



HAL
open science

Nonverbal predication in Movima

Katharina Haude

► **To cite this version:**

Katharina Haude. Nonverbal predication in Movima. Simon Overall; Rosa Vallejos; Spike Gildea. Nonverbal predication in Amazonian languages, 122, John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.217-244, 2018, Typological Studies in Language, 9789027200525. 10.1075/tsl.122.08hau . halshs-01848221

HAL Id: halshs-01848221

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01848221>

Submitted on 17 Sep 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Nonverbal predication in Movima

Katharina Haude

CNRS–SeDyL

Final version published in: *Nonverbal Predication in Amazonian Languages*, Simon E. Overall, Rosa Vallejos and Spike Gildea (eds.), 2018, p. 217-244 [Typological Studies in Language 122]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

1 Introduction¹

Movima is an unclassified, endangered native language of South-Western Amazonia, spoken by a few hundred elderly speakers in and around the town of Santa Ana del Yacuma, Bolivia. The data on which the present study is based were collected during approximately 15 months of fieldwork spread over 11 years, resulting in an annotated corpus of spontaneous discourse of over 30 hours.

A remarkable feature of Movima is its weak noun-verb distinction, especially on the syntactic level. While only transitive verbs, which are overtly morphologically marked, can head transitive clauses, intransitive clauses can be headed by verbs and nouns likewise, and there is no copula that would mark a nonverbal construction. The difference between verbal and nonverbal predicates only becomes apparent in embedded (i.e. adverbial, complement, and negated) clauses, whose predicates are overtly derived through morphological marking, the type of marking depending on lexical class.

The morphological marking of embedded predicates furthermore shows that not only verbs and nouns, but also demonstratives, locative adverbs, and even personal pronouns can function as predicates. It turns out that, in contrast to claims made in previous publications

¹ The preparation of this paper has benefited from financial support of the program *Investissements d’Avenir* overseen by the French National Research Agency, ANR-10-LABX-0083 (LabEx *Empirical Foundations of Language*, opération GD1). The research presented here furthermore forms part of the section *L’énoncé et ses composantes (Axe 1)* of the Laboratory *Structure et Dynamique des Langues* (CNRS/INALCO/IRD) and of the ANR project *CorTypo* (ANR-12-BSH2-0011). I wish to thank Christine Bonnot, Dejan Matić, and Zygmunt Frajzinger for discussions on the topics addressed here. The detailed comments from two anonymous reviewers and from the editors of this volume on a previous version of this paper greatly helped to improve its quality. Needless to say, all remaining shortcomings are of my own responsibility. I wish to dedicate this paper to the memory of my teacher Hans-Jürgen Sasse.

predicate of a transitive clause must be a verb that is overtly morphologically marked (either as “direct” or as “inverse”; see below).

(2) **PREDICATE_{DR/INV}=ARGUMENT** [(-)ARGUMENT]

In addition to the core arguments, which are unmarked morphologically, a clause can contain an unlimited number of oblique-marked RPs, which can be considered adjuncts; furthermore, different kinds of particles (tense-aspect-mood, discourse particles etc.) can occur anywhere in the clause.

For ease of understanding the examples in the remainder of the paper, Tables 1 and 2 give an overview of the most common referential elements, articles and pronouns (the third set of referential elements contains the demonstratives, not represented here). Table 1 contains the so-called articles, which are the most common determiners. They always occur in combination with a content word, with which they form an RP. It is assumed that the final element /s/ that occurs on all these elements bears the determiner function (whose relevance will become apparent in 5.3 below); unlike an /s/ in coda position of other morphemes, this element tends to be reduced to [h].² The articles do not mark definiteness.

Table 1. Movima articles

	presential/generic	absential (AB)	past (PST)
human male (M)	<i>us</i>	<i>kus</i>	<i>us</i>
human female (F)	<i>(i)'nes</i>	<i>kinos</i>	<i>isnos</i>
non-human (N)	<i>as</i>	<i>kos</i>	<i>os</i>
plural/mass (PL)	<i>is</i>	<i>kis</i>	<i>is</i>

Table 2 lists the personal pronouns of third person. These resemble the articles quite closely, especially the absential bound forms. However, the final *s* of these is usually not aspirated, and their distributional properties differ from those of the articles. The free pronouns occur typically in clause-initial position (see Section 6), while the bound forms always appear as enclitics.

² The final *s* also appears on demonstratives in determiner function (see Haude 2006: 141).

Table 2. Movima third-person pronouns

	free		bound (= / --)	
	presential	absential (AB)	presential	absential (AB)
human male (M)	<i>u'ko</i>	<i>usko</i>	<i>u'</i>	<i>us</i>
human female (F)	<i>i'ne</i>	<i>isne</i>	<i>(i)'ne</i>	<i>(i)sne</i>
non-human (N)	<i>a'ko</i>	<i>asko</i>	<i>a'</i>	<i>as</i>
plural/mass (PL)	<i>i'ko</i>	<i>isko</i>	<i>i'</i>	<i>is</i>

An intransitive clause is presented in (3). As can be seen, the predicate (here, a verb) occurs in initial position, and the argument is represented by an RP consisting of an article and a noun. (The predicate is rendered in boldface and the external argument in square brackets.)³

- (3) ***jo'yaj*** [us majni=Ø]
 arrive ART.M offspring=1SG
 'My son arrived.' [CCT_120907_1 135]

When the argument of an intransitive clause is represented by a bound pronoun, this pronoun is attached to the predicate through “external cliticization”, as in (4). External cliticization (represented by two hyphens) is characterized by the fact that when the host ends in a consonant, this consonant forms the syllable onset of a vowel-initial enclitic (cf. Haude 2006: 101–103). The stress and lengthening patterns of the host are not affected.

³ Tense, mood, and aspect, as well as the choice of the definite or indefinite article in the English translations correspond to the context from which the examples were taken, since these categories are not always overtly marked in Movima. In contrast, some categories that are overtly marked in Movima but not in English, like presence, absence and ceased existence of referents, or modal and evidential values indicated by particles, are usually not included in the English translations (not even in the “literal” ones, which are merely attempts to convey the structure of the Movima examples), since they are not pertinent to the present discussion and would render the translations unnecessarily complicated. The information in square brackets following the translation indicates the source of the example (usually speaker, date, and number of annotation unit).

- (4) *jo'yaj--[us] neyru*
 arrive--3M.AB here
 'He arrived here.' [EAO_120906_3 007]

The argument of an intransitive clause is not obligatorily realized. The predicate alone can constitute a clause, as in (5) (particles, like *jayna* 'then, already' in this example, are frequent in this type of clause, but not grammatically required).

- (5) *jayna jo'yaj*
 DSC arrive
 'Then (he) arrived.' [LTC 020906_5 389]

Transitive clauses, as exemplified in (6), are headed by a verb that is overtly marked as bivalent (either "direct" or "inverse"). The two arguments are distinguished by their syntactic position, occupying structural positions internal and external, respectively, to the predicate phrase. The external argument shares all its formal and behavioural properties with the single argument of an intransitive clause outlined above (see Haude to appear *a* for further details).

