
CRUCIAL ISSUES IN NON-VERBAL PREDICATION
Answers to the questionnaire relative to the volume:

Non-verbal Predication in the World's Languages

Pier Marco Bertinetto, Luca Ciucci, and Denis Creissels
(eds.)

De Gruyter 2026

Chapter 4

Non-verbal predication in Caijia and Waxiang

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Do the two languages have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Yes. Caijia and Waxiang both have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives which can be distinguished from verbs in terms of predicative behaviour (§3.5).

- 1.2. *If in the two languages the predicative behaviour of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behaviour of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Yes. Adjectives can take intensifying modification, form adverbials, can be freely reduplicated and take part in a large number of syntactic constructions such as the comparative, whereas nouns may not, including when they serve as predicate terms (see §3.5).

- 1.3. *Do the two languages distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates?*

No. There are no distinctions of the kind observed for Spanish *ser* versus *estar* or other word classes.

- 1.4. *In the two languages, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication?*

No adverbial predication is allowed in Caijia, whereas locational predication can be considered adverbial in Waxiang and this is the only type (as restricted to animate subjects).

- 1.5. *Do the two languages exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Adverbs, prepositions and demonstratives are not permitted as a predicate with a copula.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the two languages?*

Copular predication with nominal and nominalized complements is the most common type. Juxtaposition exists in both languages with nominal predication, but is fairly restricted in use (§3.3). Adjectival predication is not formed with copulae in either of the languages. Locational predication is treated as adverbial in Waxiang in a copular-like construction (§3.4.2), while it is verbal in Caijia (§3.4.1).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the two languages, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Two constructions which are in competition are the copula construction and juxtaposition, the latter being limited to the domains of age, dates, weights and measures in both Caijia and Waxiang.

- 2.3. *If the two languages adopt the copular construction, do they have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

In Sinitic languages such as Waxiang, and in Caijia (Sino-Tibetan), there is just one main copula in each language used in nominal predication with both identity and inclusion functions. In Waxiang, the copula is also used in locational constructions.

- 2.4. *If the two languages have copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

The copula *sɿ*³³ in Caijia and the *tsʰɿ*²⁵ in Waxiang are both cognate with *shì* 是 [ʃɿ⁵¹] in Standard Chinese (Mandarin) and all are claimed to derive from the demonstrative *shì* in Archaic Chinese (7th–3rd BC) (§7). In the Cantonese and Hakka branches of Sinitic, the copular verb is generally believed to have ‘bind’ as its source, for example, [hei²²] in Hong Kong Cantonese and [hai¹¹] in Liancheng Hakka.

- 2.5. *If the two languages adopt the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

There is no predicative inflection.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Do the two languages distinguish between the way in which inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

No. There is no formal distinction. Both context and the associated information status of the head noun aid in the interpretation of either inclusion or identity. Modification of the head noun can also play a role.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

As above. Morphological marking of the NPs by various forms of modification, such as demonstratives and relative clauses, or the use of attributives allows the head noun to be coded as specific or individuated; or alternatively, non-specific, such as with the use of [‘one’ – CL] or by a bare classifier.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

There is coincidence of discourse topic (=given information) and subject for nominal and adjectival predication. In the assertive construction, the elements placed between the copula and the final particle are put into focus as new information (§4). The existential construction (which corresponds to the HAVE-ILP con-

struction, as explained in Chapter 1) has a presentative function with the postverbal single argument generally representing indefinite and new information.

- 3.4. *In the two languages, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the two languages to express ostension?*

There is no dedicated ostensive marker in either Caijia or Waxiang. Demonstratives are used to express ostension.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the two languages, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Yes. In Caijia, different verbs are used to form these two constructions. The locative verb *tu*²¹, derived from the verb ‘dwell’, forms the plain-locational clause: [Located entity *tu*²¹ Locus], while the existential verb *ɣã*²¹ ‘there be, have’ forms the inverse-locational clause: [(Locus) *ɣã*²¹ Located entity]. The same applies for Waxiang with *tsʰy*²⁵ and *va*²⁵ respectively for these two types.

- 4.2. *In the two languages, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Yes. The ILP-construction may express generic existence (§5).

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the two languages to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

The monovalent existential verbs *ɣã*²¹ and *va*²⁵ (HAVE-ILPs) also respectively serve as possessive verbs to code the plain-possessive constructions in Caijia and Waxiang, using the distinct clausal syntax of NP_{possessor} – HAVE – NP_{possession}.

