



**HAL**  
open science

# Grammatical relations in Movima: Alignment beyond semantic roles

Katharina Haude

► **To cite this version:**

Katharina Haude. Grammatical relations in Movima: Alignment beyond semantic roles. Alena Witzlack-Makarevich; Balthasar Bickel. Argument selectors: New perspectives on grammatical relations, 123, Benjamins, pp.213 - 256, 2019, Typological Studies in Language, 9789027202024. halshs-02049736

**HAL Id: halshs-02049736**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02049736>**

Submitted on 26 Feb 2019

**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.

# Grammatical relations in Movima: Alignment beyond semantic roles

Katharina Haude, CNRS (SeDyL)

Pre-final version (Feb. 2018) : Please refer to published version for citation

To appear in: *Argument selectors: New perspectives on grammatical relations*, 213-256. [Typological Studies in Language 123]. Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena and Balthasar Bickel (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

## 1 Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Movima is a genealogically isolated language of the Southwestern Amazon, spoken by a few hundred adults in North-Central Bolivia, and was first comprehensively described in Haude (2006).

Movima contributes challenging facts to the typological discussion of grammatical relations. As will be shown in this paper, there is clear evidence for grammatical relations in Movima. Formal marking of both the predicate and the arguments indicate the relation between the clausal elements, and there is a coding asymmetry: One argument of a transitive clause shares the formal properties of the single argument of an intransitive clause, and it is syntactically privileged in a number of grammatical constructions. However, this argument does not have the semantic and pragmatic properties that are cross-linguistically common of privileged arguments, such as topicality and agency: It is the argument whose referent is low in discourse topicality, and usually a patient. In this way, Movima comes close to a syntactically ergative language such as Dyirbal (see Dixon 1972), while sharing properties of

---

<sup>1</sup> Several research institutions and programmes have made possible the research on which this article is based: My home institution SeDyL (CNRS–INALCO–IRD); the programme *Investissements d’Avenir* overseen by the French National Research Agency, ANR-10-LABX-0083 (Labex EFL/GD1); the ANR-funded project *Cortypo* (ANR-12-BSH2-0011). The data were collected during the Movima documentation project (DOBES, Volkswagen Foundation, Az. II-81914/54349) and the project *Referential Hierarchies in Morphosyntax* of the EuroBABEL/EuroCores programme (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft HA-5910/1-1). The specific annotation of three-participant events in the Movima corpus, which shed new light on the potential argument status of an oblique-marked RP, was carried out thanks to the DOBES project *The expression of three-participant events in a cross-linguistic perspective* (Volkswagen Foundation, Az. II-86740). The colloquium of Area B of the CRC 1252 *Prominence in Language* provided insights into the role of the agency in argument encoding. I wish to thank the Movima speakers who provided the data presented here for their willingness to share their knowledge with me. The editors of this volume are thanked for their detailed, helpful, and sometimes challenging remarks on a previous version of this paper. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for all remaining errors and shortcomings.

symmetrical-voice systems such as Tagalog (see Foley 1998, Himmelmann 2005). At the same time, Movima differs from both these languages because its basis is formed by a direct-inverse system: A transitive verb receives morphological marking – either “direct” or “inverse” – to indicate the semantic roles A vs. P/G/T of its arguments. In contrast to other languages that are known to have such systems (e.g. Algonquian languages), however, Movima core arguments are not expressed by verbal affixes, but by clausal constituents.

This paper is organized as follows. The structure of basic clauses is described in Section 2, including an outline of the direct-inverse system that determines the structure of transitive clauses (2.1) and a description of how the “internal” vs. “external” position of nominal constituents distinguishes clausal arguments (2.2). It furthermore introduces oblique-marked constituents (2.3) as well as embedded (i.e. complement and adverbial) clauses (2.4). Section 3 shows that the argument expressed in the external constituent position has exclusive access to constructions involving relativization, as is apparent from the fact that a detransitivizing operation is necessary to relativize the internal argument. The different types of so-called relative constructions include headed relative clauses (3.1), “verbal RPs” (3.2), and clefts (3.3). Relativization is used, among other things, in the formation of *wh*-questions, whose main predicate is the question word (3.4). Relative constructions are the only constructions that allow the encoding of an event participant as an additional core argument, which is not possible in basic clauses (3.5); this is the case with some verbs whose semantic valency exceeds their syntactic transitivity (3.5.1) and with predicates that are overtly nominalized with an “applicative” morpheme (3.5.2). Other constructions that are restricted to the external argument include clauses with a fronted demonstrative (Section 3.6) and argument incorporation (Section 3.7). Argument incorporation is restricted to the P argument and therefore determined not by syntax alone, but also by semantics; however, an incorporating verb must be marked as direct, since only an external argument can be incorporated. The incorporation of a patient expressed as the internal argument of an inverse-marked verb – which would show that argument incorporation is determined by semantic role alone – is grammatically impossible.

The few constructions that select an argument on the basis of its semantic role are treated in Section 4. They include possessor ascension (4.1), which is restricted to patients, but not necessarily to the external argument, and imperatives (4.2), which show a bias towards the A argument. Section 5 describes some constructions that are typically cited as argument selectors in other languages, but which do not seem to have this property in Movima. These include reflexives, which are intransitive verb forms (5.1), coordination, which is neutral with

respect to which argument can be deleted (5.2), embedded clauses, whose arguments are not retrieved from the main clause (5.3), and quantifier floating, which seems to show a bias towards S and P, but is not restricted to these relations (5.4). Conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

The annotated corpus on which the present study is based consists of approximately 130,000 words (30 hours) collected in the field from approximately 50 speakers between 2001 and 2012.<sup>2</sup>

## 2 The basic clause and its components

### 2.1 The direct-inverse system

Movima is a language with a direct-inverse system: Bivalent verbs receive morphological marking – either “direct” or “inverse” – indicating the semantic roles A vs. P/G/T of the nominal arguments. There is neither person-indexing morphology on the verb nor case marking distinguishing the two arguments of transitive clauses. Movima argument encoding is best described in terms of constituency: One argument of the transitive clause is encoded by a constituent internal to the predicate phrase and the other one is encoded by a constituent external to the predicate phrase. The predicate phrase occupies the first position in a pragmatically unmarked (i.e. “basic”) clause. A first illustration of transitive clauses and the direct/inverse alternation is given in (1), with square brackets indicating the constituent structure. Here, the internal constituent is a cliticized pronoun and the external constituent is a referential phrase (RP), consisting of a determiner and a content word. In (1)a, the direct marker on the verb indicates that the predicate-internal constituent (the bound pronoun =*as*) represents A and the external constituent P (*os nołkwa*); in (1)b, by contrast, the inverse marker on the verb indicates the reversed situation, where the internal constituent (the bound pronoun = *'ne*) represents P and the external constituent A (*is ka:wup*).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Except where indicated otherwise, all examples in this paper stem from spontaneous discourse; most of the sources can be accessed in The Language Archive (<https://corpus1.mpi.nl/ds/asv/?1>). The English translations are context-based and/or follow the Spanish translations provided by Movima native speakers.

<sup>3</sup> The inverse construction can usually be translated by an English passive, which illustrates its pragmatic effect rather well. However, throughout this paper, the inverse is translated in the English active voice to reflect the transitivity and non-derived nature of the construction.



to encode A in the internal position, so that the direct construction can be considered the default pattern.

Table 2. The assignment of argument positions in Movima transitive clauses (“<” and “>” stand for “higher” vs. “lower” in the referential hierarchy)

<b>internal</b>	<b>external</b>
1SG/PL	2PL, 3
2SG/PL	3
3 [< animate]	3 [> animate]
3 [< topical]	3 [> topical]

The choice of the terms “direct” and “inverse” is based on the assumption that the starting point from which an action is carried out, as well as the viewpoint from which it is presented, is typically the event participant that ranks higher in terms of person, animacy, and topicality (see DeLancey 1981; Silverstein 1976); therefore, a construction expressing this scenario is called “direct”, whereas an action that goes against this pattern is seen as an inversion of this direction, hence the term “inverse”.

Since the internal argument of a transitive predicate encodes participants high in the referential hierarchy, it is not surprising that this argument is usually expressed as a pronoun (see Haude 2014). The following examples, which contain short chunks of discourse consisting of an intransitive clause followed by a transitive one, illustrate the topic-maintaining function of the internal argument. In the direct clause (2), the internal argument (=as) is A, and in the inverse clause (3), the internal argument (again, =as) is P; in both cases, the internal argument cross-refers anaphorically to the S of the intransitive clause.

- (2) *jo'yaj os rulrul, tet-a-poj-a=as lat*  
 arrive ART.N.PST jaguar scare<DR>-CAUS-LV=3N.AB EV  
*os pa:kona:nak*  
 ART.N.PST fox  
 ‘The jaguar arrived, it scared the fox.’ [HRR\_2009\_tape1\_A 017]

- (3) *jayna łat alawni os rey pa:kona:nak [...]*  
 DSC EV freeze ART.N.PST MOD fox  
*che os tuspak łat jayna eney pet-kay-a=as*  
 and ART.N.PST vulture EV DSC FILLER greet-INV-LV=3N.AB  
 ‘The fox, they say, was freezing already [...], and the vulture then spoke to it.’<sup>5</sup>  
 [HRR\_2009\_tape1\_B 157f.]

## 2.2 Formal properties of argument encoding

The internal and external argument positions are formally distinguished not only by their relative linear proximity to the predicate, but also by their morpho-phonological attachment to the predicate, as well as by their ability to remain unexpressed or to “move”.