The internal argument, in contrast, is obligatorily realized (zero marks the first person singular). It is phonologically attached to the predicate through so-called "internal cliticization", a process that results in a prosodic word bearing penultimate stress (represented by an accent in (6)); if the host has an open penultimate syllable, this syllable loses its original lengthening. Internally cliticized elements furthermore require a preceding vowel, so that, when the host ends in a consonant, the vowel *-a* is inserted as a linker, as illustrated in (6). Example (6) also demonstrates that unlike external cliticization, internal cliticization also involves determiners: the article of the RP representing the internal argument, *us Ernan*, is phonologically attached to the predicate. (Note that internal cliticization also encodes possessors on nouns, which are expressed by the same sets of referential elements.)

- (6) *jayna jay<a>moł-á=us Ernan [us pa:toron-a=y'ti]*
 DSC call<DR>-LV=ART.M Ernan ART.M landlord-LV=1PL
 'Then Ernan called our landlord.' [EAO Cbba 196]

opposite way, i.e. the external argument represents the agent and the internal argument the patient; see (9).

- (9) *joyle-kay-a=us* [os *diya:volo*]
take-INV-LV=3M.AB ART.N.PST devil
'The devil took him with him.' [LYO_250808_2 246]

Thus, the expression of event participants in either the internal or the external syntactic position of a transitive predicate is not a means to encode semantic roles, since this is achieved by verbal marking. The assignment of argument positions is determined by the arguments' (discourse) referential properties: the internal position is reserved for the event participant that ranks higher in a hierarchy of person (1>2>3), animacy (human > non-human animate > inanimate) and discourse status (prominent > less prominent), while the external position is occupied by the event participant that ranks lower on these hierarchies (see Haude 2014b for a more detailed account).⁵

3 Distinguishing verbal from nonverbal predicates: the marking of embedded predicates

The predicate position of a Movima clause can just as well be occupied by a noun, as shown in (10). There is no copula.

- (10) *tolkosya--[ne]*
girl--3F
'She is a girl.' [Dial. EA&AH 012]

Nouns and verbs are not easily distinguished in Movima (see Haude 2009b); for example, there is no morphological marking of categories like tense, aspect, or mood on verbs, or gender, number, or case on nouns. Consequently, it is not always possible to distinguish nominal from verbal predicates. For the present purpose, the most useful criterion is the form a predicate takes in a complement, adverbial or negated (subsumed here under the term "embedded") clause. Embedded clauses have the form of RPs, i.e., they contain minimally an

⁵ For this reason, and to avoid theoretically misleading terminology, the arguments have also been labelled "PROX" – for the internal – and "OBV" – for the external argument – in other publications (e.g. Haude 2010).

article and a content word. They are obligatorily possessed (with some exceptions, see below), i.e. the content word obligatorily takes an internal enclitic. In the case of an intransitive predicate, the internal enclitic represents the single argument, shown in (11); in the case of a transitive predicate, the internal enclitic represents the internal argument, as in a main clause, shown in (12). (Like external arguments, embedded clauses will also be signalled by square brackets in the remainder of the paper.)

- (11) *bele:ka* [*n-os* *joyaj-wa=Ø*]
 happy OBL-ART.N arrive-NMZ.EVT=1SG
 ‘(She) was happy when I arrived (lit.: “... at my arriving”).’ [GCM Bacho 029]

- (12) *yey-na=Ø* [*as* *visitar-na:-wa=Ø* [*kus* *alkaka:ye=Ø*]]
 want-DR=1SG ART.N visit-DR-NMZ.EVT=1SG ART.M.AB relative=1SG
 ‘I want to visit (lit.: “... my visiting”) my relative.’ [EAO Visita 047]

Crucially, the embedded predicate is morphologically marked, and the type of marking depends on the type of predicate: verbs take the suffix *-wa*, as illustrated in (11) for an intransitive and in (12) for a transitive verbal clause. Nouns, in contrast, undergo reduplication, as shown in (13).⁶

- (13) *dottol--[isne]* [*n-os* *tolkos<ya~>ya=sne*]
 bad_person--3F.AB OBL-ART.N.PST girl<NMZ.ST~>=3F.AB
 ‘She was a bad person when she was (lit.: “at her being”) a girl.’ [EAO Mala 002]

According to this criterion, words denoting property concepts, which are susceptible of belonging to a separate class of adjectives, can be analyzed as morphological nouns: they also undergo reduplication, as illustrated in (14) with the word *jayaw* ‘good’. While some property-denoting words show features that distinguish them from nouns (e.g. a possible alternative embedding derivation with a suffix *-te*, see (82) and (83) below, or distributional

⁶ This marking can be considered a nominalization (as reflected by the gloss ‘NMZ’ and by the “literal” English translations); a justification of this analysis (based on distributional and marking restrictions) would go beyond the scope of the present paper, however, which is why I use more general terms like “form”, “marking”, or “derivation” here.

restrictions in compounds; see Haude 2006: 117–119 for a discussion of a possible class of adjectives), the differences are so subtle that property-denoting words are treated as nouns in this study.

- (14) *jayna n-[os ja<ya~>yaw-a=is]*
 DSC OBL-ART.N.PST good <NMZ.ST~>-LV=3PL.AB
 ‘Then, when they (were) good ...’ MCA_280806_1 421

Other words that can function as predicates, such as locative adverbs (15) and personal pronouns (16), take the suffix *-niwa*, a fossilized combination of a verbalizer *-ni* and the verbal embedding marker *-wa* (see Section 5).⁷ (RPs containing embedded demonstratives or personal pronouns, as in (16), are not possessed.)

- (15) *[n-os ney-niwa='ne]*
 OBL-ART.N.PST here-VBZ:NMZ=3F
 ‘when she was here (lit.: “at her being here”)’ [EAO Basket 001]

- (16) *[n-os usko-niwa]*
 OBL-ART.N.PST PRO.3M.AB-VBZ:NMZ
 ‘that it was him (lit.: “at being him”)’ [EAO Sueño 182]

Table 4 gives an overview of the three marking patterns of predicates in embedded clauses.

Table 4. Predicate markers in embedded clauses

Predicate type	Word class	Marker of embedded predicate	Gloss
Content word	Verb	<i>-wa</i> (+ possessor)	NMZ.EVT
	Noun	<RED~> (+ possessor)	NMZ.ST
Referential element	Demonstrative	<i>-niwa</i>	VBZ:NMZ
	Personal pronoun	<i>-niwa</i>	VBZ:NMZ
Other	E.g. locative adverb	<i>-niwa</i> (+ possessor)	VBZ:NMZ

⁷ This property also applies to some other nonverbal lexemes, e.g. *jankwa* ‘say/said thing’, not treated here.

Note that it is not resolved yet whether the distinction between suffixation of *-wa* to verbs and reduplication of nouns is really due to lexical class. It might also be postulated that the markers themselves are meaningful (as indicated by the glosses), distinguishing between events and states (see Haude 2011 for a closer examination of this issue). Still, by turning a main-clause predicate into an embedded one, the form the predicate takes in the embedded clause is a good indicator of how it is best interpreted in the main clause: as a verbal or as a nonverbal predicate.

An analysis of nonverbal predication in Movima, therefore, has to be based on two central questions:

- a) How is a predicate derived when occurring in an embedded clause?
- b) Which word of the main clause is derived in the corresponding embedded clause?

