST.UW
 'Very soon after the nestlings hatched, a fox came to the tree and
 shouted to the bird.'

In Hunzib, the copula, which forms together with the perfective converb the periphrastic perfect tense as in (1), (7), and (8), is dropped in many bridging clauses and although this looks formally like an omission such constructions are morphosyntactically substitutions and will be treated in §3.1.4.

3.1.3 Additions

Sometimes the bridging clause in recapitulative linkage expresses more information than the reference clause. Additional information that is given in the bridging clause is not new or doesn't crucially alter the event described in the reference clause but rather provides additional background information in the form of adverbs or spatial arguments. The bridging construction in (11) contains more information about the manner of movement of the group ('happily') and adds

a locative argument ('on their way'), but there are also some omissions like the deletion of the locative adverb that expresses the place of origin. Furthermore, the bridging clause is introduced by the clause-initial manner adverb *hemedur* 'so'. Manner adverbials of this and similar types as well as temporal adverbials with a very general meaning are frequently used in narrative discourse to establish boundaries between individual episodes and at the same time link the episodes together. It comes thus naturally to add them in bringing constructions (see also 4).

(11) Tsez (Abdulaev & Abdullaev 2010: 138)

- a. *ža=n hemedur=tow ešur-no yizi-a*
 DEM.SG=ADD SO=EMPH take.along-CVB DEM.PL.OBL-ERG
yizi-ł r-oq-no ele-ay bitor uyno=n
 DEM.PL.OBL-CONT PL-become-CVB there-IN.ABL thither four=ADD
sadaq r-ik'i-n
 together PL-go-PST.UW

'So they took him along with them as well and from there the four went further together.'

- b. *hemedur uyno=n rok'uy^wey-ł' huni-x r-ik'i-ł'orey*
 so four=ADD fun-SPR way-AD PL-go-SIM.CVB
žeda-r b-exur-asi boc'i b-esu-n
 DEM.OBL-IN.LAT III-kill-RES.PTCP wolf III-find-PST.UW

'So when the four of them went on their way happily, they found a wolf who was killed.'

In the bridging clause in (12) there are no omissions but only additions that slightly alter the content. The predicate in the reference clause is a causative verb that expresses an action carried out by the fox. In the bridging clause the predicate occurs in its bare intransitive form and consequently there is no agentive argument. Instead, the result of the action is described and the predicate is further modified by an adverbial phrase expressing quality/evaluation.

(12) Khwarshi (Z. Khalilova, p.c.)

- a. *zor-i ło gut'-un, łuγ-k'-un boc'o bolo-qa-l*
 fox-ERG water pour-CVB, stick-CAUS-PST.UW wolf ice-CONT-LAT

'The fox poured out the water and the wolf froze to the ice.'

- b. *b-og b-oʃu bolo-qa-l boc'o ʃuy-aʃa, goʃ'-un*
 III-well III-alike ice-CONT-LAT wolf(III) stick-ANT.CVB call-PST.UW
zor-i
 FOX-ERG

‘When the wolf was good frozen to the ice, the fox called (the witch).’

3.1.4 Substitutions

Substitutions in bridging clauses can be formal and/or semantic. The most common kind of substitution concerns the verbal predicate of the reference clauses. Bridging clauses in Tsezic languages are generally subordinate clauses and therefore require different marking than the preceding reference clause. Verbs in reference clauses occur in “finite verb forms”, most commonly present tense or unwitnessed past/perfect in our data (§2.1) and are replaced by a suitable converb in the bridging clause. The most frequent substitution strategy found in all Tsezic languages involves the verb form in the main clause being replaced by the perfective converb, indicating temporal anteriority with respect to the situation in the following main clause. In most examples presented so far in this paper, the verb form in the main clause is the unwitnessed past (4–12). This is due to the fact that the vast majority of texts analyzed for this paper are traditional fairy tales and legends that are almost exclusively narrated in the unwitnessed past. By contrast, example (13) from Bezhta belongs to an autobiographical narration that also contains other tenses such as the present (used as historical present in the example) or the witnessed past. In (13) it is the present tense that occurs in the main clause (reference clause). Regardless, (13) still illustrates the common substitution strategy within the bridging clause.

(13) Bezhta (unpublished data, courtesy of M. Khalilov)

- a. *holʃo-s k'et'o gemo=na y-iq'e-na holco huli y-ũq-ča*
 DEM.OBL-GEN1 good taste=ADD IV-know-CVB he.ERG DEM IV-eat-PRS
 ‘Knowing its good taste, he eats it.’
- b. *huli=na y-ũq-na saala ničdiya box-a-ʃ'a āko ēʃ'e-š*
 DEM=ADD IV-eat-CVB one green.OBL gras-OBL-SPR release go-PRS
huli
 DEM

‘Having eaten it he lays down on the green grass.’

Besides the perfective converb, we find the anterior converb (as in 7, 8, and 12), the immediate anterior converb in (3) and the simultaneous converb in (9) in bridging clauses.