The coding of the internal argument involves so-called “internal cliticization” (Haude 2006: 97-101), which creates a prosodic word with penultimate stress, but without the usual penultimate vowel lengthening, and which requires the insertion of an epenthetic vowel *-a* on consonant-final hosts. Both determiners and bound pronouns can be encliticized in this way; example (4) illustrates the internal cliticization of an article (= *kus*; for pronouns, see (1)-(3) above). Since determiners form a syntactic unit with the subsequent content word, I take their phonological encliticization as evidence of the predicate-internal syntactic status of the entire RP.

- (4) [*mas-na=kus itila:kwa*] [*kinos alwaj-a=us*]  
 beat-DR=ART.M.AB man ART.F.AB spouse-LV=3M.AB  
 ‘The man beat his wife.’ [JGD\_130907-13 209]

As is illustrated by (4) as well, the encoding properties of the internal argument are identical to those of an adnominal possessor (= *us* in (4)), which is expressed by the same morphemes as arguments and also internally cliticized. However, nouns can receive an internal enclitic without containing any particular morphological marker (see e.g. *alwaj* in (4)), whereas a main-clause verbal predicate must contain a direct or inverse marker to receive an internal clitic. Therefore, the ability to take an internal enclitic without being marked as direct or inverse is an important criterion for identifying a noun in Movima.

<sup>5</sup> Clauses with an initial RP, usually representing the external argument, have not been conclusively analyzed yet and will not be discussed in the present study.

An RP representing the external argument does not show cliticization of the article, as can be observed in all the examples given above. Cliticization only takes place when the external argument is expressed by a bound pronoun. In that case, the pronoun is attached through “external cliticization” (represented by a double hyphen, “--”; see Haude 2006: 101-103). This type of cliticization involves no stress shift and is characterized by resyllabification with a host-final consonant – in (5), the second-person internal enclitic =*n* – which forms the syllable onset of the encliticized morpheme.

- (5) *kat-a-tɛ=n--is*                      *no-kos*                      *ma:ma=is*  
 break-LV-CO=2-3PL.AB    OBL-ART.N.AB    mother\_of=3PL.AB  
 ‘You break them off their mother (plant).’                      [NCG Chorankwanto\_006]

Externally cliticized third-person pronouns are preceded by a *k-* when they follow a third-person or 1PL exclusive pronoun in a transitive clause, as in (6). I analyze this form as a redundant “obviative” marker (marking a less topical third person), since it only occurs when the internal argument is or includes a third person as well.

- (6) *jayna joy-a-tɛ=is--k-isne*  
 DSC    go-LV-CO=3PL.AB--OBV-3F.AB  
 ‘Then they took her (with them).’                      [JGD\_160808-Fundacion 387]

In contrast to the internal argument, the external argument can remain unexpressed. This can happen when its referent can be deduced from the context, as in (7), where the referent (*is manka*) was mentioned just before.

- (7) *ɛt-ka-cho-na=is*                      *is*                      *manka,*                      *jom<a>ni=is*  
 chew-MLT-CLF.inside-DR=3PL.AB    ART.PL    mango    devour<DR>=3PL.AB  
 ‘They chewed the mangos from inside, they devoured (them).’  
 [EAO Wo’ray 008]

The properties of the internal and the external argument are summed up in Table 3.



Table 3. Properties of the internal and the external argument of a transitive clause

<b>internal</b>	<b>external</b>
Directly follows the predicate	Occurs after the internal argument
Internal cliticization ( = ): stress shift; epenthetic /a/	External cliticization ( -- ): no stress shift; resyllabification
Pronouns and determiners are cliticized	Only pronouns are cliticized
Obligatorily realized (=Ø ‘1SG’)	Not obligatorily realized
Referentially “high” (SAP, animate and/or topical third person)	Referentially “low” (lower-ranking animate, inanimate, or nontopical third person)
A of direct, P/G/T of inverse predicate	P/G/T of direct, A of inverse predicate
Identical with nominal possessor	Identical with S

The sole argument of an intransitive predicate, S, is encoded as an external constituent (see Haude 2009a, 2010b): When represented by an RP, the article is not cliticized to the predicate (8), and the argument is not obligatorily expressed (9). When S is a bound pronoun, the pronoun is attached to the predicate through external cliticization (10).

(8) *jayna a:mon lat isnos majniwa=us*  
 DSC enter EV ART.F.PST offspring\_of=3M.AB  
 ‘Then his daughter entered.’ [HRR\_120808-tigregente 620]

(9) *a:mon n-os ney n-as du~<du:~>duk=Ø*  
 enter OBL-ART.N.PST here OBL-ART.N RED~<INAL~>back=1SG  
 ‘(It) entered here at my back.’ [EAO araña 002]

(10) *jayna a:mon--us no-kos ro:ya*  
 DSC enter.MD--3M.AB OBL-ART.N.AB house  
 ‘Then he goes into the house.’ [ERM\_140806\_2 143]

The external pronoun can occur with the “obviative” marker *k-* (see (6) above) as well; however, this is only the case when the predicate is a demonstrative adverb, as in (11).



from that of an external argument of an intransitive clause, as can be seen in Table 4 (see also Haude 2011b).

Table 4. SAP pronouns

	free pronouns	internal		external (of intransitive)		external (of transitive)
		proclitic (optional)	enclitic	proclitic (optional)	enclitic	enclitic
1SG	<i>inla</i>	<i>(i)t</i>	= $\emptyset$	<i>(i)t</i>	–	–
2SG	<i>ulkwat</i>	–	= <i>n</i>	<i>(i)s</i>	–	–
1+2	<i>i:de</i>	<i>(i)t</i>	= <i>n</i>	<i>(i)t</i>	–	–
1PL	<i>iy’li</i>	<i>(i)t</i>	= <i>y’li</i>	<i>(i)t</i>	--( <i>i</i> ) <i>y’li</i>	–
2PL	<i>iy’bikwet</i>	–	= <i>n-kwet</i>	<i>(i)s</i>	--( <i>i</i> ) <i>y’bi</i>	--( <i>i</i> ) <i>y’bi</i>

Of all SAPs, only the second person plural can be encoded as the external argument of a transitive clause. This is the case when it cooccurs with a 1SG internal argument (zero-encoded). In the below examples it can be seen that the externally cliticized form --*y’bi* occurs as S (12), as P of the direct (13), and as A of the inverse clause (14):

(12) *ji<wa:~>wa--y’bi n-as piyesta*  
 come<MD~>--2PL OBL-ART.N fiesta  
 ‘You (pl.) came to the *fiesta*.’ [CVM\_020906\_1 207]

(13) *jayna ona-ye:-na= $\emptyset$ --y’bi*  
 DSC know-CLF.person-DR=1SG--2PL  
 ‘I already know you (pl.).’ [CVM\_020906\_1 317]

(14) *che rey iy’bi jayna ona-ye:-kay= $\emptyset$ --iy’bi*  
 and MOD PRO.2PL DSC know-CLF.person-INV=1SG--2PL  
 ‘And you (pl.), you know me, too.’ [CVM\_020906\_1 318]

When 2PL is the internal argument of a transitive predicate, it is encoded by a different form, =*n-kwet*. This is a combination of the second-person enclitic =*n* and the final segment of the 2PL free pronoun *iy’bikwet*, which also occurs on plural imperatives (see 4.2).

(15) *jayna ona-ra-na=n-kwet*  
 DSC know-CLF.NTR-DR=2-2PL  
 ‘You (pl.) already know (it).’ [GCM\_290806\_1 161]

(16) *ju:-kay-a=n-kwet*  
 scold-INV-LV=2-2PL  
 ‘(They) scold you (pl.).’ [CCT\_120907\_2 205]

Thus, while the set of SAP pronouns on the whole does not provide much evidence for the existence of a single argument position shared by transitive and intransitive clauses, the difference in form of the second person plural – one form for the internal and a different form for the external argument of both transitive and intransitive predicates – is a confirmation of the pattern.

### 2.3 Obliques: adjuncts or oblique arguments?

In addition to the core arguments, a clause can contain an unlimited number of oblique-marked constituents (RPs or free pronouns; henceforth termed “obliques”), which usually occur either before or after the clausal core. They are marked by the prefix *n(V)-*, which attaches to referential elements (free pronouns, demonstratives, articles). The presence of an oblique constituent is never grammatically obligatory, and obliques are not restricted to any clause type. The semantic role of an oblique-marked RP is specified by lexical semantics and context, and not directly by the valency of a verb. Therefore, in basic clauses, there is no distinction between oblique arguments and adjuncts. (It will be shown in 3.5, however, that with a small number of verbs, whose valency exceeds their syntactic transitivity in basic clauses, oblique constituents can be relativized, in which case they are treated like an additional external argument.)

Obliques can encode all kinds of non-agent event participants or circumstances: locations, comitatives, purposes, reasons, patients, possessors, etc. The oblique RP in (17), for instance, refers to a location, and the oblique RP in (18) refers to a point in time;<sup>6</sup> the comitative function is illustrated in (19).

---

<sup>6</sup> In temporal RPs, the different forms of the neuter article indicate nonpast (*as*), hodiernal past (*kos*) and hesternal past (*os*). The same is the case with complement and adverbial clauses (see Haude 2010a).

(17) *loy it joy-chet nosdé, lat jankwa=us, joy-chet n-as lo:los*  
 ITN 1.INTR go-R/R over\_there EV said=3M.AB go-R/R OBL-ART.N village  
 ‘I’ll go over there, he said, (I)’ll go to the village.’ [EAO Alcanzar 014]

(18) *jayna joy-chet n-as tawakni, joy-chet rey*  
 DSC go-R/R OBL-ART.N next\_day go-R/R MOD  
 ‘Then (you) go the next day, (you) go again.’ [EAO Chaco I 042]

(19) *nokwa loy joy-chet nu-kulre’, jankwa=Ø*  
 right\_now ITN go-R/R OBL-DEM.M.STD.DIST say=1SG  
 ‘Now (I)’ll go with that (man standing at a distance), I said.’ [GCM\_290806\_5 077]

Example (20) illustrates oblique marking on an adverbial purpose clause (which contains a nominalized intransitive predicate, *baye-wa* ‘hunting’; see 2.4) and, inside the adverbial clause, another oblique RP denoting the patient of the embedded event.