Question a) separates verbal from nonverbal predicates; question b) identifies the predicate among several clausal elements.

4 Nominal predicates⁸

4.1 Equational clauses

A nominal predicate forms an equational clause (a term I am using here as a cover term for what is called identification, categorization and property in the introduction to this volume), which can be paraphrased as “X is N(oun)”, X being the entity encoded as the argument. In principle, only unpossessed, common nouns can function as nominal predicates. Just like in intransitive verbal clauses, the argument of the nominal predicate can be expressed as a phonologically independent RP, as in (17); as an externally cliticized pronoun, as in (18) (where the nominal predicate, *rulrul*, follows a sequence of verbal predicates with identical argument encoding; see also (10) above); and it can be omitted, as in (19). (For a property-denoting nominal predicate see *dottoł* ‘bad (person)’ in (13).)

⁸ The term “nominal predicate” is used here rather than the more traditional “predicate nominal” (e.g. Payne 1997) because it facilitates the distinction between different predicate types (“verbal”, “pronominal”, etc.).

- (17) *bo ja' jułpa [is manniwanra=is]*
 REAS just arrow ART.PL weapon=3PL.AB
 'Because their weapons (were) just arrows.'⁹ [HRR_120808 602]
- (18) *jayna pol<ka>ba:ba--[as] łat, potmo--[as], jayna rulrul--[as]*
 DSC roll_around<MLT>--3N.AB EV get_up--3N.AB DSC jaguar--3N.AB
 'Then it rolled around, it got up, then it (was a) jaguar.' [LYO_250808_2 231]
- (19) *jayna paj'i jaysot, paj'i*
 DSC dolphin apparently dolphin
 '(they were) like dolphins, (they were) dolphins.' [JGD_130907 122]

Possessed nouns do usually not occur as predicates. One of very few exceptions is illustrated in (20).

- (20) *łat rey lavabat-a=as [os be~bet-kwa] jayna*
 EV MOD shade-LV=3N.AB ART.N.PST RED~skin-ABS DSC
 'The hide (was) its soul (lit.: "shade"), you see.'¹⁰
 [HRR_120808-tigregente 232]

The possible occurrence of possessed nominal predicates is limited to cases where the argument is expressed by an RP, as in (20) above. Possessed nouns as stand-alone predicates, i.e. without an overt argument expression, are not attested. Furthermore, and more importantly, the argument of a possessed nominal predicate cannot be expressed by an externally encliticized pronoun, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (21)a. The pronominal expression of this argument is only possible with a free personal pronoun in initial position, shown in (21)b. However, this is a different construction, in which the pronoun, not the noun, functions as the predicate (indicated by boldface); this so-called "pronominal construction" is described in Section 6 below.

⁹ The particle *bo* 'because' is often used sentence-initially and does not mark syntactic dependency.

¹⁰ The example stems from a mythological story about a person who transforms into a jaguar; the person is referred to by the "non-human" pronoun *=as* here.

- (21) a. **pa:ko=us--[k-as]*
 dog=3M.AB--OBV-3N.AB
 (intended meaning: “It’s his dog.”) [elicited]
- b. *a’ko pa:ko=us*
 PRO.3N dog=3M.AB
 ‘It’s/That’s his dog.’ [elicited]

Similarly to possessed nouns, proper nouns never occur as predicates, and neither do nouns denoting unique entities, such as *yejcho* ‘moon’ and *tinno* ‘sun’. Thus, predicate nominals are restricted to the categorizing and property-ascribing function in Movima. Identification, in which the entity referred to by the argument is identical to the entity specified by the predicate nominal, is expressed with the pronominal construction (Section 6).

4.2 Reduplicated nouns as possessive predicates

There is a special form of monovalent nominal predicates, where the initial iambic foot of the noun – (C)VCV, (C)VC, or (C)V: – is reduplicated to create a possessive predicate. Consider the two cases of (C)VCV-reduplication in (22) (see Haude 2014a for more examples).¹¹

- (22) *iti~itila:kwa jayna [is tolkosya], che*
 POSSPRED~man DSC ART.PL girl and
[is itila:kwa] jayna kweya~kwe:ya jema’
 ART.PL man DSC POSSPRED~woman also
 ‘The girls had husbands already and the men already had wives, too.’
 [HRR_120808-tigregente 365]

The reduplication is not a verbalization. Evidence from embedding shows that like simple nouns, possessive predicates undergo infixing reduplication in embedded clauses, as illustrated in (23).

¹¹ In the second clause in (22), the argument RP precedes the predicate, a construction that can arguably be analyzed as a left dislocation.

- (23) [*n-as* *maj~maj<ni~>ni='ne*]
 OBL-ART.N POSSPRED~offspring<NMZ.ST~>=3F
 ‘when she has children (lit.: “in her having children”)’ [ERM_150806 108]

5 Other nonverbal predicates

This section lists and describes several types of nonverbal elements that occur as predicates of intransitive clause. They are characterized by the fact that they belong to closed lexical classes and are, in embedded clauses, derived by the suffix *-niwa*, probably a fossilized combination of the verbalizing suffix *-ni* ‘PRC’ and the verbal embedding marker *-wa*. The canonical function of the suffix *-ni* is to mark inchoative aspect, as in (24). However, in many cases this function cannot be detected, e.g. on property-denoting words (see (57)), and it is lexicalized with a number of monovalent verbs, such as *ilo:ni* ‘walk’ or *alwa:ni* ‘talk’. When embedded, words ending in *-ni* are marked by the suffix *-wa* and never reduplicated (Haude 2006: 493–500), so that *-ni* can be considered a verbalizer.¹²

- (24) *po~poy-kwa:-ni[--is]*, *rulrul-ni*
 RED~BR.animal-ABS-PRC--3PL.AB jaguar-PRC
 ‘They transformed into animals, (they transformed into) jaguars.’
 [HRR_120808-tigregente 016]

The lexical bases discussed in this section never take the suffix *-ni* alone. A peculiarity of the suffix *-niwa* is that unlike the suffix *-wa*, the embedded predicate it derives is not automatically marked as possessed (see below) and that the syllable *-ni* is never lengthened in penultimate position. In any case, the predicates that take *-niwa* when embedded can be considered nonverbal because they cannot be combined directly with the verbal nominalizer *-wa*, but require an element that can be traced back to a verbalizer.

The predicates discussed here are demonstratives (5.1), three locative adverbs (5.2), and the negative copula *ka* (5.3).¹³ While this section contributes to a more complete picture of what

¹² However, nouns ending in *-ni*, like *iwani-wamba-ni* ‘telephone’ (talk-INSTR:CL.ROUND-PRC) have not been tested for their behaviour as predicates of embedded clauses.

¹³ Other nonverbal predicates that are not nouns, e.g. the lexemes *jankwa* ‘said (thing)’, *jampa* ‘done (thing)’, and question words, have slightly different properties and are discussed elsewhere (Haude 2006: 352).