Sometimes we find substitution by means of (near) synonymy, i.e., one of the verbs in either the reference clause or the bridging clause has a more general meaning than the other one. The verb *-ũče* ‘run’ that is used in the reference clause in (14) provides a more precise description of the kind of movement that is used to return home (namely fast movement by foot), while the more general verb *-ēļe* ‘go’ used in the bridging clause is a default verb to express movement. Note also that the locative adverb *deno* ‘back’ is substituted by *buļii* ‘home’ which provides, in contrast to *deno*, a more specific description of the goal of the motion.

(14) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 234)

- a. *ēļe-n=no* “*r-uwor q’arawulʔi*” *ļe nisə-n šima-λ’o=n*
 go-CVB=ADD V-do-PST guard(v) QUOT say-CVB grave-SPR=ADD
λ’-it’o deno ũče-n lo bəd
 go-CVB.NEG back run-CVB be.PRS.I 3SG.I
 ‘He went and without having gone to the grave, he said “I have guarded it” and he ran back (home).’
- b. *ēļe-n buļii ut’-un lo ʔana wədə*
 go-CVB home sleep-CVB be.PRS.I three day
 ‘Having gone home he slept for three days.’

Another kind of substitution we find regularly is the replacement of one verb of motion by another one with a different deictic meaning, e.g., ‘go’ is replaced by ‘come’ in (15). The reference clause contains a verb of motion that expresses movement away from the deictic center (‘go’) where previous events took place while the verb in the following bridging clause changes the perspective and expresses movement to the new deictic center (‘come’). This strategy is almost always used when the event expressed in the following main clause takes place at a new location. Additionally, in example (15) the goal of the movement, namely the king’s whereabouts, is replaced by the spatial adverb *elo* ‘there’, similar to example (9).

(15) Tsez (Abdulaev & Abdullaev 2010: 74)

- a. *ayi=n b-is-no adāz=gon b-oc’-no*
 bird(III)=ADD III-take-CVB ahead=CNTR III-drive-CVB
t’eka=n kid xan-däyör y-ik’i-n
 he.goat(III)=ADD girl(II) khan-APUD.VERS II-go-PST.UW
 ‘Having taken a bird and chased a goat ahead, the girl went to the king.’

- b. *elo-r y-ay-nosi yiṭa xan-qor aḡi teḷ-xo*
 there-LAT II-COME-ANT.CVB she.OBL.ERG khan-AT.LAT bird give-ICVB
zow-no
 be-PST.UW

‘After she arrived there, she wanted to give the bird to the king.’

Further substitution can be found in the nominal domain, i.e., a lexical NP can be replaced by another lexical NP with a similar meaning. In (16) one word to express ‘time’, *meχ*, is replaced in the bridging clause by another word *zaban* expressing roughly the same meaning. Note again that gender agreement on the verb *-ēḷe* ‘go’ changes because the two words belong to different genders.

(16) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 202)

- a. *āq’-oṭ boṭu-l lač’i n-iza:-n li, həs=no*
 come-ANT.CVB this-ERG clothes(v) v-wash-CVB be.PRS.V one=ADD
q’am n-iza:-n li həs=no bəḷi-d əgi-d
 head(v) v-wash-CVB be.PRS.V one=ADD here-DIR there-DIR
tiq-en meχ m-eḷ’e-n lo
 be.busy-CVB time(IV) IV-go-CVB be.PRS.IV

‘After he had come, time passed while she washed clothes, washed her head, keeping busy with this and that.’

- b. *zaban n-eḷ’-oṭ, b-u<wα>t’-a anta*
 time(v) v-go-ANT.CVB HPL-sleep<PL>-INF moment(IV)
m-aq’-oṭ nisə-n li “b-u<wα>t’-a” ḷe nisə-n
 IV-COME-ANT.CVB say-CVB be.PRS.V HPL-<PL>sleep-INF QUOT say-CVB
li yurdelo-l
 be.PRS.V mullah-ERG

‘And when the time had passed, when the moment came to go to bed, the mullah said “Let’s go to bed.”’

3.2 Summary linkage

In summary linkage the reference clause is replaced by a dedicated verb which summarizes its content. This kind of bridging construction is not very common in Tsezic languages since recapitulative linkage is the preferred bridging construction, but nevertheless can occasionally be found. In example (17) from Hunzib summary linkage is achieved by using the dedicated verb *-aq* ‘happen’. In this example, the verb ‘happen’ has scope over two reference clauses and is used to summarize both events.

(17) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 160)

- a. ēλ'e-n lo oɬu-dər k'arλe-n lo oɬu-γur
 go-CVB be.PRS.I 3SG.OBL-ALL wander-CVB be.PRS.I 3SG.OBL-COM
 'And he went down to her and went for a walk with her.'
- b. **αq-oɬ** *bəd* *λ'i* *ũχe-n* *χoχ-λ'o* *ēλ'e-n* *lo* *bəd*
 happen-ANT.CVB 3SG.I back turn-CVB tree-SPR go-CVB be.PRS.I 3SG.I
 'Having done this, he returned and went back into the tree.'