(20) *joy-chet--iy’li n-os chot baye-wa=y’li n-is dawjes*  
 go-R/R--1PL OBL-ART.N.PST HAB hunt-NMZ.EVT=1PL OBL-ART.PL deer  
 ‘We always went to hunt deer.’ [EAO Cazando 002]

As can be seen in some of the above examples, no formal distinction can be made between those obliques that represent an adjunct and those that might be considered a semantic argument of the verb, such as the goal of a verb of directed motion. Even though the locative function, as in (17), is particularly common with a motion verb like *joy-chet* ‘go’, examples (18)–(20) have already shown that not every oblique RP combined with a motion verb denotes a location: The interpretation depends on the meaning of the noun and on the context. For instance, in (21), the oblique-marked RP following the intransitive verb *ba:yet* ‘hunt’, which can be considered semantically bivalent, refers to a location, in contrast to (20) above, where the oblique RP refers to the patient.

(21) *che ba:yet--is jema’ n-as chapmo*  
 and hunt--3PL.AB also OBL-ART.N bush  
 ‘And they hunted in the forest, too.’ [ERM\_140806\_1 0468]

To further illustrate this point, consider the verb *kaykay* ‘eat’, which, like *bayeṭ* ‘hunt’, is syntactically intransitive, although it may be considered semantically bivalent. In (22), the oblique-marked RP represents the patient.

- (22) *jayna kay~kay--is n-is is~'is-ra*  
 DSC MD~eat--3PL.AB OBL-ART.PL RED~roast-CLF.meat  
 ‘Then they ate roasted meat.’ [HRR\_120808-tigrege 548]

Of the 74 instances of the verb *kaykay* ‘eat’ in the corpus (excluding nominalized and other morphologically derived forms), only 25 are accompanied by an oblique RP. Of these obliques, 18 represent the patient, while the remaining seven represent some other event participant or circumstance. Hence, the correct interpretation of the oblique-marked RP depends to a large extent on the context. Consider the following examples. In (23), the oblique-marked RP (*nokos pamban*) does not represent the patient. The preceding sentence tells us that what is eaten is an *egg*, while the oblique-marked RP following the verb *kaykay* denotes something that *accompanies* the egg, as indicated by the relative clause (*di' sekema*).

- (23) *di:ra dej-na=n kos da' joṭ-kwa che da'*  
 at\_least cook-DR=2 ART.N.AB DUR.NSTD egg-ABS and DUR.NSTD  
*is kay~kay no-kos pamba=n di' sekema=n*  
 2 MD~eat OBL-ART.N.AB bread=2 REL side\_dish=2  
 ‘At least you cook an egg and you eat (it) with your bread as side dish.’  
 [ERM\_140806\_2 155]

Similarly, in (24), the context leaves no doubt that the woman eats *together* with her husband, but not that she eats her husband, which would be the interpretation if the oblique constituent in a clause with a semantically bivalent intransitive verb automatically encoded the patient of the verb.

- (24) *kidé da' kay~kay jayna n-us alwaj-a='ne*  
 DEM.F.NSTD DUR.NSTD MD~eat DSC OBL-ART.M spouse-LV=3F  
 ‘She is now eating with her husband.’ [EAO Neighbours 009]

In (25), on the other hand, it follows from the larger (extralinguistic) context that the ‘mud’ referred to by the oblique-marked RP is the thing eaten, and not that something is eaten *in* the mud – even though the latter might be a likely interpretation if the clause were taken in isolation. Thus, an oblique nominal constituent in a clause headed by a semantically bivalent, but syntactically intransitive verb, is not an argument. It *can* denote the patient, but it does not necessarily do so.

- (25) *ena’ toł kay~kay n-is bu~but-kwa*  
 DUR.STD EMPH MD~eat OBL-ART.PL RED~mud-ABS  
 ‘(She) is eating mud.’ (‘Mud’ is used here humoristically to refer to dark-coloured manioc mass.) [JAO Tuncho 025]

Another case where an oblique might be expected to represent an argument concerns clauses that have undergone the detransitivizing operation (see 3.1), after which the external argument of a formerly transitive predicate can only be expressed by an oblique RP. In the vast majority of cases, an oblique RP in these constructions indeed represents P (or G or T), i.e., a semantic argument, as in (26). However, example (27) shows that also a different role – here, an instrument – can be expressed in this way; as in the examples above, the correct interpretation follows from context and/or world knowledge (this is not about “buying money”, but about buying something *with* money). (On the structure of this sentence type, see 3.3.)

- (26) *isko kwey rimet-na n-os kay-wanra*  
 PRO.3PL.AB DETR buy-DR OBL-ART.N.PST eat-INSTR:CLF.NTR  
 ‘They were the ones who had bought the food.’ [EAO Llamada hija 029]

- (27) *isko kwey rimet-na n-os polata=is*  
 PRO.3PL.AB DETR buy-DR OBL-ART.N.PST money=ART.PL.AB  
*kompanye:ra=sne*  
 friend=3F.AB  
 ‘They were the ones who had bought (the food) with her friends’ money.’  
 [EAO Llamada hija 028]





Indirective three-participant verbs are not easily found with an overtly encoded G participant (unless G is a location, see (36) below). The example of a direct-marked verb in (32) shows G encoded as the possessor (*us nonok*) of the T argument; in (33), which contains the inverse form of an indirective verb, G is not overtly encoded at all.

(32) *jayna chot doj<a:>te=∅ os organo=us nonok=∅*  
 DSC HAB steal<DR>=1SG ART.N.PST harmonica=ART.M grandparent=1SG  
 ‘Then I always stole my grandfather’s harmonica.’ [EAO Organ 007]

(33) *di’ joy jayna ja’ um-me-te-kay-a=n us pa:pa=n*  
 HYP DUB DSC just send-CLF.person-CO-INV-LV=2 ART.M father\_of=2  
 ‘if maybe your father just offered you (as a wife) ...’ [JAO Jovina 002]

Similarly to semantically bivalent intransitive verbs, like *ba:yeł* ‘hunt’ and *kaykay* ‘eat’, also in the case of semantically trivalent verbs, the oblique-marked constituent does not necessarily represent a semantic argument. This is illustrated by (34) and (35). Consider first (34), which contains an oblique RP representing the theme of the verb *kayapoj* ‘feed’ (the external argument encoding G is unexpressed here.)

(34) *kay-a:-poj=∅ n-is maropa*  
 eat-DR-CAUS=1SG OBL-ART.PL papaya  
 ‘I fed (him) papaya.’ [EAO\_240807\_vbr 189]

In (35), by contrast (which describes a scene from a story of a jaguar and a fox, which are both feeding on the same prey animal), the oblique RP might be interpreted as the theme as well; however, it can also be interpreted as referring to the location where the fox starts eating – and in fact, this latter interpretation corresponds to the translation provided by the speaker.



possessed in this way (see e.g. (4) in 2.2). An intransitive complement clause (in square brackets) is shown in (38).

- (38) *yey-na='ne* [*as joy-wa='ne*]  
 want-DR=3F ART.N go-NMZ.EVT=3F  
 ‘She wants to go (lit. She wants her going).’ [EAO Asilo 035]

The arguments of transitive embedded clauses are encoded in the same way as in transitive main clauses. Example (39) shows an adverbial clause with a direct-marked transitive predicate whose arguments are both overtly expressed; (40) shows an inverse complement clause (the direct and inverse morphemes are represented by the reduplicative allomorphs CV~ and CVC~, respectively, on these derived forms; see Haude 2006: 360-365).

- (39) *n-os jayna ve~vel-wa=is os bebetkwa*  
 OBL-ART.N.PST DSC DR~watch-NMZ.EVT=3PL.AB ART.N.PST skin  
 ‘when they were taking care of the hide’ [HRR\_120808-tigregente 692]

- (40) *yey-na=∅ os vel~vel-wa=∅--us*  
 want-DR=1SG ART.N.PST INV~watch-NMZ.EVT=1SG--3M.AB  
 ‘I wanted him to have a look at me.’ [EAO\_120906\_3 013]

The fact that the S argument of an embedded intransitive predicate is encoded like a possessor, i.e. like the internal argument of a transitive predicate, means that the alignment split seen in basic main clauses is reversed here: Embedded direct predicates pattern accusatively (i.e. {S, A}), while embedded inverse predicates pattern ergatively (i.e. {S, P/G/T}).

### 3 Argument selectors privileging the external argument

There is one family of constructions in Movima that can only be accessed by the external argument, i.e. by {S, P/G/T} in the case of a direct-marked predicate and by {S, A} in the case of an inverse-marked predicate. They can be characterized in terms of relativization, as defined by Bickel (2011: 428): “Relative constructions turn a propositional expression into a referential one, for example, a clause like *he read it* into *the one he read*. The referent of the

expression is thereby chosen among the arguments and adjuncts of the clause ....” The Movima constructions in point will be referred to as headed relative clauses (3.1), verbal RPs (3.2), and syntactic clefts (3.3).<sup>7</sup> Wh-questions, which are also restricted to the external argument, involve relativization as well (3.4). Furthermore, as was hinted at in 2.3, the ability to be relativized can be taken as evidence of the argument status of an oblique-marked element (3.5); this is the case with some verbs whose semantic valency exceeds their syntactic transitivity (3.5.1) and with an “applicative” nominalization that enables the relativization of a former non-argument (3.5.2).