- 4.4. *Do the two languages express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Yes. The predicate of an inverse-possessive construction is an adnominal possessive construction in Caijia and Waxiang.

- 4.5. *In the two languages, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Caijia uses a copular construction for quantification and juxtaposition for measures. Waxiang similarly can use juxtaposition for measures, specifically for calendar dates, weight and age, in addition to the copular construction. These are not used to avoid existential or possessive constructions.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In Caijia and Waxiang, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

No.

- 5.2. *In the two languages, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Yes. Both Caijia and Waxiang can use assertive constructions which place the predicate term in focus. This is effected by means of the copula and clause-final discourse markers which bracket this term (§4). All kinds of predication may be modified by clause-final aspectual-modal markers which take the whole clause in their scope.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of a non-verbal predication is coded exactly like the argument of a semantically monovalent verb.

- 5.4. *Do the two languages have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Yes. In Caijia and Waxiang, the copula in nominal predication cannot be negated by the perfective negator. By contrast, either of the two main negators, irrealis and perfective can be used with the locational forms and adjectives. Age and time-word predication in Caijia cannot, however, be negated due to their nominal features.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Illocutionary force is signaled by the use of clause-final aspectual-modal particles in imperatives, assertions, and other clause types.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Non-verbal predication is found in complex sentences such as conditionals and concessives, and in dependent clauses; see §4. A whole clause can be the subject or the predicate with non-verbal predication.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiners (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Nominal features are preserved in predicate nouns in Caijia and Waxiang, including their use in numerical specification and with classifiers, demonstratives, possessive and adjectival modifiers.

- 5.8. *If the two languages have adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Adjectival predicates show specific features which distinguish them from verbal predication, such as modification by intensifiers, formation of adverbials and use in comparative constructions. There is, however, no inflectional marking for number or gender in Caijia and Waxiang.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the two languages.*

Verbal aspect marking is not permitted with respect to nominal and adverbial predication, nor is co-occurrence with modal verbs (where they precede the copula and indicate prospective near future or participant-internal modality). Locational predication in Caijia is verbal, which makes aspect marking possible. By contrast, adjectival predication allows a restricted set of aspect marking. Clause-final particles are used to express aspectual-modal values in non-verbal predication, since these markers take the entire utterance in their scope.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in these two languages in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

The copulae in Caijia and Waxiang are not related to the category of the auxiliary.

Chapter 5

Non-verbal predication in Siyewu Khroskyabs

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

No. In Siyewu Khroskyabs, “adjectives” are actually a subclass of verbs.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Irrelevant since there is not a separate class of adjectives.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

There is no evidence for this distinction.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication is not restricted to locational predication. Ideophonic predication, in particular, may be regarded as a specific subtype within the category of adverbial predication.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

I have no confirmed case where an adverb serves as the predicate.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Copula construction, predicative inflection.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Copula constructions are typically employed with nominal predication. Predicative inflection primarily applies to ideophones, exhibiting ideophonic, but not verbal, inflection.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Yes. They have nominal copulae and locational copulae.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

A significant number of them have transparent etymologies or can be reconstructed to the proto-language.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Siyewu Khroskyabs exhibits ideophonic inflection, a type of predicative inflection. Its historical origin remains uncertain.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

No.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The interaction between the specificity parameter and non-verbal predication remains to be confirmed, which requires further investigations.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

I do not see anything special related to information structure and constituent order.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

There are no dedicated ostensive constructions in this language.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Syntactically, inverse-locational clauses are not systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses in Khroskyabs. However, a distinction is observed in possessive constructions, where both plain and inverse patterns are attested.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

The construction used for ILP is also employed to express possessive meanings.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Yes, Siyewu Khroskyabs uses locational predicates to express plain-possessive predication.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Siyewu Khroskyabs uses an adnominal possession construction to express inverse-possessive predication.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Siyewu Khroskyabs uses locational copulae for quantification.

5. **Morphosyntactic issues**

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

No.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

No.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Some copulae have suppletive negative forms.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

To the best of my knowledge, the coding of the various non-verbal predication types stays unchanged when such clauses are embedded as components of complex constructions.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

There is no change of coding, as far as I know.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Basically all nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Irrelevant.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

None. Verbal features are carried exclusively by the copular elements.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

No.