Another type of summary linkage that is relatively common is given in (18) and (19). The reference clauses in (18) and (19) consist of quotes whose contents are summarized by a demonstrative pronoun that is used together with a verb of speech.

(18) Tsez (Abdulaev & Abdullaev 2010: 87)

- a. "di mi yuro-x egir-an=λin odä-si zow-č'u ži
 1SG 2SG COWS-AD send-FUT.DEF=QUOT do-RES be-NEG.PST.WIT now
r-od-a šebin anu=λin"
 IV-do-INF thing be.NEG=QUOT
 "I didn't give birth to you to have you pasture the cows but now there is nothing to do."
- b. **ža=n** **eλi-n** *hemedur=tow* *ozuri-λay* *gugi-n*
 this=ADD say-CVB so=EMPH eye-SUB.ABL escape-PST.UW
 'Having said this, he flew out of sight.'

(19) Hinuq (Forker, unpublished data)

- a. hibayɬu minut-ma b-aq'-a goɬ dew-de aldoyo-r
 that.OBL minute-IN III-come-INF be you.SG.OBL-ALOC in.front-LAT
debe goɬa murad t'ubazi b-uw-ayaz
 you.SG.GEN1 be.PTCP wish(III) fulfill III-do-PURP
 '(The horse said:) In that minute I will be in front of you to fulfill your wish.'
- b. **hag=no** **eλi-n** *gulu* *k'oλe-n* *hawa-λ'o* *b-iλ'i-yo*
 that=ADD say-CVB horse(III) jump-CVB air-SPR III-go-PRS
 'Having said that the horse goes away jumping through the air.'

4 Functions of bridging constructions

4.1 Discourse functions

Cross-linguistically, bridging constructions are used to keep the discourse cohesive and ease tracking of characters and events. Therefore, bridging constructions are regularly found in languages that employ switch reference. Although there are no switch reference constructions in Tsezic languages, bridging constructions, or to be more precise recapitulative linkage, can sometimes be found when the subject of the clause that follows the bridging clause deviates from the one in the reference and bridging clause. In (20), the reference clause contains a lexical NP that is omitted in the following bridging clause but still serves as subject. The main clause that follows the bridging clause switches the subject to another character of the narrative.

(20) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 209)

- a. *ẽdu m-aq'e-n lo řařdah*
 inside IV-come-CVB be.PRS.IV dragon(IV)
 'The dragon went inside.'
- b. *ẽdu m-aq'-oř bořu-l bodu řařdah b-iř'e-n*
 inside IV-come-ANT.CVB 3SG.I-ERG this(IV) dragon(IV) IV-kill-CVB
gãč'
 be.PRS.NEG
 'When it went inside, the boy did not kill the dragon.'

Example (21) is another instance of subject switching. The reference clause and the following bridging clause share the subject 'girl', but the following clause changes to another subject (see also (22) below).

(21) Khwarshi (Z. Khalilova, p.c.)

- a. *akal-un gollu kad zamana-č m-ok'-řehol*
 be.tired-CVB be.PRS.PTCP girl time(III)-INTS III-go-POST.CVB
řus-un
 sleep-PST.UW
 'The girl who has been tired fell asleep as some time passed.'
- b. *kad řus-uč, abaxar-i m-oc-un iře-s*
 girl sleep-IMM.ANT neighbour-ERG III-tie-PST.UW 3SG.OBL-GEN1
kode=n řon-o-řo-l
 hair(III)=ADD tree-OBL-CONT-LAT
 'As soon as the girl fell asleep the neighbor tied her hair to the tree.'

In many instances the switched subject occurs in the immediately preceding discourse. For instance, in example (6) above the clause preceding the reference clause has a demonstrative pronoun ‘he’ as subject, referring to a male human being. The reference clause and the bridging clause share the subject ‘raven’. The next clause after the bridging clause switches back to the previous subject ‘he’. Other examples of this type are (7) and (12).

However, in most of the examples the clause following the bridging constructions describes a new episode. An episode is a brief unit of action in a narrative. Consecutive episodes in narratives can but need not share some or all of the characters. They can take place in the same or in distinct locations. Therefore, a new episode can be accompanied by a change of the subject referent in comparison to the previous episode. This can mean that an entirely new referent is introduced in the clause after the referent clause as in (9), (10) and (11), or the previous subject-referent is taken up again as in (6), (7), or (12). It is also possible to switch back to a protagonist who was not a subject referent in the bridging clause, but is not entirely new to the narration as in (1) and (21). Similarly, in a number of the examples the utterance following the reference clause moves the string of narration to a new spatial goal or location. For instance, in (5a) the situation takes place at the home of the protagonist. In (5b) the clause following the bridging construction describes that the place of the action has changed from inside the house to outside. Comparable examples are (18) and (19) in which the clause after the bridging construction describes how one of the protagonists disappears from the scene.