Formally, all Movima relative constructions have three traits in common: a) the relativized argument is expressed before the relative clause and is “gapped” inside it; b) to relativize an internal argument, the predicate must undergo a detransitivizing operation; c) relative clauses are negated in a way different from main-clause negation. These properties are described in detail in the following subsection on headed relative clauses (3.1), and are subsequently illustrated for each of the other constructions in their respective subsections.

### 3.1 Headed relative clauses, detransitivization, and negation

Headed relative clauses are introduced by the particle *di'* and follow the noun they modify. Only the external argument of the relative clause can function as the head, and it may not be expressed again inside the relative clause. Accordingly, an intransitive relative clause, illustrated in (41), does not contain an overt core argument (square brackets mark the relative clause in the present section; they do not include the relativizing particle, which is considered the subordinating element).

- (41) *oso' os [...] merek ko' di' [tok~tok]*  
 DEM.N.PST ART.N.PST big tree REL MD~fall  
 ‘There was a [...] big tree that had fallen over.’ [EAO\_tigreyperro\_150808 070]

Since only an external argument can be relativized, the head of a transitive relative clause represents P when the predicate is marked as direct (42), and A when the predicate is marked as inverse (43).

---

<sup>7</sup> The term “relativization” is not entirely adequate for the constructions described here, since, for instance, no finiteness is involved. In fact, the constructions simply consist of a content word preceded by a referring expression whose referent is characterized by the content word. For the present purpose, however, the term seems appropriate, since relativization is a typologically well-established argument selector.

(42) *kawra as ti:viɟ di' [jiwa-ɫe-na=as powmuj]*  
 much ART.N pain REL come-CO-DR=ART.3N wind  
 'The wind brings a lot of pain (lit. A lot (is) the pain that the wind brings).'

[JGD\_160808-Fundacion 422]

(43) *kiro' kis senyo:ra di' [vel-kay-a=sne]*  
 DEM.PL.AB ART.PL.AB lady REL watch-INV-LV=3F.AB

'There are ladies who look after her.'

[Asilo 004]

To relativize the participant that is encoded as the internal argument of a basic transitive clause, a detransitivizing operation has to be used – an operation that only occurs in relative constructions, but is absent from main clauses. The detransitivization is brought about by the particle *kaw* (or *kwey*, depending on the speaker) placed before the predicate. The predicate, while retaining its transitivity marker (direct or inverse), becomes syntactically intransitive, which means that it cannot take an internal enclitic anymore. The former internal argument is thus S of the now intransitive predicate and hence relativizable, while the former external argument is expressed as an oblique if expressed at all. Example (44)a illustrates a basic direct transitive clause with A as internal and P as external argument; (44)b shows the same direct-marked verb in a detransitivized relative clause, where A has become as S and P is encoded as oblique.<sup>8</sup>

(44) a. *joy-a-ɫe=is buka' is o:ro*  
 go-DR-CO=3PL.AB DUR.MOV ART.PL gold

'They brought gold.'

[Abuelo 025]

b. *is buka' itila:kwa di' [kaw joy-a:-ɫe n-is ...]*  
 ART.PL DUR.MOV man REL DETR go-DR-CO OBL-ART.PL

*ke:so=is]*

cheese=3PL.AB

'the men who were carrying their ... cheese'

[HRR\_2009\_tape1\_B 029]

<sup>8</sup> The detransitivizing operation can also take place with nouns, showing how similar the syntactic properties of nouns and verbs are in Movima (see 3.2).

In the corpus, the detransitivizing operation occurs only with direct-marked verbs, maybe because nearly all relative clauses involve an agent that outranks the patient in the referential hierarchy and because the direct construction, which allows direct relativization of P, is the default (Haude 2014). The operation can therefore be described as an antipassive, promoting A to S and demoting P (or G/T) to oblique. This may lead to the assumption that the underlying syntactic rule for this operation is role-based, favoring P as the privileged argument, as in a syntactically ergative system. However, in elicitation Movima speakers also accept the detransitivizing operation with inverse predicates, where the valency-decreasing operation has a passive effect (i.e. S represents the patient), as in (45).

- (45) *us itila:kwa [di' kwey lap-kay n-os mimi:di]*  
 ART.M man REL DETR bite-INV OBL-ART.N.PST snake  
 'the man who was bitten by the/a snake' [EAO 220807, 20Eli014h]

To sum up, the detransitivizing operation allows the internal argument of a transitive clause to become S of an intransitive clause when this is required for relativization.

Another criterion that distinguishes relative constructions from main clauses is negation marking. Main clause negation is illustrated in (46) with an intransitive clause and in (47) with a transitive clause. Here, the main predicate is the negative copula *ka* with an encliticized determining element, while the lexical predicate is nominalized, just as in embedding (see 2.4).

- (46) *ka=s joy-wa=is*  
 COP.NEG=DET go-NMZ=3PL.AB  
 'They did not go.' [Cabildo 006]

- (47) *ka=s ona-ye-na-wa=i*  
 COP.NEG=DET know-CLF.person-DR-NMZ=3PL  
 'They don't know (him/her/them).' [Summary 007]

Relative clauses, in contrast, are negated with the particle *loy* preceding the predicate. Furthermore, the predicate in this construction is only nominalized if intransitive (and not marked as possessed), as in (48), and retains its form if transitive, as illustrated with the direct-marked verb in (49) and with the inverse-marked verb in (50).

- (48) *kis juyeni di' [loy joy-wa n-as lo:los]*  
 ART.PL.AB person REL NEG.SUB go-NMZ OBL-ART.N village  
 '(the) people who do not go to the village' [AMY\_180806 242]
- (49) *kos juyeni di' [loy ona-ye-na=i]*  
 ART.N.AB person REL NEG.SUB know-CLF.person-DR=3PL  
 'a person whom they do not know' [Erlan Rojas 127]
- (50) *das-na=Ø is ja' wawankwa di' [loy tojet-poj-kay-a=y'ti]*  
 cut-DR=1SG ART.PL just liana REL NEG.SUB get\_by-CAUS-INV-LV=1PL  
 'I cut down the lianas that did not let us get through.' [LYO\_250808 136f.]

Thus, the predicate of a relative clause has the same form as a main-clause predicate, but the impossibility to take an external argument, the ability to be detransitivized and the different negation process show that it has a different, subordinate syntactic status. The same properties apply to the predicates in the constructions described below; the only formal difference between a headed relative clause and the predicates in the constructions below is that the former is introduced by an explicit marker, *di'*, while the latter are not.

### 3.2 Verbal RPs

The content word of an RP (marked by square brackets in the examples below) may be a verb instead of a noun. The result, termed here “verbal RP”, may be described as a “light-headed relative clause” (Citko 2004), whose head is the article alone.<sup>9</sup> The referent of a verbal RP is the event participant that would be encoded as the external argument of the same verb in predicate position. For an intransitive verb, this is S (51); for a transitive direct verb, this is P (52); for a transitive inverse verb, this is A (53). It is quite typical for verbal RPs to occur with nonverbal (i.e. demonstrative, nominal, or adjectival) predicates, as in the examples below (see Haude to appear *a*).

---

<sup>9</sup> In fact, there is not much difference between “verbal RPs” and RPs containing a noun. Also nouns, in any of the constructions described here, can be preceded by the detransitivizing particle, which results in a loss of the potential to be marked as possessed, and the referent of the RP is the possessor; and also a noun inside an RP (or inside any other relative constructions, for that matter) can be negated with the particle *loy*, although examples are rare.





- (56) *sot-ka-ra*            [*os*            *loy*            *ona-ra-na=sne*]  
 other-MLT-CLF.NTR ART.N.PST NEG.SUB know-CLF.NTR-DR=3F.AB  
 ‘(There was) something she did not know (lit. Something [was] the [thing] she did not know).’  
 [Cabildo\_020907 236]

### 3.3 Clefts

The construction discussed here is created by positioning a free pronoun in clause-initial position. From a purely syntactic perspective, the construction may be considered a cleft because it consists of a nonverbal main predicate – a pronoun – and a subordinate lexical predicate – a verb or noun – that has the same properties as the relative clauses described above.<sup>10</sup> Example (57) illustrates this with an intransitive verb, (58) with a direct transitive verb, and (59) with an inverse transitive verb.

- (57) *jayna isko*            *joy-chel nosdé*  
 DSC    PRO.3PL.AB    go-R/R over\_there  
 ‘But these rich people, who had money [...], they were the ones who went there.’  
 [ATL\_230806 312ff.]

- (58) *i’ko*            *yey-na=i*  
 PRO.3PL    want-DR=3PL  
 ‘Those (are what they) want.’  
 [Tolkosya II 004]

- (59) *asko*            *tikoy-kay-a=sne*  
 PRO.3N.AB    kill-INV-LV=3F.AB  
 ‘That (was what) killed her.’  
 [HRR\_120808-tigregente 266]

Evidence that the pronoun is the main-clause predicate in these constructions comes from embedding (see Haude to appear *a*). As was outlined in 2.4, the predicate of an embedded clause is nominalized. In the case of a cleft, it is the pronoun, not the verb, that undergoes nominalization (marked with the suffix *-niwa*, which nominalizes non-content words and does

---

<sup>10</sup> The function of the construction is not that of a canonical cleft, however, since it has a topicalizing rather than a focus-marking effect (Haude to appear *b*).

not trigger possessive marking everywhere). This is illustrated by the complement clause (in square brackets) in (60).<sup>11</sup>

- (60) *bo jayna rey da' ona-ra-na=is [os*  
 REAS DSC MOD DUR.NSTD know-CLF.NTR-DR=3PL.AB ART.N.PST  
*usko-niwa bispa]*  
 PRO.3M.AB-VBZ:NMZ knowledgeable  
 ‘They had already found out that he was (the one who was) knowledgeable.’  
 [PMP\_HRR\_etal\_210908 278]

The lexical predicate has the same properties as in other relative constructions. As in headed relative clauses (3.1) and verbal RPs (3.2), the external argument is gapped (although gapping is less strict here than in the other two constructions; a prosodic analysis is still needed to see if this is a case of right dislocation). Furthermore, the construction undergoes detransitivization when the free pronoun refers to the participant that would be encoded as the internal argument of the corresponding basic clause. This can be seen in (61), where the agent is a human and the patient (represented by an oblique RP) an inanimate entity, a scenario that does not permit the inverse.