- (26) ***kino'*** [kinos kwe:ya], ***kiro'*** [kis o:ye
 DEM.F.AB ART.F.AB woman DEM.PL.AB ART.PL.AB two_person
di' itila:kwa] nosdé
 REL man over_there
 ‘There is a woman, there are two men (lit.: “two persons who [are] men”) over there.’
 [EAO Cbba 256]

Embedded demonstrative predicates are illustrated in (27)–(29). Example (29) simultaneously shows that demonstratives, like other predicates, can occur on their own (see 5.3 below on the structure of negated clauses). Embedded demonstrative predicates are never marked as possessed, perhaps because the possessor would be coreferential with the demonstrative.

- (27) *n-os* ***oso'-niwa*** [os wa:ka]
 OBL-ART.N.PST DEM.N.PST-VBZ:NMZ ART.N.PST cow
 ‘when there was cattle (lit.: “at there being cattle”)’ [GBM Ganado 033]

- (28) *n-as* ***koro'-niwa*** [kos alpani-kay-a=n]
 OBL-ART.N DEM.N.AB-VBZ.NMZ ART.N.AB help-INV-LV=2
 ‘when there is someone who helps you (lit.: “at there being [the one who] helps you”)’ [Erlan Rojas 418]

- (29) *jayna ka=[s kiro'-niwa]*
 DSC NEG=DET DEM.PL.AB-VBZ:NMZ
 ‘There are none left (lit.: “There is already not them being [there]”).’
 [ERM_140806_1 0297]

The interpretation of a demonstrative predicate as expressing an existential or a locational predication is largely a matter of context. Example (30) contains an adverbial denoting a location (*n-as Kachwe:la*; see also *nosdé* in (26)), so that this clause may be considered locational. With the ‘past’ demonstrative, shown in (31), the locational reading tends to imply that the entity is not at its former place, rather than that it has ceased to exist.

(30) *n-as Kachwe:la koro'* [kos ra:diyo]
 OBL-ART.N Cachuela DEM.N.AB ART.N.AB radio
 'In Cachuela there is a radio.' [EAO_120906_3 112]

(31) *oso'* [os loto:ba] ney
 DEM.N.PST ART.N.PST jug here
 'There was a jug here.' [JGD_130907-06 244]

When the argument RP of a demonstrative predicate is marked as possessed, the construction is interpreted as a possessive predication, as in (32) and (33). Speakers state that this construction is synonymous with the reduplicative construction described in 4.2. Obviously, there is a syntactic difference: the reduplicated possessive nominal predicate has the possessor as its argument, while the demonstrative predicate has the possessed entity as its argument.

(32) *koro'* [kos chakpa=sne]
 DEM.N.AB ART.N.AB walking_stick=3F.AB
 'She has a walking stick (lit.: "There is her walking stick").' [EAO Asilo 088]

(33) *uso'* [us alwaj-a='ne]
 DEM.M.PST ART.M spouse-LV=3F
 'She had a husband (lit.: "There was her husband").' [NAO_FSG_300706_1 329]

Not surprisingly, these "possessive" clauses can also be interpreted as existential or locational, depending on the context. So, for instance, (34) can be understood as indicating that on a particular ranch, there are a number of animals, some of them possessed. Example (35) is even more straightforward in that the text is not about fish, but about the use of the remains of fish eggs for pottery.

- (34) *iso'* [is wa:ka=is], *iso'* [is kaw-ra]
 DEM.PL.PST ART.PL cow=3PL.AB DEM.PL.PST ART.PL much-CL.NTR
di' chi:vo]
 REL goat
 'They had cattle, they had many goats.' Or: 'There was their cattle, there were many goats (lit.: "many [things] which [were] goats").' [ERM 140806-1 0422]

- (35) *kiro'* [kis lat rey, eney, jo:t-a=is bi:law]
 DEM.PL.AB ART.PL.AB EV MOD FILLER egg-LV=ART.PL fish
 'There are, er, eggs of fish (i.e. fish eggs).' [Erlan Rojas 250]

5.2 Locative adverbs as predicates

Locative adverbs are a fossilized combination of a (former) demonstrative with the oblique prefix *n(V)-*. There are three such adverbs: *ney* 'here' (probably from **n-ay* OBL-DEM.N.PRX), *nosdé* (from **n-osdé* OBL-DEM.?) and *nokodé* (from **no-kodé* OBL-DEM.N.NSTD), the latter two both meaning '(over) there'. Like other adverbial elements, locative adverbs often cooccur with a lexical predicate, as illustrated in (36)a. In that case it is the lexical predicate, and not the adverb, that appears as the derived predicate of an embedded clause, as shown in (36)b.

- (36) a. *it joy-chet nosdé*
 1INTR go-R/R over_there
 'I go over there.' [JGD_130907-13 191]
- b. [*n-os joy-wa=Ø nosdé*]
 OBL-ART.N.PST go-NMZ.EVT=1SG over_there
 'when I went over there' [EGA_MGA_DMY_060906_1 119]

When a locative adverb functions as predicate, it can be combined with an RP, as in (37), or with a pronominal enclitic (which here, and in contrast to other intransitive clauses, takes the "obviative" form preceded by a *k-*, normally only found in transitive 3>3 pronoun combinations), as in (38).

(37) *[is pa:ko] nosdé ki'laj*
 ART.PL dog over_there far
 ‘The dogs (are) over there, far away.’ [HRR_200510_1 033]

(38) *nosdé--[k-is] jayna*
 over_there--OBV-3PL.AB DSC
 ‘They (are) already over there.’ [EAO Alcanzar 005]

There are no clear examples of locative adverbs occurring as predicates by themselves. However, their behaviour in embedding and the fact that they can take a pronominal enclitic suffices to claim that they can function as predicates. In embedded clauses, the predicative locative adverb is marked with the element *-niwa*. Unlike embedded demonstrative or pronominal predicates (on the latter, see Section 6 below), these forms are possessed.

(39) *jayna pakuk-na=Ø [os nosde-niwa='ne]*
 DSC understand-DR=1SG ART.N.PST over_there-VBZ:NMZ=3F
 ‘I already knew that she (was) over there (lit.: “I already knew her being there”).’
 [EAO In between 023]

(40) *[n-as ney-niwa=us] chot jema' ji<wa:~>wa[--us] ney*
 OBL-ART.N here-VBZ:NMZ=3.AB HAB also come<MD~>--3M.AB here
 ‘When he (is) here (lit.: “At his being here”), he always comes here.’
 [ERM_140806_1 0554]

5.3 The negative copula

Negated main clauses consist of a negative copula followed by an embedded clause. They can be paraphrased as “X’s V-ing (or: X’s being N) does not exist”. Compare the affirmative and negative verbal clauses in (41)a and (41)b, respectively.

(41) a. *bo jema' chi:~chi [os rulrul]*
 REAS also MD~go_out ART.N.PST jaguar
 ‘Because the jaguar would come out, too.’ [Balvina 144]

- b. *jayna ka=[s chi-wa=os rulrul]*¹⁴
 DSC NEG=DET go_out-NMZ.EVT=ART.N.PST jaguar
 ‘The jaguar didn’t come out anymore (lit: “The jaguar’s coming out was already not”).’
 [PMP_HRR_etal_210908 277]

The element *ka* is considered here a copula expressing existential negation, and the =s attached to it is considered a determining element that forms an RP with the derived lexical predicate. Support for this analysis comes from the fact that, like the final *s* of a determiner but unlike a final *s* on other morphemes, the final *s* of the element *kas* is often pronounced as [h] (see Section 2, above Table 1). Negated clauses, therefore, are embedded, comparable to complement and adverbial clauses. Unlike these, they are not preceded by a full article, and therefore, do not contain temporal information. Apart from that, however, their structure is exactly the same. For instance, negated transitive predicates retain their argument structure, as shown in (42) (here, the argument of the transitive verb *yeyna* ‘want’ is an intransitive complement clause).