A change of the protagonists or location more clearly indicates that a new episode follows and thus the bridging construction helps to structure the narration by demarcating episodes. As mentioned above, new episodes do not necessarily have new protagonists or new locations, but are defined by new actions. Therefore, the bridging construction can also mark the end of an episode and thus the beginning of a new episode in which the subject referent is just the same such that we have subject/topic continuity as in (11), (14), and (15). More specifically, in (11), the episode in the bridging construction describes the joint walk of the protagonists. The new episode refers to how the protagonists found a dead wolf. The bridging construction in (14) describes the walk back home of the protagonist and the following clause his lying down to sleep.

Similarly, a change in the location is not obligatory, e.g., (16), (20), and (21). For example, in (20) the bridging construction narrates that the girl fell asleep. This episode is followed by a new one in which the neighbor tied her hair to a tree.

Furthermore, bridging constructions may be used to express the chaining of events, i.e., consecutive events can be recapitulated. The reference clause in (22)

actually consists of two clauses that express consecutive events, the drinking and the sleeping afterwards. Both events are recapitulated in the bridging clause that consists of two converbial clauses.

(22) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 216)

a. *wedra yino χuλ-un lo, χura:-n lo,*
 bucket(IV) wine(IV) drink-CVB be.PRS.I get.drunk-CVB be.PRS.I
ut'-un lo bəd
 sleep-CVB be.PRS.I 3SG.I

‘He drank a bucket of wine, got drunk and went to bed.’

b. *χura:-n ut'-oł bəd eže-n lo bołu-l*
 get.drunk-CVB sleep-ANT.CVB 3SG.I take-CVB be.PRS.I this.OBL-ERG

‘When he got drunk and went to bed, the dragon took him outside.’

4.2 Genre

In the corpora of Tsezic languages, bridging constructions are primarily found in fictional narratives, that is, fairy tales, sagas and legends. We do not have examples of bridging constructions from historical narratives except for a single instance in the autobiographical narration in (13). In procedural texts, we also find occasional occurrences of bridging constructions, but they cannot often be unambiguously separated from repetitions (see Section §4.3 for a discussion).

Therefore, it seems that bridging constructions are stylistic devices of traditional narrations together with other stylistic markers such as unwitnessed past tenses and narrative formulae. For instance, traditional narratives are characterized by use of special introductory formulae which index the genre. In Tsezic languages as well as in many other languages of the wider area the introductory formulae consist of a repetition of the verb ‘be’, i.e., ‘There was, there was not...’

Bridging constructions in Tsezic represent a particular instance of parallelism. Parallelism, i.e., recurring patterns in successive sections of the text, is one of the most common framing devices of ritual language, to which the genre of traditional narratives belongs (see Frog & Tarkka 2017 for a short introduction). Parallelism has extensively been studied in poetry, including songs, epics, proverbs and other forms of ritual language, where it is used to express emphasis, and to provide authority or significance (e.g., Jakobson 1966; Fox 2014; among many others). Formulaic parallelism as instantiated by the bridging constructions in Tsezic help the narrator buy time while s/he mentally prepares the next sentences, and are a hallmark of oral performance (Fabb 2015).

Another criterion for the occurrence of bridging constructions seems to be the medium, i.e., if texts are written or originate from oral narrations. Oral narrations seem to have more bridging constructions than written texts (though, as in §1 explained, we do not know how much the Tsez, Khwarshi and Hunzib texts have been edited). The Bezhta texts used for this paper have been written down and no oral versions exist. This might explain why we have only relatively few examples from Bezhta in which the perfective converb always occurs in the bridging clause.

4.3 Bridging constructions, repetition, and predicate doubling

A problem we encountered when analyzing bridging constructions is keeping them apart from simple repetition of clauses. For instance, (23) has been uttered in a procedural text that describes the preparation of the Daghestanian national dish khinkal (a type of dumplings). The speaker repeats verbatim one clause with a short break between the two utterances. The example resembles (25) below, but in contrast to (25), both clauses in (23) are main clauses containing imperative verb forms as all other main clauses in the texts. It is probable that the speaker who uttered (23) repeated the sentence because she was concentrating on narrating all individual actions in the correct order and the repetition of the clause gave her a little bit more time to prepare the next utterances. As can be seen in (23b), she also repeats a preposition.

(23) Hinuq (Forker, unpublished data)

- a. *xok'o b-uw-a b-aq'e-yo at'=no r-ux!*
 khinkal(II) III-make-INF III-must-COND flour=ADD v-take
 'If you have to prepare khinkal, take flour!'
- b. *at'=no r-ux! k'ot'o-ma teŋer, teŋer čiyon kur! soda=n*
 flour=ADD v-take plate-IN into into salt=ADD throw soda=ADD
kur!
 throw
 'Take flour! Pour (lit. throw) salt into, into a plate! Pour soda!'