- (61) *jayna us ney pa:'i, usko kwey ajkara:-na*  
 DSC ART.M here priest PRO.3M.AB DETR arrange-DR  
*n-is chora:da ja'a*  
 OBL-ART.PL street just  
 ‘Then that priest, he put the streets in order.’  
 [HRR\_120808-tigregente 036]

The negation of the lexical predicate in the cleft construction is carried out in the same way as in headed relative clauses, i.e. with the particle *loy* and the corresponding morphological treatment of the predicate – nonpossessed nominalization of intransitive predicates, as in (62), no modification of transitive predicates (63).

---

<sup>11</sup> The same can be observed in negation (see Haude to appear *a*).

(62) *u'ko loy iwani:-wa*  
 PRO.3M NEG.SUB TALK-NMZ.EVT  
 'He doesn't talk.' [CCT\_120907\_2 104]

(63) *a'ko loy ona-ra-na=Ø*  
 PRO.3N NEG.SUB know-CLF.NTR-DR=1SG  
 'That (is what) I do not know.' [EVM Gringas III 011]

Also the internal argument can occur before the lexical predicate, as in (64) below. This is less common, however, and in elicitation, speakers tend to reject this construction. Furthermore, the construction cannot be analyzed in terms of clefting. It is not found in embedding, so there is no evidence that the free pronoun might be a predicate. There is no gapping involved, since the internal argument is obligatorily repeated by the internal enclitic on the predicate. Detransitivization does not occur with this construction. And last but not least, as shown in (65), the lexical predicate in this construction is negated like a main-clause predicate, i.e. with the negative copula *ka=* and subsequent nominalization (see (46)–(47) above). Thus, an initial free pronoun cross-referencing the internal argument is best described in terms of left dislocation, since it does not have an effect on the structure of the clause.

(64) *usko [...] ji:sa-na=us os nego:siyo*  
 PRO.3M.AB make-DR=3M.AB ART.N.PST trade  
 'He made the deal.' [EAO Abuelo 012]

(65) *isko ka=[s ona-ra-na-wa=is]*  
 PRO.3PL.AB COP.NEG=DET know-CL.NTR-DR-NMZ=3PL.AB  
 'They didn't know (it).' [GCM\_290806\_1 082]

Thus, the external argument can be represented by a free personal pronoun before the lexical predicate, in which case it functions as the main predicate of a cleft construction. When a pronoun cross-referencing the internal argument is placed in initial position, in contrast, this does not have any syntactic effect.



- (69) *téla* [kos tarat-**kay**-a=n-kwet]  
 what\_is ART.N.AB heal-INV-LV=2-2PL  
 ‘What was the (thing that) healed you?’ [ERM\_140806\_1 0938]

When the referent of A is equal or higher in the referential hierarchy than P/G/T, so that it would be encoded as the internal argument of a direct-marked verbal predicate in a basic transitive main clause (70)a, the detransitivizing operation is used (70)b. (Here, the unexpressed P is a ranch, therefore outranked by the human A). Note that, unlike *téla* ‘what’, the question word *e:te* ‘who’ is never followed by an RP, but only by a predicate. I have no explanation for this, but it means that this construction has the structure of a cleft (see 3.3).

- (70) a. *vel-na=as ja’ is pa:ko*  
 watch-DR=3N.AB just ART.PL dog  
 ‘It (the jaguar) just looked at the dogs.’ [HRR\_120808-tigregente 598]
- b. *e:te kaw nokwa vel-na*  
 who\_is DETR FUT watch-DR  
 ‘Who (is the one who) will look after (it)?’ [GBM\_Ganado 050]

Thus, Movima wh-questions select the external argument, irrespective of its semantic role.

### 3.5 Oblique arguments? Evidence from relativization

#### 3.5.1 Relativization of non-core arguments

While in basic clauses, there is no marked difference between adjuncts and oblique arguments (see 2.3), relativization shows that with certain verbs, an event participant encoded as an oblique has the status of an external argument: Here, an event participant that would be expressed as an oblique in the basic clause is represented by a non-oblique free pronoun in clause initial position. This phenomenon can be observed with some verbal lexemes whose semantic valency exceeds their syntactic transitivity. It is found only with a few verbs, notably the intransitive verb *ya:lo:we* ‘drink (sth.)’ and the transitive verb *kayle-* ‘give somebody (sth.)’, and is not systematic even there. However, there is no sign that the

constructions in the examples below are “errors”, since they occurred spontaneously in natural discourse, and some of them repeatedly. Therefore, the cases in point show that there is a possibility, albeit marginal, of obliques to be treated as arguments.

Consider first the verb *ya:lo:we* ‘drink’. This verb is intransitive, and in a basic clause like (71), the agent is expressed as S (--*is*), and the patient is expressed as an oblique (*n-is pokso*). The cleft construction in (72) shows that S (here, the agent) can be relativized, in the same way as with all other intransitive verbs.

(71) *ya:lo:we--is n-is pokso*  
 drink--3PL.AB OBL-ART.PL *chicha*  
 ‘They drank *chicha*.’ [HRR\_120808-tigremente 547]

(72) *ban ja’ usko da’ ya:lo:we*  
 but just PRO.3M.AB DUR.NSTD drink  
 ‘But he was just drinking.’ [ERM\_140806\_1 1068]

However, in the case of *ya:lo:we*, the relativized element can also refer to the patient of the event – which is never the case with other intransitive verbs such as *kaykay* ‘eat’. Consider (73) for a cleft and (74) for a verbal RP.

(73) *ji:sa-na=sne is pokso, isko ya:lo:we*  
 make-DR=3F.AB ART.PL *chicha* PRO.3PL.AB drink  
 ‘She made *chicha*, that was what (she) drank.’ [MCA\_280806\_1 033]

(74) *rimeł-’i [kis ya:lo:we]*  
 buy-RES ART.PL.AB drink  
 ‘The drinks were bought (i.e. not prepared at home).’ [GCM Bacho 082]

Other examples where oblique RPs can be relativized involve verbs with an incorporated argument. As was shown above (2.3, example (28)–(29)); see also Section 3.7 below), these verbs are intransitive, and their patient can only be additionally expressed as an oblique. However, it seems that at least some of them allow the relativization of the patient. (Note that there are only a few examples of incorporating verbs in relative constructions, so it cannot be said how systematic this is.)

Consider example (75). In unmarked transitive constructions, the verb *loja'oj* 'do the laundry' is intransitive according to all criteria (see Haude 2006: 283-284); here, this is evident from the expression of the patient as an oblique. Furthermore, the external argument (S, i.e. the agent) can be clefted, as shown in (76).

(75) *loj-a:-'oj*                      *n-is*                      *do'we-wanra:-ni*  
 wash-DR-CLF.clothes OBL-ART.PL clothes-INSTR-PRC  
 '(I) washed the clothes.' [EAO Cbba 282]

(76) *usko*                      *loj-a:-'oj*  
 PRO.3M.AB wash-DR-CLF.clothes  
 'He was (the one who) did the laundry.' [JGD\_130907 034]

However, a speaker once spontaneously uttered the clause in (77) when noting that someone's laundry had fallen from the clothesline. The correctness of this construction was confirmed later by another Movima speaker. Here, the intransitive verb *loja'oj* 'wash clothes' occurs inside an RP, whose referent should normally be the participant that is coded as the external argument in the predicative use of the verb, i.e. here, the agent. Instead, however, the referent is the patient, which is an oblique in the basic construction (see (75)). The agent is encoded as an internal argument or possessor.

(77) *tat-vo:s-et*                                      [*is*    *loj-a-'oj-a=is*                                      *juyeni*]  
 get\_down-CLF.wood-APPL    ART.PL wash-DR-CLF.clothes-LV=ART.PL person  
 'The people's laundry has fallen down.' [EAO 19, 156]

Finally, a case where an oblique element behaves as an argument is found with the semantically trivalent verb *kayle-* 'give', which is of the secundative type, i.e., with A and G expressed as core arguments and T as oblique (see 2.3). First of all, consider the expected construction, illustrated in (78) with the direct form in a cleft. Here, the initial free pronoun refers to G, which is the external argument of the same predicate in a basic clause (see (30)). A is expressed by the internally cliticized pronoun, and T by an oblique RP.





### 3.5.2 Relativization of applied arguments

Some verbs can receive an applicative suffix that allows them to occur in a relative construction whose head does not represent a core argument.<sup>12</sup> The suffix specifies the semantic role of the relativized element. In contrast to the constructions described in 3.5.1, therefore, the constructions are morphologically complex, but semantically unambiguous.

The forms derived by one of these suffixes receive an internal enclitic also when they do not contain direct/inverse marking. Therefore, the suffixes can be considered nominalizers. At the same time, transitive predicates in these constructions retain their two core arguments. The constructions are not found with detransitivization.

As a first illustration, consider the locative applicative *-(kwi)na* (the long form *-kwina* occurs on bivalent, the short form *-na* on monovalent bases; see Haude 2006: 340-341, 400). The nominalized predicate denotes the place where an event occurs or (in the case of verbs of directed motion) the place to which it is directed. With intransitive predicates, S is encoded as the possessor, and the place of occurrence is encoded by the fronted element. Example (81) shows the applicative form in a cleft construction; in (82), the applicative occurs both in an RP (*kos asnan*) and in a headed relative clause (*di' joynan*) (compare (17) above, where the place of going is coded as an oblique in a basic clause.)