Chapter 6

Non-verbal predication in the Uralic languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

The Uralic languages have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, although not always clearly distinguishable from nouns. The clearest difference is that there are some specific suffixes for adjective derivation. As predicates, Uralic adjectives usually behave like nouns, but in the Mordvin and Samoyedic languages, non-verbal predicates (adjectives, nouns, even nouns inflected in adverbial cases or non-finite verb forms) can also be inflected like verbs. In Samoyedic, there is a group of property concepts encoded as verbs.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

In the Uralic languages adjective predicates usually behave like nouns. However, in Permic, adjective and adverbial predicates have a specific plural marker, distinct from that of nouns. In Saami, many adjectives have two different forms, for modifiers and for predicates. In the Mordvin languages, non-verbal predicates can be inflected like verbs, and at least in Erzya, this is more frequent with adjectives than with nouns.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

In many Uralic languages, temporary or contingent state or property can be expressed with case inflection; typically, the non-verbal predicate is inflected in a case labelled “essive” or “translative”. Such inflections are less likely to occur with adjectives than with nouns.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

In addition to static locational predication, typically with the predicate in a static locative case, adverbial predication is possible in a “source” or “goal” case or in other semantic cases, such as comitatives. Similar meanings can, of course, also be expressed with an adpositional (in Uralic, mostly postpositional) phrase.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

At least the major Uralic languages allow all word classes in predicative position, also adverbials of diverse types. Numerals and quantifiers as quantifying

predicates ('we are four'), however, are not allowed everywhere; many branches of Uralic favour other types of predicative quantification.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

2.1. Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?

- a) Juxtaposition alternating with copula constructions: most branches of Uralic;
- b) Conjugation (person and/or tense inflection) of non-verbal predicate, alternating with copula constructions and juxtaposition: Mordvin and Samoyedic;
- c) Copula constructions only (i.e., copula verb is obligatory): (most of) Finnic and Saami.

2.2. If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?

Copula constructions occur in all Uralic languages. In languages which also allow juxtaposition in predication, the choice between these strategies depends on overt morphological marking – the copula carries person, tense or mood suffixes – or the type of predication: juxtaposition is used in nominal or adjectival predication, whereas existential clauses, in some languages also plain-locational ones, apply a copula verb or an existential.

2.3. If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?

The two mostly used copulae can be traced back to Proto-Uralic **woli-* and **le(wi)-*. While the reflexes of **woli-* may also have lexical content ('be alive', 'live', 'dwell'), **le(wi)-* often displays dynamic ('become', 'come into being'), future ('will be') or some kind of non-real (conditional, potential, etc.) meanings. Alongside the inflectable copula verbs, some Uralic languages have so-called "existentials", usually uninflected or with only a restricted set of inflections, such as singular and plural. (North Samoyedic, however, has fully inflectable existential verbs distinct from normal copulae.) Etymologically, some existentials look like derived nouns, and some – such as Komi *em*, Mari *ulo*, or archaic Hungarian *vagyon* (a variant of Modern Hungarian *van*) – double as nouns for 'property, wealth'. Alternatively, at least some of them, such as Mari *ulo* or Hungarian *van*, can be understood as irregular or suppletive 3SG forms of the copula verb. Existentials are not used for nominal or adjectival predication but in inverse-locational, possessive and sometimes also plain-locational (or other adverbial) predication. As the existentials cannot be inflected for tense or mood, in marked tenses or moods the correspondingly inflected 'be' verb forms are used instead.

2.4. If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?

The two mostly used copulae, **woli-* and **le(wi)-*, probably existed already in Proto-Uralic. **le(wi)-* has cognates and derivatives indicating possible grammaticalization from 'be born'; a late parallel to this is the Karelian dynamic copula *rodiekseh* 'become', from Russian *rodit'sja* 'be born'.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

In the Mordvin languages, non-verbal predicates can be inflected like predicate verbs in person and tense. This strategy evolved in Proto-Mordvin, probably as a result of complex interactions between the person-marking systems in nominal and verbal inflection (Subtype IIIa), in which only a limited subset of the inflectional categories of verbs can be marked on the non-verbal predicate. Independently of Mordvin, a largely similar strategy of non-verbal predicate conjugation has evolved in Samoyedic. In Nenets, Enets and Nganasan, both noun and adjective predicates can take the person suffixes of verbal conjugation, whereas past-tense marking on non-verbal predicates is possible in Nenets and Enets but not in Nganasan. Selkup allows the conjugation of predicate nouns but not of adjectives, whereas for the extinct Kamas, it seems that only the copula and juxtaposition strategies are reliably documented. Constructions applying both copula and predicate inflection, Type IV, seem to be rare universally, and within Uralic they only occur in some Samoyedic languages.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Uralic languages typically do not make any systematic formal distinctions between inclusion and identity predication, however, see 3.2.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