- (42) *ka=[s yey-na:-wa=Ø [as kayni:-wa=Ø]]*
 NEG=DET want-DR-NMZ.EVT=1SG ART.N die-NMZ.EVT=1SG
 ‘I don’t want to die (lit.: “My wanting my dying is not”).’
 [GCM_290806_5 121]

The copula *ka* differs from other predicates in that it is prosodically defective, consisting of one light syllable only. Like other main-clause predicates, however, it can occur alone, as in (43), and it can be followed by a bound pronoun, as in (44). Its vowel is then lengthened and combined with the dummy element -*i* (Haude 2006: 61–62), resulting in a full prosodic word.

- (43) *ka:-’i*
 NEG-D
 ‘No.’ ‘(There) isn’t/aren’t (any).’ [CVM_020906_1 190]

¹⁴ Middle reduplication, like many other verbal morphemes (see Haude 2006: 363–364) is dropped before the addition of the suffix *-wa*: this is why *chi:chi* in (41)a becomes *chi-wa* in (41)b.

- (44) *jayna ka:-'i--[is] jayna*
 DSC not_exist-D--3PL.AB DSC
 ‘They aren’t (there) anymore.’ [MCA_280806_2 355]

This long form of the negative copula can also occur in embedded clauses, as illustrated in (45). (Note, however, that there are only two such occurrences in the corpus, and in both, the meaning seems to be conventionalized as “not to be in one’s normal state”.) The embedded form is not possessed.

- (45) *jayna [n-os da' ka:-'i-niwa jayna]*
 DSC OBL-ART.N.PST DUR.NSTD NEG-D-VBZ:NMZ DSC
 ‘(when she was ill), when (she) couldn’t do anything anymore (lit.: “when she didn’t exist anymore”) ...’ [EAO Ay’ku II 009]

The element *ka*, therefore, is a special kind of predicate, resembling a particle in being prosodically defective and only rarely occurring independently. However, analyzing it as a predicate followed by a determining element is the only way to explain the embedded structure of the negated clause, which is not possible if *kas* is considered a particle (as done in Haude 2006: 316–319; 543–544).

6 Pronominal predicates

In previous publications on Movima morphosyntax (e.g. Haude 2009a), clause-initial personal pronouns (see Table 2 above) were analyzed as representing the external argument in a marked-topic position. This is illustrated by the bracketing and boldface in (46).

- (46) [*usko*] ***joro:kwa***
 PRO.3M.AB sleep
 ‘He slept.’ [EAO Cbba 096]

When the criteria of the present study are employed, however, it turns out that clause-initial pronouns are more adequately analyzed as predicates (comparable to the “deictic predicates” in Salish, Shank 2003). Being long forms in comparison with the corresponding pronominal enclitics (see Table 3), the free pronouns might even be considered a fusion of a referential

expression (e.g. *us-* ‘3M.AB’ in *usko*) and a copular element, i.e. the ending *-ko* shared by most third-person free pronouns. However, neither the feminine free pronouns (*i’ne*, *isne*) nor the free pronouns of first and second person take this ending; furthermore, the free pronouns occasionally also occur in non-initial position, as e.g. in (47), where there is no evidence that they function as predicates. While, therefore, it is possible that diachronically, there was an element *ko* (reminiscent, by the way, of the negative copula *ka*) functioning as a copula, the hypothesis that the free pronouns contain copular elements cannot be kept up synchronically.

- (47) *isko* *ona-ra-na=us* *usko*
 PRO.3PL.AB know-CL.NTR-DR=3M.AB PRO.3M.AB
 ‘Those were (the things) he knew, he (did).’ [ERM_150806 187]

The remainder of this section shows how free pronouns function as predicates when occurring alone (6.1) or in combination with an adverbial clause (6.2). They can also occur in combination with a bare noun (6.3.1) or verb (6.3.2), resulting in what I term “pronominal construction”; the status of the content word in this construction is briefly discussed in Section 6.3.3.

6.1 Personal pronouns as stand-alone predicates

Free personal pronouns can occur alone to express a full predication, as in (48).

- (48) *u’ko*
 PRO.3M
 ‘It’s him.’ [GCM_290806_4 149]

When a pronominal predicate occurs in an embedded clause, the pronoun is marked with the suffix *-niwa* ‘VBZ:NMZ’, as shown in (49) for an adverbial and in (50) for a negated clause. Note that, like embedded demonstrative predicates (Section 5.1), an embedded pronominal predicate is not marked as possessed – presumably because here as well, the possessor would be coreferential with the referent of the pronoun in this case.

(49) *[n-asko tokbaycho-wa=Ø [n-os usko-niwa]]*
 OBL-PRO.3N.AB remember-NMZ.EVT=1SG OBL-ART.N.PST PRO.3M.AB-VBZ:NMZ
 ‘Then I remembered that it was him (i.e God himself) (lit.: “At that was my remembering of [it] being him”).’¹⁵ [EAO Sueño 182]

(50) *ka=[s rey u’ko-niwa]*
 NEG=DET MOD PRO.3M-VBZ:NMZ
 ‘It’s not him (lit.: “being him is not”), you see.’ [GCM_290806_2 162]

6.2 Pronominal predicates with an adverbial clause

Pronominal predicates are also found in combination with adverbial clauses. Adverbial clauses cannot occur independently, they require a main clause (see e.g. (11), (13), and (30) above). The main-clause predicate can be a pronoun, as shown in (51). The pronominal predicate in this construction is always the “non-human” form (*a’ko* for nonpast, *asko* for past contexts; see Table 2 above), and the adverbial clause usually provides temporal information; the construction is used to describe key events in a narrative. The fact that a personal pronoun forms a sentence with an adverbial clause in the absence of any other potential syntactic head is thus evidence of its predicative status.

(51) *jayna asko [no-kos joy-wa=us jayna]*
 DSC PRO.3N.AB OBL-ART.N.AB go-NMZ.EVT=3M.AB DSC
 ‘Then was when he left (lit.: “That was in his going”).’
 [EAO Alcanzar 022]

Free personal pronouns can also cooccur with other oblique-marked RPs, which, as mentioned above (5.1, 5.2), can express location, possession, or temporal information. The examples below illustrate this with a locative adverb (*nosdé*) in (52), with a free pronoun encoding a possessor (*n-i’ko*) in (53), and with a full RP (*n-i’net ay’ku...*) again encoding a possessor in (54).

¹⁵ The construction *n-asko X-NMZ* “at that was X-ing” seen in (49), frequently employed to express unexpected events in a narrative, is not yet well understood.