(81) *asko joy-na=y'li*  
 PRO.3N.AB go-NMZ.LOC=1PL  
 'That's where we went.' [EAO Dichiyeve 009]

(82) *n-as jayna dum<a>ye:-wa=n kos as-na=n*  
 OBL-ART.N DSC find<DR>-NMZ=2 ART.N.AB sit-NMZ.LOC=2  
*di' joy-na=n, jayna joy-chet*  
 REL go-NMZ.LOC=2 DSC go-R/R  
 'When you find your home (lit. your sitting place) where you go (lit. which [is] your going place), then you go.' [EAO Escape Marivel 014]

Example (83) illustrates the locative applicative with a direct transitive verb (marked by prefixed CV-reduplication). Here as well, the initial pronoun refers to the place where the event occurs. However, A and P are encoded in the same way as in the basic transitive clause,

<sup>12</sup> I thank N. Himmelmann (p.c.) for the suggestion to analyze these suffixes as applicatives.



(86) *os jayna kay-poj-wa=y'ti--k-isne*  
 ART.N.PST DSC eat-CAUS-INSTR.INV=1PL--OBL-3F.AB  
 ‘what she fed us then’ [NCG\_240806\_1 040]

(87) *is la' kayle:-wa=Ø--'nes majni=Ø*  
 ART.PL PST give-INSTR.INV=1SG--ART.3F offspring=1SG  
 ‘the (ones) my daughter had given me long ago’ [EAO Aros II 050]

To sum up, a few affixes derive predicates that can relativize an element that is not originally a core argument. The locative affix and its allomorphs are productive on all verbal bases, while this is not the case with the “instrumental” affixes, which are as yet not very well understood. These latter, however, are quite common with the few bases on which they actually occur, i.e., the word forms in (84)–(87) are by no means exceptional or speaker-dependent. Therefore, these data show that in Movima, the unambiguous assignment of semantic roles to syntactic arguments is extremely important also in relative constructions, and that occasional ambiguities that may arise with verbs whose semantic valency exceeds their transitivity (see 3.5.1) can be resolved through dedicated morphology.

### 3.6 Fronted demonstratives

Like free personal pronouns in clefts (3.3), demonstratives can also occur before the lexical predicate while the argument inside the clausal core is gapped. This process is also restricted to the external argument. The following examples illustrate the pattern: (88) shows the encoding of S by a demonstrative in an intransitive clause, (89) the encoding of P by a demonstrative in a transitive direct clause, and (90) shows the encoding of A by a demonstrative in a transitive inverse clause.

---

an oblique here, i.e., the suffix *-wawa* does not have an applicative function: It derives a noun denoting a T possessed by G.

(i) *i'ko kayle-wawa=y'ti n-us alkalde*  
 PRO.3PL give-NMLZ:RED=1PL OBL-ART.M maire  
 ‘These are our gifts from the maire.’ [EGA\_BVO\_AAO\_HRR\_180706\_1 026]

(88) *jayna kiro' joy-chet*  
 DSC DEM.PL.AB go-R/R  
 'They are gone already.' [EAO Alcanzar 011]

(89) *kuro' joy-a-le=kus David*  
 DEM.M.AB go-DR-CO=ART.M.AB David  
 'David has taken him (with him).' [EAO\_240807\_vbr 036]

(90) *nokowa kiro' alpani:-kay=Ø*  
 FUT DEM.PL.AB help-INV=1SG  
 'They will help me.' [HRR\_081009\_isbijaw 225]

In contrast to the relative constructions described above, however, constructions with the demonstrative pronouns do not undergo the detransitivizing operation, which would be expected if a higher-ranking A were encoded by the demonstrative. Firstly, the corpus contains no example of this constellation. Secondly, whenever an element *kwey* occurs in a clause with a demonstrative, it is not the detransitivizing particle, but the homophonous tense particle that indicates hodiernal past and has no syntactic effect (Haude 2006: 538–540). In (91), for example, it can be seen that the verb retains its internal enclitic despite the presence of the element *kwey*.

(91) *jayna koro' kwey kwaj-na=i n-as susentral*  
 DSC DEM.N.AB HOD pass-DR=3PL OBL-ART.N *Subcentral*  
 'Today they have already passed it over to the *Subcentral*.'<sup>14</sup> [MCC\_250806 125]

Thus, the placement of a demonstrative pronoun in clause-initial position is further evidence of the privileged syntactic status of the external argument: A fronted demonstrative can refer to S of an intransitive, P of a transitive direct, and A of a transitive inverse verb. However, it does not fall in the domain of relativization, and the exact function of clause-initial demonstrative pronouns – which also convey aspectual information – is a matter of further research.

---

<sup>14</sup> The verb base *kwaj-* 'pass' encodes T, and not G, as a syntactic argument.

### 3.7 Argument incorporation

Argument incorporation was already discussed at several occasions above ((28)–(29), (75)–(77)). It involves the incorporation of P (in the form of a noun root, a classifier-like element or a truncated noun) into a direct-marked verb. The verb retains its direct marker, but becomes syntactically intransitive: The agent is encoded as S of the now intransitive verb, while the patient, if overtly expressed in addition to the incorporated element, receives oblique marking.

The following examples contrast a transitive clause, (92)a with an intransitive one created by the incorporation of the P argument, (92)b. (Here, for morphophonological reasons, the incorporation triggers the occurrence of the base-internal direct allomorph *-a-*; see Haude 2006: 325).

(92) a. *dan-na=sne is chinata*  
chew-DR=3F.AB ART.PL manioc  
'She chewed (the) manioc.' [JGD\_130907-06 088]

b. *dan-a:-so--is n-is pokso*  
chew-DR-TRC.*chicha*--PL.AB OBL-ART.PL *chicha*  
'They chewed (on the) *chicha*.' [HHR, TX 291]

As is cross-linguistically common, argument incorporation is restricted to the P argument of a transitive verb. Therefore, the ability to be incorporated is linked to the semantic role of the argument. At the same time, however, incorporation is restricted to direct-marked verbs, where P is encoded as the external argument: It is not possible to incorporate a P that is encoded as the internal argument of an inverse-marked verb. An example that the animacy hierarchy can be overridden in this way is given in (93). Here, a noun denoting humans is incorporated in a verb describing an event where humans are acted upon by an animal. (Note that there are only few such examples; incorporated nouns usually denote inanimate entities or animals.)

(93) *jayna rey ja' yok-a-juyeni--as*  
DSC MOD just catch-DR-person--3N.AB  
'Then again it (the jaguar) just caught people.' [HRR\_120808-tigregente 286]

Thus, argument incorporation is both semantically and syntactically determined: It is restricted to the P of a direct-marked verb, i.e. to a P encoded as the external argument.

## **4 Argument selection based on semantic role**

Two grammatical processes select arguments on the basis of semantic role: possessor ascension, which can both only involve a P argument, and imperative formation, which is biased towards A. In both cases, the semantic basis for argument selection goes along the cross-linguistically common lines. Possessor ascension (4.1) involves the incorporation of an affected part-of-whole term, so that it is no longer encoded as P and makes room for the possessor to be encoded as P, while the transitivity of the verb remains unaffected. Imperatives (4.2), finally, are used to tell somebody to do something, so that the addressee tends to be A (see Dixon 1994: 131).

### **4.1 Possessor ascension**

In contrast to argument incorporation (3.7), so-called “modifying incorporation” (Haude 2006: 377-391) does not affect the verb’s transitivity: A verb containing a modifying incorporated element can either be intransitive, and it can be transitivized through direct or inverse marking. There are several types of modifying incorporation, but the one that is of interest here involves the incorporation of a body-part term, which can also be expressed as a clausal argument, into the verb. The owner of the body part, expressed as the possessor of the non-incorporated form, “ascends” to argument status, taking the position of the body-part term, so to speak. The incorporated body-part term, and therefore also its possessor, are always the patient in the event. Consequently, the ascended possessor can either be the internal or the external argument, depending on its status in the referential hierarchy with respect to A.

The process is illustrated with a direct-marked verb in the elicited examples in (94). In (94)a, the body-part term first appears as the external argument (a possessed RP) of the transitive verb. In (94)b, the body-part term is incorporated; in contrast to a verb with an incorporated argument, this verb is transitive, too, as can be seen from the zero enclitic encoding the first person singular and the encliticization of the external argument pronoun, which represents the possessor of the incorporated term. The internal argument remains unaffected in these examples: In both cases, it denotes A, since the verb is marked as direct. In (94)c, the incorporating verb is marked as inverse, which means that the internal argument

representing the owner of the body part is P. Finally, the incorporating verb can also be intransitive, as shown in (94)d (a verbal RP stemming from a text).

- (94) a. *tan-na=∅*      *as*      *risa-<kwa~>kwa='ne*  
 cut-DR=1SG      ART.N      BR.hair-<INAL~>ABS=3F  
 'I cut her hair.'      [elicited]
- b. *tan-a-ri:sa=∅--'ne*  
 cut-DR-BR.hair =1SG--3F  
 'I gave her a haircut (lit. I hair-cut her).'      [elicited]
- c. *tan-ri:sa:-kay=∅--i'ne*  
 cut-hair-INV=1SG--3F  
 'She gave me a haircut (lit. She hair-cut me).'      [elicited]
- d. *kinos*      *neyru*      *tan-ri:sa*  
 ART.F.AB      DET      cut-BR.hair  
 'that (woman with) the short hair (lit. that absent female hair-cut [one])'  
 [EAO Alojamiento 002]

In (95), which is made up of two clauses, it can be seen how possessor ascension works with monovalent verbs. The incorporation occurs in the first clause: The predicate contains the incorporated body-part term *mosi* 'back', and the owner is encoded as S. In the second clause, there is no incorporation: Here, S is the possessed RP referring to the body part.