Example (24) contains another repetition of a main clause that could have been used by the speaker as a stylistic device to indicate intensity. Again the clauses resemble bridging constructions, but without the morphosyntactic structure of main clause followed by converbal clause that we have identified in §2.

- (24) Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 257)

ēλ'e-n lo bəd wazir, ēλ'e-n lo əgi-do āq'-ot
 go-CVB be.PRS.I this advisor(I) go-CVB be.PRS.I there-DIR come-ANT.CVB
m-iqə-k'-ən gudo m-uχe-n, lači=n r-əhu-n
 IV-catch-CAUS-CVB hen(IV) IV-slaughter-CVB clothes(V)=ADD V-take-CVB
λ'odo-s, hās b-iq:'u hōgo b-oχče-n, hōgo-li-i=n ēdu
 above-ABL one IV-big coat(IV) IV-take-CVB coat-OBL-IN=ADD inside
k'arλe-k'-en hadeʔeče-n sid bač-do raʕal-li-λ' gəl-ən
 twirl-CAUS-CVB be.slow-CVB one.OBL rock-INS edge-OBL-SPR put-CVB
lo
 be.PRS.I

‘The advisor went and he went and when he arrived there, he caught a hen and killed it, he took the (boy’s) outer clothes off and took a furcoat and he wrapped the boy in the coat and put him on the edge of the rock.’

In example (25) the first clause is a converbal clause with the reduplicated perfective converb. It is followed by another clause with the same predicate inflected as narrative converb. The construction looks similar to bridging constructions because of the identical predicates, but the two clauses slightly differ. The first converbal clause lacks any arguments, contains only a temporal adjunct and is verb-final. The second converbal clause, by contrast, contains the object and the verb occurs in the clause-initial position. However, because both clauses are converbal clauses, the example does not adhere to our definition of bridging constructions in Tsezic and is therefore analyzed as repetition.

- (25) Hinuq (Forker, unpublished data)

[oc'era oc'era ʔera minut-ma r-exir-an r-exir-no], [b-exir-no
 ten.OBL ten.OBL five.OBL minute-IN V-cook-RED V-cook-CVB III-cook-CVB
haw pulaw], hoboy hezodoy k'ot'o-ma got'-no q'idi=n b-iči-n,
 this pilaw(III) then then plate-IN pour-CVB down=ADD HPL-sit-CVB
ga
 drink.IMP

‘Cooking it for 10–15 minutes, and having cooked the pilaw, then pour it into plates, sit down and eat (lit. drink) it.’

Hinuq, Khwarshi and Bezhta also have constructions in which the predicate is doubled. The first occurrence of the predicate occurs in the infinitive or perfective converb followed by the additive particle or another particle. The second occurrence of the predicate can also have the form of the perfective converb or it

is used as finite verb and inflected for the appropriate tense. These constructions can express intensity, prolonged duration, emphasis, predicate topicalization and sometimes polarity focus (Maisak 2010; Forker 2015). The Bezhta example in (26) can be paraphrased with ‘As for coming, people do not come here’. Another instance of predicate doubling is the first converb clause in (25).

- (26) Bezhta (unpublished data, courtesy of M. Khalilov)
bekela-a-qa hiyabač'e-na hoło? ädäm öq'an=na öq'a?a-s
 snake-PL-POSS fear.PL-CVB here person come-INF=ADD come-NEG-PRS
 ‘Because of fear for snakes people do not come here.’

5 Bridging constructions in other Nakh-Daghestanian languages

Not only Tsezic languages but also other languages of the Nakh-Daghestanian language family use bridging constructions. One of those languages is Chirag Dargwa, a member of the Dargwa (or Dargi) sub-branch. (27) illustrates that Chirag Dargwa uses the same strategy that we already saw in Tsezic languages. The reference clause is a main clause in the past resultative tense while the bridging construction is again a non-main converbal clause. Additionally, there is a change in the word order. The reference clause has VS constituent order because it introduces new referents (as it was explained for the Khwarshi example in (6)). The bridging clause is verb-final because this is the preferred order for adverbial clauses and for clauses with neutral information structure.

- (27) Chirag Dargwa (D. Ganenkov, p.c.)
- a. *k'a^f q'ilae řaři-l-i ag-ur-re niř=ra*
 DEM.UP Qilae caraway-OBL-SPR go.PFV-AOR-RES.3 mother=ADD
rus:i=ra
 girl=ADD
 ‘A mother and a daughter went there to Qilae for caraway.’
- b. *niř=ra rus:i=ra řaři-l-i ag-ur-s:aħ, [...]*
 mother=ADD girl=ADD caraway-OBL-SPR go.PF-AOR-TEMP
q'wala d-arq'ib-le it:-a-d řaře
 <collect> N.PL-do.PFV-AOR-RES.3 DEM.DIST-PL-ERG caraway
 ‘When the mother and the daughter went for caraway, [...] they collected the caraway.’