In Hungarian (the only Uralic language with a full-fledged system of definite and indefinite articles), the marking of definiteness can serve to distinguish identity predication from ascription. In the Mordvin languages, nouns can be marked as definite with suffixes. At least in written Erzya, it seems that such definite nominal predicates prefer juxtaposition to predicative inflection; this would indicate a systematic difference between the encoding of (definite) identity predicates preferably by juxtaposition and ascriptive (indefinite) non-verbal predicates preferably by predicative inflection. In Finnish, the contrast between nominative and partitive case for plurals or uncountables encodes the contrast between an indivisible whole and divisible plurality or mass. The former interpretation can also imply identity predication.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

In Uralic languages, word order is flexible and reflects the information structure. However, in those Uralic languages which do not use any inflectional marking in ascriptive or identity predication, the constituent order determines which one of the NP's is the subject and which one the predicate. In Hungarian and Mordvin,

definite marking of nouns can be used to mark the subject in ascriptive predication, in which case word order can vary according to information structure.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

In Uralic, probably the typical strategy is an ILP-type clause with a demonstrative pronoun ('here is'), although specific ostensive markers can also occur (Hungarian *íme*).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Some Uralic languages employ specific existentials: in Northern Samoyedic, there is a dedicated existential copula verb. In most of Uralic, however, the existential clause can be regarded as an information-structure-related variant of the plain-locational clause, characterized by a specific (Ground to Figure) word order. In Finnic, ILP constructions with plural or uncountable "theme" or "Figure" NPs differ from locational clauses not only by their word order but also syntactically; lack of verb agreement and the partitive case for plural or uncountable theme NPs make them object-like ("pseudo-ergativity"). In Hungarian, ILPs are distinguished from plain-locational clauses not just by the copula-initial word order pattern but also by the indefiniteness of the "Figure" NP, marked with an article or a quantifier. In Mordvin, locational clauses employ same strategies as inclusive and ascriptive predication, but ILP-constructions contain a copula also in present tense. Definite marked subjects occur in locational predicate constructions but usually not in ILP-constructions.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other "existential" meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Pure existence is usually expressed with the standard ILP construction. There are also specific verbs for 'exist', at least Hungarian *létezik* [derived from *lét* 'the act of) being, existence', itself a derivative from the "dynamic/irreal" copula verb *le-*], or specific lexicalized constructions such as the (probably) pan-Finnic "be in-the-being", Finnish *olla olemassa*.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

In most Uralic languages, predicative possession can be classified to the S-possessee type. In most Finnic and Saami languages except for Livonian and South Saami, the clause is built like inverse-locational predication. Livonian and Hungarian use their dative cases to encode the possessor. In the second subtype of "genitive possession" constructions, as in Permian, Mordvin, Mari, and Kamas, the possessor is in the genitive case. This option also exists in South Saami. Some

Samoyedic languages code predicative possession with an ILP-like construction which is difficult to classify in terms of “genitive” or “locational” possession, as the possessor does not carry morphological marking of either type. The transpossession type is less frequent in Uralic but occurs in South Saami, Ob-Ugric (Khanty and Mansi), and Nganasan. The incorporated-possessee types with proprietive (“having X”) and caritive (“X-less”) adjectives can be fairly productively derived across Uralic.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Many Uralic languages can express inverse-possessive predication with a bare genitive form or a genitive construction with a placeholder (pro)nominal in the predicate position. ‘Belong’ verbs, with the possessee as a grammatical subject, also occur. Hungarian (which has no genitive case) uses a specific inverse-possessive suffix *-é* on the possessor in the predicate position.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

In Uralic, quantification patterns typically with adverbial predication, applying an adverbial case or derivational suffix for adverbs of manner, a postposition or a specific “collective numeral” form. In Mordvin and Samoyedic, quantifier predicates can be conjugated like other non-verbal ones and in at least Ob-Ugric, there are constructions patterning with nominal/adjectival predication. Patterning with ILP is typical of Finnic but less widespread in the rest of Uralic.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Case-marked nominal predicates flagged like functive adjuncts may occur at least in some Uralic languages of Russia: Mari (dative) or Khanty (lative). Many branches of Uralic have nominal predicates expressing contingent or temporary property or state in a specific case (translative or essive, cf. 1.3).