- (52) *isko nosdé bo tijka:rim[--is]*
 PRO.3PL.AB over_there REAS work-3PL.AB
 ‘They are over there because they work.’ [EAO Narasa:mes 057]
- (53) *bo jayna łat a’ko n-i’ko*
 REAS DSC EV PRO.3N OBL-PRO.3PL
 ‘Because now it is theirs (lit.: “... it is at them”).’ [ATL_230806 248]
- (54) *a’ko n-i’neł ay’ku=Ø di’ bitok*
 PRO.3N OBL-PRO.3F:1 aunt=1SG REL old_person
 ‘It is my old aunt’s (lit.: “It is at my aunt’s, who [is] an old person”).’
 [EAO Buscar vivienda 006]

Unlike locative adverbs (e.g. *nosdé* in (52)), other adjuncts cannot constitute predicates by themselves; they need to be combined with another word functioning as predicate, e.g. a free pronoun. In embedded clauses, then, it is the main predicate that is morphologically marked. Consider the embedded clauses with a pronominal predicate combined with a pronominal adjunct in (55) and with an RP in (56).

- (55) *ona-ra-na=Ø [as jayna isko-niwa n-inta]*
 know-CL.NTR-DR=1SG ART.N DSC PRO.3PL.AB-VBZ:NMZ OBL-PRO.1SG
 ‘I know that they are mine (lit.: “I know the they-being on me”).’
 [EAO Patrona 025]
- (56) *jayna rey ka=[s i’ko-niwa n-i’nes virjen]*
 DSC MOD NEG=DET PRO.3PL-VBZ:NMZ OBL-PRO.3F Virgin
 ‘They didn’t belong to the Virgin (lit. “The they-being of the Virgin’s was not”).’
 [LTC_020906_4 129]

Like lexical predicates (verbs or nouns), pronominal predicates can also be combined with a full RP (i.e., a content word preceded by a determiner), as in (57) and (58). Structurally, this results in a typical Movima intransitive clause of the type illustrated in Section 2: a clause-

initial predicate is followed by an RP. However, with pronominal predicates this construction is relatively rare, and it seems to have a restricted function (different from pronominal constructions with bare nouns, discussed in 6.3): in the combination pronoun–RP, the pronoun refers to the preceding context, and the RP expresses the reason for the situation described in the preceding context.

- (57) *a'ko* [as to:mi di' cho'es-ni]
 PRO.3N ART.N water REL dirty-PRC
 'That's (because of) the dirty water (lit.: "That's the water, which [is] dirty").'
 (Context: "We've all got diarrhea.") [Agua sucia 004]

- (58) *a'ko* [as bijaw-wa:nas]
 PRO.3N ART.N old-INSTR:ABSTR
 'That's (because of) the old age.' (Context: "Our bones hurt.")
 [Cabildo_020907 011]

6.3 Pronominal predicates with a bare content word: the pronominal construction

6.3.1 Pronominal predicates with a noun

Clause-initial pronominal predicates frequently cooccur with bare nouns, as illustrated in (59). The result is an equational clause, propositionally equivalent to the use of a predicate-nominal construction (see Section 4.1), shown in (60).

- (59) *i'ko* mowi:maj
 PRO.3PL Movima
 'They (are) Movima.' [NAO_FSG_300706_1 518]

- (60) *mowi:maj--[i']*
 Movima--3PL
 'They (are) Movima.' [NAO_FSG_300706_1 561]

When the construction of the type in (59) occurs in an embedded clause, only the free pronoun is overtly marked as the embedded predicate. The noun remains unmodified. Compare the example in (61) with the negated clause headed by a nominal predicate in (62).

(61) *ka=[s isko-niwa mowi:maj]*
 NEG=DET PRO.3PL.AB-VBZ:NMZ Movima
 ‘They are not Movima (lit.: “It’s not them being Movima”).’
 [JGD_160808-Fundacion 192]

(62) *ka=[s mowi<ma~>maj-a=is askwa=a]*
 NEG=DET Movima<NMZ.ST~>LV=ART.PL inhabitant=3N
 ‘Its inhabitants (are) not Movima (lit.: “The being Movima of its inhabitants is not.”).’ [JGD_160808 Fundacion 247]

The combination of a pronominal predicate with a noun can have a pragmatically marked effect, as in (63), where a contrast between the negated and the affirmative proposition is established. However, this effect cannot be observed everywhere. In fact, it seems that the construction with the clause-initial free pronoun (as in (63)) is preferred over that with a pronominal enclitic (as in (60)) for expressing equation, although a text count confirming this impression still needs to be carried out.

(63) *ka=[s i'ko-niwa mowi:maj], i'ko ita:nak*
 NEG=DET PRO.3PL-VBZ:NMZ Movima PRO.3PL white
 ‘They (are) not Movima, they are white people.’ [NAO_FSG_300706_1 542]

It was shown in Section 4.1 (see example (21)) that possessed nouns usually do not function as main-clause predicates; in particular, they cannot cooccur with a bound pronoun expressing the argument. To express the identity of a referent with a possessed entity, a possessed noun is preceded by a free pronoun, as in (64). The same is true of proper nouns, illustrated in (65), and of nouns with a unique denotee, as in (66).

(64) *asko lavabał-a=os Buscha*
 PRO.3N.AB shade-LV=ART.N.PST proper_name
 ‘That was Buscha’s soul.’ [HRR_120808-tigregente 597]

(65) *ji:nanak u'ko Ernan jankwa=Ø*
 maybe PRO.M proper_name say=1SG
 ‘Perhaps it’s Ernan, I said.’ [EAO Cbba 171]

(66) *asko rey yejcho*
 PRO.N.AB MOD moon
 ‘It was the moon, of course.’ [HRR_2009_tape1_B 079]

The examples in (67) and (68) show how the pronominal construction appears in a complement and negated clause, respectively. Again, it is the free pronoun that is marked as the embedded predicate, while the noun remains underived (the reduplication in (67) indicates inalienable possession, which is marked in the same way in main clauses; see Haude 2006: 89).

(67) *ona-ra-na=is [os rey asko-niwa*
 know-CL.NTR-DR=3PL.AB ART.N.PST MOD PRO.3N.AB-VBZ:NMZ
be~bet-<kwa~>kwa=os Buscha]
 RED~skin-<INAL~>ABS=ART.N.PST Buscha
 ‘They knew that that was Buscha’s hide (lit.: “They knew it being Buscha’s hide”).’
 [HRR_120808-tigregente 668]

(68) *ka=[s u'ko-niwa pa:pa='ne]*
 NEG=DET PRO.3M-VBZ:NMZ father_of=3F
 ‘He is not her father (lit.: “He being her father is not”).’ [EAO Neighbours 027]

6.3.2 Pronominal predicates with a verb

The pronominal construction also occurs with verbs. The following examples illustrate a pronominal predicate with an intransitive (69), a transitive direct (70), and a transitive inverse

(71) verb. The pronoun in this construction always represents the participant that corresponds to the predicate’s external argument.¹⁶

(69) *usko joro:-kwa*
 PRO.3M.AB sleep-BDP
 ‘He slept.’ [EAO Cbba 096]

(70) *asko yey-na=’ne*
 PRO.3N.AB want-DR=3F
 ‘She wanted that.’ [EAO Abuelo 053]

(71) *usko jiwa-le:-kay=Ø*
 PRO.3M.AB come-CO-INV=1SG
 ‘He brought me.’ [EAO_120906_3 258]

Pronominal predicates create a pragmatically marked structure, especially with transitive verbs (the effect on intransitive predicates – both nominal and verbal – seems to be less strong but still requires further investigation): the free pronoun typically takes up a referent that was introduced immediately before, but that was not a protagonist of the preceding discourse, and the content word asserts something about the referent. A detailed discussion of the pragmatic function of the pronominal construction can be found in Haude (2018).