In example (28) from Agul, a language of the Lezgian sub-branch, the main verb of the bridging clause is marked by a temporal converb while the verb in the reference clause is finite and bears the aorist suffix.

(28) Agul (Maisak 2014: 134)

- a. *aχira* *χ.i-s* *qax.i-naw* *mi* *bäfž*
 finally leave.INF-INF start.PFV-AOR DEM.M friend
 ‘The friend was about to go.’
- b. *χ.i-s* *qax.a-gana* *mi* *ruš.a-s* *raqq.u-naw*
 leave.INF-INF start.PFV-TEMP DEM.M daughter-DAT see.PFV-AOR
p.u-naw
 say-AOR
 ‘When he started to go, the girl saw him and said...’

In Tsova-Tush, one of the three Nakh languages, the use of converbs is the primary strategy to express recapitulative linkage. Bridging constructions can also be found regularly in Chechen (Molochieva, p.c.).

(29) Tsova-Tush (ECLING)

- a. *d-ax-en*, *xi* *met-or=e*
 II-go-AOR, water drink.IPFV-PST=ADD
 ‘They went off and drank water.’
- b. *xi* *met-oš* *o* *maq’vlen* *oqar* *c’omal*
 water drink.IPFV-SIM.CVB that Makvala.DAT 3PL.ERG drug(v)
eg-b-iē *ču, me* *ču-toh-y-it-ra-lō*
 mix-V-do.PFV.AOR in COMP PVB-sleep-II-CAUS-PST-EVID
 ‘While drinking they mixed drugs for that Makvala to make her fall asleep.’

Due to the lack of data we cannot judge if some sub-branches of the Nakh-Daghestanian language family such as Tsezic show a larger preference for bridging constructions than others (e.g., Lak). Furthermore, except for the Tsezic languages we do not have examples of summary linkage or mixed linkage, and all examples (27)–(29) contain specialized temporal converbs in the bridging clause and not general converbs. It seems reasonable to assume that narrative traditions and genres largely overlap among the Nakh-Daghestanian peoples such that from a functional perspective we would expect to find bridging constructions across the same types of narrations (traditional fictional narratives) and within the same types of (oral) performance (as suggested in Matsigenka, see Emlen 2019 [this volume]).

6 Conclusion

Bridging constructions are a common feature in narratives of Nakh-Daghestanian languages. In this paper, we focused on the Tsezic languages, but bridging constructions seem to exist in most, if not all, branches of the Nakh-Daghestanian language family.

We defined bridging constructions as bipartite consisting of a main reference clause followed by a subordinate bridging clause. The bridging clause expresses adverbial subordination and is marked by a variety of general or specialized temporal converbs. In Tsezic, bridging constructions instantiate recapitulative linkage as well as summary linkage, although the latter is not very frequent. The main functions are stylistic rather than grammatical. They are stylistic devices of traditional narratives and represent a specific type of parallelism, which is characteristic of oral performances. In addition, Tsezic bridging constructions are repeatedly used to indicate episode changes in narration, which can but need not be accompanied by switches of subject referents or locations. More research is required in order to explore how bridging constructions relate to other forms of repetition and parallelism such as predicate doubling.

Appendix

A Hunzib story told by Džamaludin Atranaliev from Stal'skoe (van den Berg 1995: 154–157) about a mother and a father who were frequently ill, both of them claiming to want to die first so the other one could take care of the son. The excerpt sets in right after the parents discuss the probable looks of Malakulmawt, the angel of death, to which their son replies that he looks like a plucked cock.

- (A1) *əg-ra bowaž-er m-ac'-oł, əg-ra*
 that-PL believe.PL-PST.PTCP HPL-see-ANT.CVB that-PL
m-učax-əšun bed ože gišo-ke-n ẽł'e-n
 HPL-slumber-IMM.ANT then boy(I) outside-INCH-CVB go.I-CVB
m-iqə-k'-en žide-s b-i?er ħeleku=n ogu
 IV-find-CAUS-CVB self.OBL.PL-GEN IV-small cock(IV)=ADD that
m-oł'ak'-en lo
 IV-pluck-CVB be.PRS.IV

‘When he saw that they believed him, the boy went out, as soon as they fell asleep, caught their own little cock and plucked it.’