- (95) *jayna t*      *tivij-mosi:-ni,*      *tivij-ni*      *as*      *mosi-<kwa:~>kwa=∅*  
 DSC      1INTR      pain-back-PRC      pain-PRC      ART.N      back-<INAL~>ABS=1SG  
 'Then I got pain in the back (lit. I back-hurt), my back hurt.'  
 [DMA Fracaso 014]

Possessor ascension thus depends on the semantic role rather than on the syntactic status of the possessed entity.





A trace of S=A alignment can be discerned, however, when plural person marking of imperative verbs is considered. The 2PL marker for the imperative subject of the intransitive verb, *-kweł*, shown in (100), is the same as that for A of the transitive direct imperative verb, (101). (This element also occurs on the plural form of the second-person internal enclitic, *=n-kweł*; see Table 4 above.)

(100) *chokbal-ki-kweł*      *ba:ra n-is*      *eney chanko-wanra:-ni*  
 cover-IMP.INTR-2PL    all      OBL-ART.PL    FILLER blanket-INSTR-PRC  
 ‘Cover yourself (pl.) all with blankets!’      [JGD\_160808-Fundacion-02 418]

(101) *vel-ti-kweł*      *is no:no=∅*  
 watch-IMP.DR-2PL    ART.PL animal=1SG  
 ‘Look (pl.) after my animals!’      [ERM\_140806\_1 1027]

The plural form of the inverse imperative is different. Here, either P or A can be encoded by the plural form, but not both. The plural form encoding P is illustrated in (102). The presence of the epenthetic vowel *-a* indicates that we are dealing with internal cliticization here, which is the expected encoding of P of an inverse form.

(102) *alpani-doj-a=y’hi*      *ma’a*  
 help-IMP.INV-LV=1PL    my\_mother  
 ‘Help us, mother!’      [JGD\_160808-Fundacion-01 433]

Interestingly, when A (i.e. the addressee) is in the plural, the external enclitic of the 2PL marker is chosen (*y’bi*). However, unlike on non-imperative verbs, this person marker is not attached to the verb through external, but through *internal* cliticization (normally reserved for the internal argument), involving the linking vowel *-a*. In this way, the plural marking of the A argument on inverse imperatives displays a mixture of the person encoding patterns known from declarative predicates. I cannot provide an explanation of this at this point.

(103) *kayte-doj-a=y’bi*  
 give-IMP.INV-LV=2PL  
 ‘Give (pl.) (it) to me!’      [JGD\_130907-13 186]

To sum up, Movima imperative marking distinguishes between transitive and intransitive verbs, but there is a slight bias towards accusative alignment, apparent from the second-person plural form. The imperative inverse form constitutes a special case: Either the first-person P or the second-person A can be encoded as plural, and the plural form of the latter (*y'bi*) is different from that used on direct-makred verbs (*kweł*). This is a deviance from the S=A alignment pattern of the other imperative forms; it shows that even in the imperative domain, the importance of the referential hierarchy in Movima makes a straightforward characterization of its alignment system in traditional, semantic-role based terms difficult.

## 5 “Neutral” constructions

Several constructions which in some languages show evidence for grammatical relations do not do so in Movima: Reflexive verbs are intransitive (5.1); there is no grammatical rule for the interpretation of an omitted argument expression in coordination (5.2); the interpretation of the arguments in embedded clauses does not depend on the matrix clause (5.3); and if there is such a thing as quantifier floating in Movima (5.4), it does not seem to be restricted to a particular argument.

### 5.1 Reflexives

Reflexive and reciprocal verbs are marked by the suffix *-chet*, as illustrated in (104). They are intransitive and do not distinguish grammatical relations.

- (104) *didi' tikoy-chet n-os kachi:ra*  
 FRUST kill-R/R OBL-ART.N.PST knife  
 ‘(He) wanted to kill (him)self with a knife.’ [BA Balvina 199]

- (105) *ju:-chet is kweya-m-mo*  
 scold-R/R ART.PL woman-LN-CLF.bird  
 ‘The hens fight (lit. scold each other).’ [JGD\_130907 152]

### 5.2 Coordination

There is no obligatory argument omission in coordinated constructions. As was stated in 2.2 above, the internal argument (i.e. A of the direct and P of the inverse clause) is obligatorily

overtly expressed in any context. This is illustrated in the coordinated construction in (106), where the two internal enclitics (=’*ne*) are coreferential; in the English translation, by contrast, it would seem awkward if the pronoun were repeated.

- (106) *rim<a>le=’ne os sotak-ra di’ wa:ka*  
 sell<DR>=3F ART.N.PST one-CLF.NTR REL cow  
*che rimeł-na=’ne is motlo:to di’ o:ro*  
 and buy-DR=3F ART.PL earring REL gold  
 ‘She sold one cow and (in exchange) bought earrings of gold.’ [EAO Aros 003]

The external argument can either be overtly expressed or omitted, depending on the context. In (107), which consists of two coordinated intransitive clauses, S is overtly expressed in the first and omitted in the second clause.

- (107) *ji<wa:~>wa--is che joy-chet nokoldé*  
 come<MD~>--3PL.AB and go-R/R over\_there  
 ‘They come and (then) go over there.’ [ATL\_230806 101]

In (108), several coreferential external arguments, all representing S of intransitive clauses, are unrealized.

- (108) *pora aj<te:~>tej che jayna rey en-chet che jayna rey tija:rim*  
 briefly rest<MD~> and DSC MOD stand-R/R and DSC MOD work  
 ‘(She) rested a little, and then again (she) got up and worked again.’  
 [EAO Ay’ku II 023]

In (109), in contrast, the two omitted S arguments are not coreferential. Their referents can only be identified from the context. The text is about a cow that does not have much value because its calves always die.

- (109) *tami:-tik, che kayni*  
 baby-VBZ and die  
 ‘(The cow) gives birth and (its calves) die.’ [EAO Abuelo 041]

In (110), finally, the external argument (S) of the first, intransitive clause is coreferential with the internal argument of the second, transitive clause. The omitted external argument in the second clause has a different referent, as can be seen from the translation.

- (110) *wel:le--i che tok-ka-~~te~~-na=i*  
 climb--3PL and fall-MLT-CO-DR=3PL  
 ‘They climb up and they throw (them, i.e. the fruits) down.’ [EAO Mangas 012]

### 5.3 Embedding

As was shown in 2.4, intransitive embedded clauses, in contrast to their main-clause counterparts, always contain an overtly expressed argument (encoded as the possessor of the nominalized predicate). As a consequence, there is no such phenomenon like equi-NP deletion, “raising” or the like (cf. Bickel 2011: 422-425) in Movima. For instance, in (111), the absence of an internal enclitic from the embedded predicate unambiguously indexes the first person singular.

- (111) *bele:ka--sne n-os joyaj-wa=∅*  
 happy--3F.AB OBL-ART.N.PST arrive-NMZ.EVT=1SG  
 ‘She was happy when I arrived (lit. at my [past] arriving).’ [GCM Bacho 035]

It may be assumed that the embedded clause with its overtly encoded argument permits the correct referential interpretation of an unexpressed main-clause argument; this is suggested by (112), where the embedded S is coreferential with the unexpressed main-clause S. However, this is not systematic: As can be seen in (113), where the (implied) main-clause argument is not coreferential with the embedded one, the correct interpretation of an unexpressed main-clause argument is a matter of context.

- (112) *chot bele:ka [n-os joyaj-wa=us]*  
 HAB happy OBL-ART.N.PST arrive-NMZ.EVT=3M.AB  
 ‘(He<sub>i</sub>) was always happy when he<sub>i</sub> arrived.’ [PMP\_HRR\_etal\_210908 143]



(116) *kay<a>le=y'ti pektele [ni-kis nono=y'ti]*  
 give<DR>=1PL all OBL-ART.PL.AB animal=1PL  
 'We give (you pl.) all our animals.' [HRR\_120808-tigregente 678]

However, in (117), *ba:ra* follows the quantified RP, which is T in this clause:

(117) *iso' rim<a>le=is [is bet'i=is] ba:ra*  
 DEM.PL.PST sell<DR>=3PL.AB ART.PL land=3PL.AB all  
 'They had sold all their land.' [LTC\_020906\_3 221]

In (118) and (119), *ba:ra* occurs at the beginning of the clause. In both examples, the quantifier's scope is interpreted as T, which is expressed as the external argument in (118) and as an oblique in (119), in line with the argument frames (i.e. indirective vs. secundative, respectively; see 2.3) of the verbs in question.

(118) *ba:ra rim<a>le=is [os karga di' jiwa-le-na=i]*  
 all sell<DR>=3PL.AB ART.N.PST load REL come-CO-DR=3PL  
 'They sold all the charge they brought.' [LTC\_020906\_1 101f.]

(119) *ba:ra jarak-na-bij-kay-a=n [n-is dayajna=n]*  
 all throw-DR-MAL-INV-LV=2 OBL-ART.PL belonging=2  
 '(He) throws away all your belongings.' [EAO\_120906\_2 019]

Example (120) is particularly interesting in that it shows the quantification of the P argument in a transitive inverse clause (i.e., the internal argument), and this, even though the quantifier precedes A (the external argument).

(120) *tinok-poj-kay-a=[is] ba:ra is bu:buyakapa*  
 fear-CAUS-INV-LV=3PL.AB all ART.PL hurricane  
 'The hurricane scared them all.' [HRR\_2009\_tape1\_B 271]

There are also a few examples where A is quantified. Example (121) is a cleft with an inverse-marked verb and A encoded as a fronted pronoun. In (122), finally, the quantified element is A expressed as the internal argument of a direct verb.