The following examples show that in embedded clauses, the pronoun is overtly marked while the verb is not. Hence, also when a verb is involved, the predicate is the pronoun and not the verb. In analogy to (69)–(71) above, (72) illustrates the embedded construction with an intransitive, (73) with a transitive direct and (74) with a transitive inverse verb.

(72) *kem<a:>ye=Ø [os a’ko-niwa ja’ ji<wa:~>wa]*
 believe<DR>=1SG ART.N.PST PRO.3N-VBZ:NMZ just come<MD~>
 ‘I thought it (the hen) had just come (on its own).’ [EAO Gallina 018]

¹⁶ Clause-initial free pronouns cross-referencing the internal argument exist as well. However, this constructions has different pragmatic and syntactic functions, and its structure still requires further analysis (see Haude 2012a and Haude to appear a).

(73) [n-as da' asko-niwa ew-na=n]
 OBL-ART.N DUR.NSTD PRO.3N.AB-VBZ:NMZ hold-DR=2
 'when you are holding that one' [ERM_140806_2 466]

(74) [n-as rey i'ko-niwa rey ja' joy-te:-kay=Ø]
 OBL-ART.N MOD PRO.3PL-VBZ:NMZ MOD just go-CO-INV=1 SG
 'when they just take me with them' [EAO Patrona 027]

6.3.3 On the status of the content word in the pronominal construction

Syntactic evidence shows that, despite the absence of overt marking, the content word in a pronominal construction is a subordinate predicate. This appears from the comparison with the formal characteristics of other constructions in which a content word is preceded by a referring expression: RPs, where the content word is preceded by a determiner, and headed relative clauses, where the content word is preceded by an RP.¹⁷ I will restrict the comparison to headed relative clauses (on RPs, see Haude to appear *a, c*).

Headed relative clauses follow the RP they modify (inserted in square brackets) and are introduced by the particle *di'*. Relativization is restricted to the external argument, which is “gapped” in the relative clause. Example (75)a illustrates this with a direct-marked transitive verb, indicating that the relativized RP refers to the patient; the corresponding basic transitive pattern with the same verb, *tikoyna*, can be observed in (75)b. (Further examples of relative clauses are provided in (26), (34) and (54) with nominal predicates and in (57) with an intransitive verb.)

(75) a. [is chot wa:ka] di' tikoy-na=us nonok=Ø¹⁸
 ART.PL HAB cow=3PL.AB REL kill-DR=3M.AB grandparent=1 SG
 'the cows that my grandfather used to killed' [EAO Dichiyeye 006]

¹⁷ Somewhat arbitrarily, in this paper I use the term “subordination” for these constructions, in order to reserve the term “embedding” for those constructions that involve morphological marking of the predicate, i.e. complement, adverbial, and negated clauses.

¹⁸ TAM particles, like here *chot* ‘habitual’, often occur inside an RP, although their scope is over the entire clause.

- b. *bo tikoy-na=is [kos rulrul]*
 REAS kill-DR=3PL.AB ART.N.AB jaguar
 ‘Because they killed the jaguar.’ [HRR_120808-tigremente 629]

Both relative clauses and the pronominal construction allow for access of the internal argument only by means of a detransitivizing operation. This operation consists in the insertion of the particle *kwey* (or *kaw* in the speech of some, as in (78)), which blocks the internal argument slot. The former internal argument becomes the single argument of the now intransitive clause, and the former external argument is demoted to adjunct status, i.e., marked as oblique if expressed at all. Consider (76) for a headed relative clause.

- (76) *kino’ [kinos kwe:ya [di’ kwey vel-na n-isko]]*
 DEM.F.AB ART.F.AB woman REL DETR watch-DR OBL-PRO.3PL.AB
 ‘There is a woman who looks after them.’ [EAO Asilo 021]

The following examples illustrate the detransitivizing operation with a pronominal predicate, (77) representing a main, (78) an embedded (complement) clause. The verb is given in boldface to illustrate its status as an embedded predicate.

- (77) *jayna usko kwey jay<a:>mot n-os aviyone:ta*
 DSC PRO.3M.AB DETR call<DR> OBL-ART.N.PST plane
 ‘He was (the one who) called the plane.’ [EAO_240807_vibora 144]

- (78) *bo [as i’ko-niwa kaw vat<a:>pa n-is alle=i]*
 REAS ART.N PRO.3PL-VBZ:NMZ DETR teach<DR> OBL-ART.PL friend=3PL
 ‘so that they may be (the ones who) teach their friends (lit.: “for the they-being [the ones who] ...”)’ [Erlan Rojas 231]

A further common property of the content word in a headed relative clause and in the pronominal construction is the way in which it is negated: the subordinate predicate is preceded by a particle *loy* and undergoes “partial nominalization” (i.e. only involving morphological marking of intransitives, and no possessive marking; Haude 2006: 473–474).

Consider a relative clause and a pronominal construction in (79) and (80), respectively, each involving an intransitive verb.¹⁹

(79) *jayna ben-e:te [kis tolkosya] di' loy iwani:-wa*
 DSC draw-AGT ART.PL.AB girl REL NEG.SUB speak-NMZ.EVT
 'The girls who don't speak already write.' [CCT_120907_2 124]

(80) *kula'wa=s sit-lo:to (...) u'ko loy iwani:-wa*
 DEM.APPR.M=DET sew-BR.ear PRO.3M NEG.SUB speak-NMZ.EVT
 'There comes the deaf (boy). (...) He doesn't speak.' [CCT_120907_2 102-104]

Hence, a verb that follows a referring expression (a full RP or a pronominal predicate – or a determiner, as shown in Haude to appear *a* and Haude to appear *b*) can be interpreted as a relative whose head is constituted by the preceding referring expression. The pronominal construction, then, can be paraphrased with “X (is) N / (is) the one who Vs”. In fact, the pronominal construction has the syntactic structure of a cleft: it is an equational clause containing a pronominal main-clause predicate and a subordinate predicate (the relative clause), which specifies the referent of the pronoun. (Note, however, that the prosodic and pragmatic properties of the pronominal construction differ from those of a cleft; see Haude 2018.)

Neither the pronominal construction nor headed relative clauses make a structural difference between a verbal and a nonverbal content word; in contrast to main-clause predicates, not even possessed nouns differ from the other lexical classes. Nouns functioning as predicates of a relative clause could be observed in (26) and (34) above. Moreover, nouns can also be combined with the detransitivizing particle *kaw* in these constructions.²⁰ In that case, they refer not to the noun's denotee, but to the possessor. Consider the pronominal construction with a possessed noun in (81)a and the construction with *kwey* in (81)b. (The corpus contains no example of a relative clause with a nominal predicate and *kaw*; for an example of a “detransitivized” RP, see Haude 2018.)

¹⁹ Embedded clauses are negated with *loy* as well; see Haude 2018.