- (A2) *m-oł'ak'-en hīja-do=n b-əc'-əru səsəq'an*
 IV-pluck-CVB blood.OBL-INS=ADD IV-be.filled-PST.PTCP some
pode=n=žun hadeeče-n ědu m-ije-n lo
 feather(IV)=ADD=with be.slow<IV>-CVB inside IV-send-CVB be.PRS.IV
oťu-l ogu bułii
 that.OBL-ERG that home
 'Having plucked it, covered with blood, some feathers left, he let it
 carefully into the house.'
- (A3) *bed-do ogu k'ok'ol-eru m-oł'ak'-eru taχ-li-λ λira*
 then-DIR that hurt-PST.PTCP IV-pluck-PST.PTCP ottoman-OBL-SUB under
m-eł'e-n b-eče-n lo
 IV-go-CVB IV-stay-CVB be.PRS.IV
 'Then it, being mauled and plucked, went and sat under the ottoman.'
- (A4) *sid zaban-li-i əgi-s bed gišo-ke-n lo*
 one.OBL time-OBL-IN there-ABL then outside-INCH-CVB be.PRS.IV
 'At one point, it came out from there.'
- (A5) *gišo-ke-n b-αλλe m-aq'e-n zuq'u-n lo qoqo-o*
 outside-INCH-CVB IV-middle IV-come-CVB be-CVB be.PRS.IV house-IN
heleku
 cock(IV)
 'It came out, the cock came into the middle of the room.'
- (A6) *deno t'uwat'-en lo q'anu=n əg-ra oťu-l qoqogo*
 back throw.PL-CVB be.PRS.HPL two=ADD that-PL that.OBL-ERG INTERJ
λe nis-oť
 QUOT say-ANT.CVB
 'They woke up when it crowed.'
- (A7) *deno t'uwat'-oť ogu bed tišo, řali-t-do-s*
 back throw.PL-ANT.CVB that then over.there Ali-CONT-DIR-ABL
beddo=n m-uče-n řajřat-i-t-do m-eł'e-n lo
 back=ADD IV-turn-CVB Ayřat(II)-OBL-CONT-DIR IV-go-CVB be.PRS.IV

ogu, art'o j-uh-a j-at'ə-r-o-t-do

that before II-die-INF II-want-PST.PTCP-OBL-CONT-DIR

'When they woke up, the cock went across (the room) from Ali, having turned to Ayshat, to her who wanted to die first.'

- (A8) *žini-t-do m-aq'e-č m-ac'-oł ħeleku, "bodu*
 self.OBL-CONT-DIR IV-come-ICVB IV-see-ANT.CVB cock(IV) this
ħeleku Malakulmawt lo" λe gič'-en, ħič'e-ru
 cock(IV) Malakulmawt be.PRS.IV QUOT think-CVB fear-PST.PTCP
ołu-l, řali-t-do "kiš" λe n-ac'əj nisə-n,
 that.OBL-ERG Ali-CONT-DIR INTERJ QUOT V-appear say-CVB
řali-t-do "kiš" řali-t-do "kiš"
 Ali-CONT-DIR INTERJ Ali-CONT-DIR INTERJ

'When she saw it coming, thinking that the cock was Malakulmawt, she said, frightened, "Shoo!" to Ali.'

- (A9) *bed ħeleku deno m-ug'-oys-i?*
 then cock(IV) back IV-turn-FUT.NEG-INT
 'Would not the cock then turn around?'

- (A10) *bed deno m-ug'e-n řali-t-do nuu-n lo*
 then back IV-turn-CVB Ali-CONT-DIR come-CVB be.PRS.IV
 'Then having turned, it went to Ali.'

- (A11) *řali-t-do nuw-oł, "řajřat-i-t-do kiř,*
 Ali-CONT-DIR come-ANT.CVB Ayshat-OBL-CONT-DIR INTERJ
řajřat-i-t-do kiř" λe nisə-n řali-lo-n b-oc'-on
 Ayshat-OBL-CONT-DIR INTERJ QUOT say-CVB Ali-ERG=ADD IV-chase-CVB
lo ogu
 be.PRS.IV that

'When it came to Ali, Ali chased it away, saying "Shoo!" to Ayshat.'

- (A12) *deno m-eλ'e-n beddo m-eλ'e-n maha-a-λ'*
 back IV-go-CVB back IV-go-CVB courtyard-IN-TRANS
žoB-i-i-λ' tuwac'ə-n ože=n maduhanṭi=n zuq'un
 window-OBL-IN-TRANS look.PL-CVB boy=ADD neighbours=ADD be.CVB
lo
 be.PRS.HPL
 'While it went back and forth, the boy and the neighbours were looking
 at them from the courtyard through the window.'
- (A13) *ṣadam-la zuq'un lo ʔejaʔe-č əg-ra-λ'*
 person-PL be.CVB be.PRS.HPL laugh.PL-ICVB that-PL-SPR
 'The people were laughing at them.'
- (A14) *əgaa-s žo r-aqu-n li*
 so-GEN thing(v) v-happen-CVB be.PRS.V
 'Such a thing happened.'