(121) *jayna [isko] ba:ra jema' alpani-kay-a=y'ti*  
 DSC PRO.3PL.AB all also help-INV-LV=1PL  
 'They all (were the ones who) helped us then, too.' [EAO Vida chaco 061]

(122) *ba:ra iloni-te-na[=i] kos as-na=i jayna*  
 all move-CO-DR=3PL ART.N.AB sit-NMZ.LOC=3PL DSC  
 'They all carry around their houses now (after having been transformed into turtles).'  
 [JGD\_130907\_tortugas 169]

To sum up, the interpretation of the “floating” quantifiers in Movima is basically determined by context and semantics – patient and theme participants being preferred (although not exclusively available) for quantification in transitive clauses. Both arguments and obliques can be quantified, and no argument type of the transitive clause is excluded. Thus, while it is not clear yet what determines the placement of quantifiers, quantifier floating does not seem to be conditioned by grammatical relations.

## 6 Conclusion

Arguments in Movima are distinguished by constituency, i.e. by the position of an argument expression internal or external to the predicate phrase. The single argument (S) of an intransitive main-clause predicate is always encoded as the external constituent. In transitive clauses, the argument positions are filled according to the ranking of the arguments' referents in a hierarchy that includes person, animacy, and topicality. The semantic roles of the arguments are indicated by verbal morphology: Direct marking indicates that the internal argument is A and the external argument P/G/T, and inverse marking indicates that the external argument is A and the internal argument P/G/T. Therefore, when comparing argument encoding in transitive and intransitive main clauses, the shared grammatical relation encompasses the semantic roles {S, P/G/T} in the direct construction and {S, A} in the inverse construction.

Independently of semantic role, the external argument has a syntactically privileged status in different types of so-called relative constructions (headed relatives, verbal RPs, and clefts). These are, among other things, needed for wh-question formation, and they are the only constructions that, due to their clause-initial argument position, allow the encoding of an

additional non-agent participant as an argument. In principle, either of the two transitive constructions, direct or inverse, can be chosen to encode either A or P/G/T as the external argument in order to provide it with access to relativization. However, the restrictions imposed by the referential hierarchy entail that relativization is not possible for an A that outranks P/G/T. Here, a detransitivizing operation comes into play, which promotes the internal argument to S status. The external argument is the only argument that can be represented by a clause-initial demonstrative. Finally, argument incorporation, while restricted to P, can only take place with direct-marked verbs, so this process is restricted to the external argument of an originally transitive verb.

Other constructions select an argument on the basis of its semantic role, as is expected from their semantic properties. Possessor ascension selects P as well, and imperatives select S or A. Four processes that are known as argument selectors in other languages – reflexivization, coordination, embedding, and floating quantifiers – are neutral with respect to grammatical relations in Movima.

From a crosslinguistic perspective, this system is unusual: Firstly, in a number of constructions, grammatical relations are not related to semantic roles, but based exclusively on the referential properties of nominal constituents, which determine the morphosyntactic representation of the arguments; secondly, the syntactically privileged external argument represents the referentially less prominent event participant, whereas cross-linguistically, a privileged status is usually associated with a topical, referentially prominent entity (see e.g. Aissen 1999; Keenan 1976; Zúñiga 2006);<sup>15</sup> finally, the privileged argument is {S, P/G/T} of the default transitive construction (the direct), resulting in a cross-linguistically rare ergative pattern. With these properties, Movima combines three morphosyntactic patterns known from other language types:

1. the direct/inverse systems known e.g. from Algonquian or Tibeto-Burman languages, where argument encoding is governed by referential hierarchies, while semantic roles are indicated by verb morphology (see DeLancey 1981; Dixon and Aikhenvald 1997);
2. syntactically ergative languages as exemplified by Dyrbal (Dixon 1972), where P is syntactically privileged;

---

<sup>15</sup> Movima might appear as an example of Zúñiga's "remapping inverse", were this concept not characterized as follows: "direct [...] maps A's to primary arguments ("subjects") and O's to secondary arguments ("objects") and [inverse] maps A's to secondary arguments and O's to primary arguments" (Zúñiga 2006: 67). Obviously, in Movima this relation is reversed.



3. Philippine-type Western Austronesian languages, where the privileged argument can have any semantic role, as indicated by verb morphology (Haude and Zúñiga 2016; Himmelmann 2005; Kroeger 1993; Schachter 1976; Shibatani 1988).

A possible explanation for the Movima system can be sought along the lines of a “nominalist” or “equational” hypothesis, similar to what has been proposed, for instance, for Philippine-type voice systems (Himmelmann 2008; Kaufman 2009). This hypothesis assumes that today’s finite predicates are the result of oriented (i.e. agent- or patient) nominalizations, so that today’s transitive clauses originated from intransitive clauses headed by predicate nominals, i.e., from a construction that has only one single argument, S. While there are no diachronic or comparative data available for Movima, the synchronic patterns of the language provide ample evidence for this kind of scenario (see Haude 2009b, 2010b). A plausible explanation of the impact of the referential hierarchy on the syntactic patterns of Movima, however, could not be offered so far. The apparently unique combination of properties presented here thus remains a matter for further research.

### **Symbols and abbreviations in glosses**

= internal cliticization; -- external cliticization; ~ reduplication; < > infixation

1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person; AB=absent; ABS=absolute state; ART=article; BR=bound root; CAUS=causative; CLF=classifier; CO=co-participant; COP=copula; DEM=demonstrative; DET=determiner; DIST=distant; DR=direct; DSC=discontinuous; DUB=dubitative; EMPH=emphatic; EV=evidential; EVT=event; F=feminine; FRUST=frustrative; FUT=future; HAB=habitual; HYP=hypothetical; IMP=imperative; INAL=inalienable; INCL=inclusive; INSTR=instrumental; ITN=intentional; INTR=intransitive; INV=inverse; LOC=locative; LV=linking vowel; MAL=malefactive; MD=middle voice; MLT=multiple event; MOD=modal; N=neuter; NEG=negative; NMZ=nominalizer; NTR=neutral; OBL=oblique; OBV=obviative; PL=plural; POSS=possessive; PRC=process; PRO=free personal pronoun; PST=past; RED=reduplication; REL=relativizer; R/R=reflexive/reciprocal; S=single argument of intransitive clause; SG=singular; SPK=near speaker; STD=standing; TRC=truncated element; DETR=detransitivizer; VBZ=verbalizer.

### **References**

Aissen, Judith. 1999. Markedness and subject choice in Optimality Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17(4): 673-711.

- Bickel, Balthasar. 2011. Grammatical Relations Typology. In *The Oxford Handbook of Grammatical Relations*, Jae Jung Song (ed.), 399-444. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Citko, Barbara. 2004. On headed, headless, and light-headed relatives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 95-126.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1981. An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns. *Language* 57.3: 626-657.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1972. *The Dyirbal Language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. 1997. A typology of argument-determined constructions. In *Essays on Language Function and Language Type. Dedicated to T. Givón*, Bybee, Joan, John Haiman, and Sandra A. Thompson (eds), 71-113. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Haude, Katharina. 2006. A Grammar of Movima. Doctoral diss., Radboud University Nijmegen. ([http://webdoc.uibn.ru.nl/mono/h/haude\\_k/gramofmo.pdf](http://webdoc.uibn.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: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haude, Katharina. 2010a. ‘She kisses her late husband’ = ‘she kissed her husband’: nominal tense marking in Movima. In *Rara & Rarissima: documenting the fringes of linguistic diversity*, Cysouw, Michael and Jan Wohlgemuth (eds), 95-116. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haude, Katharina. 2010b. The intransitive basis of Movima clause structure. In *Ergativity in Amazonia*, Gildea, Spike and Francesc Queixalós (eds), 285-315. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Haude, Katharina. 2011a. 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.
- Haude, Katharina. 2011b. Argument encoding in Movima: the local domain. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 77(4): 559-571.
- Haude, Katharina. 2012a. The expression of three-participant events in Movima. *Linguistic Discovery* 10(3): 80-96.

- Haude, Katharina. 2012b. Undergoer orientation in Movima. *Ergativity, Valency and Voice*, Authier, Gilles and Katharina Haude (eds), 259-288. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haude, Katharina. 2014. Animacy and inverse voice in Movima: a corpus study. *Anthropological Linguistics* 56(3-4): 294-314.
- Haude, Katharina. To appear a. Nonverbal predication in Movima. In *Nonverbal predication in Amazonian languages*, Overall, Simon, Rosa Vallejos, and Spike Gildea (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Haude, Katharina. To appear b. Clefting for topicalization? Analyzing clause-initial pronouns in Movima. *Information structure in lesser-described languages: Studies in prosody and syntax*. Adamou, Evangelia, Katharina Haude, and Martine Vanhove (eds). [Studies in Language Accompanying Series]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Haude, Katharina and Fernando Zúñiga. 2016. Inverse and symmetrical voice: on languages with two transitive constructions. *Linguistics* 54(3): 443-481.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005. Tagalog. In *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus Himmelman (eds), 350-376. London: Routledge.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005. 2008. Lexical categories and voice in Tagalog. In *Voice and Grammatical Relations in Austronesian Languages*, Austin, Peter and Simon Musgrave (eds), 247-293. Stanford CA: CSLI Publications.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2009. Austronesian nominalism and its consequences: a Tagalog case study. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35(1): 1-49.
- Kroeger, Paul R. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford CA: CSLI Publications.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. "The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above. In Li, Charles (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, 491-518. New York: Academic Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1988. Voice in Philippine languages. In *Passive and Voice*, Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.), 85-142. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, R.M.W. Dixon (ed.), 112-171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2006. *Deixis and Alignment. Inverse Systems in Indigenous Languages of the Americas*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.