²⁰ This is why the term ‘valency decreasing’ may be more appropriate than ‘detransitivizing’: valency is a category that also applies to nouns, while transitivity is a purely verbal category; on the other hand, the operation involves only the syntactic properties of the lexical element, not its semantic valency.

(81) a. *a'ko asna='ne*
 PRO.3N home=3F
 'This is her home.'
 [CVM_020906_1 400]

b. *i'ne kwey asna ney*
 PRO.3F DETR home here
 'She is the owner of this house/the one who lives here.'
 [EAO Agua sucia 020]

Furthermore, nouns, too, are negated with *loy* when functioning as subordinate predicates, as shown in (82) and (83), respectively. (The corpus only contains examples of potential adjectives, nominalized with *-te* – cf. (14) – and none of a reduplicated nonverbal predicate in these constructions.)

(82) [*is (...) motloto-wanra:-ni*] *di' ja' rey la:ta,*
 ART.PL earring-INSTR:CL.NTR-PRC REL just MOD tin
di' loy rey oro:-te
 REL NEG.SUB MOD gold-NMZ.ADJ
 'earrings that are just (of) tin, that are not (of) gold' [EAO Aros II 055]

(83) *asko loy jayaw-te n-as da' dewaj-na-wa=n*
 PRO.N.AB NEG.SUB nice-NMZ.ADJ OBL-ART.N DUR.NSTD see-DR-NMZ.EVT=2
 'That's not nice when we see (that).'

Thus, both in headed relative clauses and in the pronominal construction, nouns can be considered subordinate nominal predicates, and there is no syntactic difference between verbs and nouns in these environments.

7 Conclusion

The main outcome of this study is that in Movima, the predicate is always the first syntactic constituent of a clause. It can be a verb, a noun, or some other element (demonstrative, personal pronoun, locative adverb, copula), provided it can appear as the derived predicate of

an embedded clause. Possessed and proper nouns do usually not occur in this position, so that predicate nominals basically express categorization and property.

The diagnostic for identifying a predicate is the form the word takes in embedded (complement, adverbial and negated) clauses: the element that is overtly derived in these constructions is the predicate. The way in which it is derived identifies it either as a verb (suffix *-wa*), as a noun (reduplication), or as a member of a third, closed word class (suffix *-niwa*).

By identifying predicates through their marking patterns in embedded clauses, it turns out that Movima has no syntactic argument slot preceding the predicate. That is, there is no clause-initial “marked-topic position”. Rather, the construction in which a free pronoun precedes a content word is a complex construction consisting of a pronominal main-clause predicate followed by a syntactically subordinate element (verb, noun, or adverbial clause). This pronominal construction is the only construction that can form an identificational clause with possessed or proper nouns, which do not (or only exceptionally) occur in main-clause predicate position.

Thus, the clause-initial position is a marker of predicativity in Movima: any element that can be the overtly derived predicate of an embedded clause (i.e. a noun, verb, or pronoun) is a main-clause predicate if placed in clause-initial position; nouns or verbs occurring after this position are subordinate predicates with a relative clause status. A content word, therefore, loses its main-clause predicate status as soon as it is preceded by a personal pronoun (or, for that matter, by any referring unit representing its external argument: an RP in the case of a headed relative clause, and a determiner in the case of an NP, a structure not discussed here; see Haude to appear *b*).

References

- Haude, Katharina. 2006. A Grammar of Movima. Doctoral diss., Radboud University Nijmegen. (http://webdoc.ubn.ru.nl/mono/h/haude_k/gramofmo.pdf)
- Haude, Katharina. 2009a. “Hierarchical alignment in Movima.” *International Journal of American Linguistics* 75(4): 513–532.
- Haude, Katharina. 2009b. “Reference and predication in Movima.” In *New Challenges in Typology: Transcending the Borders and Refining the Distinctions*, Epps, Patience and

- Alexandre Arkhipov (eds), 323–342. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter [=Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs, 217].
- Haude, Katharina. 2010. “The intransitive basis of Movima clause structure.” In *Ergativity in Amazonia*, Gildea, Spike and Francesc Queixalós (eds), 285–315. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins [Typological Studies in Language, 89].
- Haude, Katharina. 2011. “Referring to states and events: subordination in Movima.” In *Subordination in South American Languages*, van Gijn, Rik, Katharina Haude, and Pieter Muysken (eds), 141–168. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins [=Typological Studies in Language, 97].
- Haude, Katharina. 2012a. “Saillance inhérente et saillance discursive en movima”. *Faits de Langues* 39: 169–180.
- Haude, Katharina. 2012b. “Undergoer orientation in Movima.” In *Ergativity, Valency and Voice*, Authier, Gilles and Katharina Haude (eds), 259–288. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. [= Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 48].
- Haude, Katharina. 2014a. “Reduplication in Movima: a prosodic morphology approach.” In *Reduplication in South American Languages*, van der Voort, Hein and Gale Goodwin Gomez (eds), 343–373. Amsterdam: Brill.
- Haude, Katharina. 2014b. “Animacy and inverse voice in Movima: a corpus study.” *Anthropological Linguistics* 56(3–4): 294–314.
- Haude, Katharina. To appear a. “Grammatical relations in Movima: alignment beyond semantic roles.” In *Handbook of Grammatical Relations* (working title), Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena, and Balthasar Bickel (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Haude, Katharina. 2018. “Clefting for topicalization? Analyzing clause-initial pronouns in Movima.” In *Information structure in lesser-described languages: Studies in prosody and syntax*, Adamou, Evangelia, Katharina Haude, and Martine Vanhove (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins [= Studies in Language Companion Series].
- Haude, Katharina. To appear b. “From predication to reference in Movima.” In *Individuation et référence nominale à travers les langues*, Bonnot, Christine, Outi Duvallon et Hélène de Penanros (eds.), Paris: Presses de l’INaLCO.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shank, Scott. 2003. A preliminary semantics for pronominal predicates. *Working Papers for the 38th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages*: 215–236.

Symbols and abbreviations

=	internal cliticization
--	external cliticization
~	reduplication
< >	infixation
1, 2, 3	first, second, third person
A	agent-like argument of a transitive predicate
AB	absential
ABS	absolute state
ABSTR	abstract
ADJ	adjective
AGT	agentive
APPL	applicative
ART	article
BDP	bodily process
CAUS	causative
CAUS.INV	causative-inverse
CL	classifier
D	dummy
DEM	demonstrative
DET	determiner
DETR	detransitivizer
DR	direct
DR2	“direct 2”
DSC	discontinuous
DUR	durative
EV	evidential
EVT	event
F	feminine
HAB	habitual
INAL	inalienable

INSTR	instrumental
INTR	intransitive
INV	inverse
LV	linking vowel
MD	middle voice
MLT	multiple event
MOD	modal
MOV	moving
N	neuter
NEG	negator
NMZ	nominalizer
NSTD	nonstanding
NTR	neutral
OBL	oblique
OBV	obviative
P	patient-like argument of a transitive predicate
PL	plural
POSSPRED	possessive predication
PRC	process
PRO	free personal pronoun
PST	past
REAS	reason
RED	reduplication
REL	relativizer
R/R	reflexive/reciprocal
S	single argument of intransitive predicate
SAP	speech-act participant
SG	singular
ST	state
SUB	of subordination
VBZ	verbalizer