Abbreviations

1SG	first person singular	DAT	dative
2SG	second person singular	DEF	definiteness
3SG	third person singular	DEM	demonstrative
I-V	gender	DIR	directional
ABL	ablative case	DIST	distal
AD	adessive case	EMPH	emphatic enclitic
ADD	coordinating enclitic	ERG	ergative
ALL	allative case	EVID	evidentiality
ANT.CVB	anterior converb	FUT	future tense
AOR	aorist	GEN	genitive
APUD	apudessive case	GEN1	first genitive
CAUS	causative	GEN2	second genitive
CNTR	contrastive	HPL	human plural
COM	comitative	IMM.ANT	immediate anterior converb
COMP	complementizer	IMP	imperative
COND	conditional converb	IN	in case
CONT	contact case	INCH	inchoative
CVB	perfective/narrative converb	INF	infinitive

INS	instrumental	PST.UW	unwitnessed past tense
INT	interrogative particle	PST.WIT	witnessed past tense
INTER	inter case	PTCP	participle
INTERJ	interjection	PURP.CVB	purposive converb
INTS	intensifier	QUOT	quotative
ICVB	imperfective converb	RED	reduplication
LAT	lative case	RES	resultative
N	neuter singular	SG	singular
NEG	negation	SIM.CVB	simultaneous converb
NPL	non-human plural	SPR	super case
OBL	oblique stem marker	SUB	sub case
PFV	perfective	TEMP	temporal converb
PL	plural	TRANS	translative
POSS	possessive	UP	located above speaker
PROH	prohibitive	VERS	versative
PRS	present tense		

References

- Abdulaev, Arsen K. & I. K. Abdullaev. 2010. *Didojskij (cezskij) fol'klor*. Makhachkala: Lotos.
- Alekseev, Mikhail E. & Ramazan N. Radžabov. 2004. Tsez. In Michael Job (ed.), *The indigenous languages of the Caucasus, vol. 3: The North East Caucasian languages, part 1*, 115–168. Ann Arbor: Caravan Books.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 2010. Capturing particulars and universals in clause linkage: A multivariate analysis. In Isabelle Bril (ed.), *Clause linking and clause hierarchy: Syntax and pragmatics*, 51–101. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Comrie, Bernard, Diana Forker & Zaira Khalilova. 2012. Adverbial clauses in the Tsezic languages. In Holger Diessel & Volker Gast (eds.), *Clause-combining in cross-linguistic perspective*, 157–190. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Comrie, Bernard, Diana Forker & Zaira Khalilova. 2016. Insubordination in the Tsezic languages. In N. J. Evans & Honoré Watanabe (eds.), *The dynamics of insubordination*, 171–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Comrie, Bernard, Madzhid Khalilov & Zaira Khalilova. 2015. *Grammatika bežtin-skogo jazyka*. Makhachkala: Aleph.
- ECLING. 2016. *Corpus, tsova-tush language documentation within ecling-project*. <https://hdl.handle.net/1839/00-0000-0000-000A-3ED7-8>, accessed 2018-9-13.

- Emlen, Nicholas Q. 2019. The poetics of recapitulative linkage in Matsigenka and mixed Matsigenka-Spanish myth narrations. In Valérie Guérin (ed.), *Bridging constructions*, 45–77. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.2563680
- Fabb, Nigel. 2015. *What is poetry? Language and memory in the poems of the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forker, Diana. 2013a. *A grammar of Hinuq*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Forker, Diana. 2013b. Microtypology and the Tsezic languages: A case study of syntactic properties of converbal clauses. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 26. 21–40.
- Forker, Diana. 2015. Towards a semantic map for intensifying particles: Evidence from Avar. *Language Typology and Universals* 68. 485–513.
- Fox, James J. 2014. *Explorations in semantic parallelism*. Canberra: ANU Press.
- Frog & Lotte Tarkka. 2017. Parallelism in verbal art and performance: An introduction. *Oral Tradition* 31. 203–232.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds.), *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*, 1–55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jakobson, Robert. 1966. Grammatical parallelism and its Russian facet. *Language* 42. 398–429.
- Karimova, Raisat Sh. 2014. *Xwarshinskij folklor*. Leipzig: MPI EVA.
- Khalilova, Zaira. 2009. *A grammar of Khwarshi*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Khalilova, Zaira. 2011. Evidentiality in Tsezic languages. *Linguistic Discovery* 9. 30–48.
- Kibrik, Aleksandr E. & Jakov G. Testelec. 2004. Bezhta. In Michael Job (ed.), *The indigenous languages of the Caucasus, vol. 3: The North East Caucasian languages, part 1*, 217–295. Ann Arbor: Caravan Books.
- Maisak, Timur. 2010. *Predicate topicalization in East Caucasian languages*. Presentation at the SWL 4 Conference, Lyon, 23–26 September 2010.
- Maisak, Timur. 2014. *Agul'skie teksty 1900-1960-x godov*. Moscow: Academia.
- Polinsky, Maria. Forthcoming. Tsez syntax. Ms. Harvard University.
- Radžabov, Ramazan N. 1999. *Sintaksis cezsckogo jazyka*. Moscow: MGLU.
- van den Berg, Helma. 1995. *A grammar of Hunzib: With texts and lexicon*. Munich: Lincom.