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

No.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

As a rule, arguments of non-verbal predication are coded like “single arguments” of monovalent verbs. In Finnic ILP and related constructions (quantification, predicative possession), the argument can show object-like features (case marking, word order, “pseudo-ergativity”).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Instead of negating the copula or the existential with the standard negation strategy, i.e. a negative auxiliary (most branches of Uralic) or a non-verbal negator (Ugric), specific negative existentials (as negative counterparts of the existentials, see 2.3 above) occur in many branches of Uralic. Like the existential predicates, they are used in inverse-locational and possessive, sometimes also in plain-locational predication.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Difficult to say and impossible to generalize, there is probably not enough research available especially as concerns the Uralic minority languages.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Difficult to say and probably impossible to generalize.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Basically, all features preserved. In Mari, neither adjective nor noun predicates agree in number. In Finnic, in dynamic or contingent/temporary predication (essive/translative case), number marking (plural agreement) may be omitted.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Uralic: basically, all features preserved. (Saami adjectives have developed a systematic distinction – marked morphologically but not uniformly – between predicative and attributive forms.) However, in Finnic translative or essive case marking on predicative adjectives may block number agreement. In Mari, neither adjective nor noun predicates agree in number.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

In the Mordvin languages (Erzya and Moksha), non-verbal predicates can be inflected like predicate verbs in person and tense (Subtype IIIa). Only a limited subset of the inflectional categories of verbs can be marked on the non-verbal predicate. In Northern Samoyedic (Nenets, Enets, Nganasan), both noun and adjective predicates can take the person suffixes of verbal conjugation, whereas past-tense marking on non-verbal predicates is possible in Nenets and Enets but not in Nganasan. Of the Southern Samoyedic languages, Selkup allows the conjugation of predicate nouns but not of adjectives; in Kamas, it seems that only the copula and juxtaposition strategies are reliably documented.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

With the exception of the negative auxiliary, Uralic languages do not have a well-defined class of auxiliaries morphosyntactically distinct from regular verbs. In Finnic and Saami, the 'be' verb functions both as a copula and what can be called an auxiliary in forming the compound perfect and pluperfect tenses. The non-verbal existentials, i.e. words lacking typical verb inflection used typically as copulae in ILP and sometimes also in plain-locational constructions, may be derivatives or lexicalized (irregular) third-person forms of the 'be' verb.

Chapter 7

Non-verbal predication in Turkic languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Yes. Turkic languages have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives and their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

The predicative behavior of adjectives and nouns is mostly the same.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

No. Turkic languages do not distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of (adjectival) non-verbal predicates.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication typically includes locational and temporal predication.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Turkic languages exclude the usage of function words (conjunctions and particles) in predicative position. As for adverbs other than setting adverbs (locative and temporal), they seem to be excluded. This topic needs, however, further research. It should also be noted that adverbs do not constitute a morphologically well-defined category in Turkic. They mostly originate as other parts of speech. For instance, the Turkish adjective *iyi* means both 'good' and 'well'.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Turkic languages display the juxtaposition construction (Type II), the copula construction (Type I), the Subtype IIIa of the predicative inflection construction as well as mixed constructions involving copular verbs added to Subtype IIIa. The juxtaposition construction (Type II) may possibly be considered part of Subtype IIIa, because it typically occurs in the 3rd person, in complementary distribution with Subtype IIIa.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

The occurrence of the copula construction is conditioned by negation and/or TAME specifications. The juxtaposition construction typically occurs with 3rd person subjects in (possibly generic) present-referring situations with all three types of predicative heads (nouns, adjectives, adverbials) for inclusion predication, as well as with nominal or nominalized predicative nuclei for identity predication. Subtype IIIa most typically occurs with SAPs.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Turkic languages display three main copula types: (1) copular verbs/verbal copulae, (2) (pro)nominal copulae (showing subject person-number agreement), and (3) the existential predictors {BAR} and its negative counterpart {YOK}. Another semi-copular verb with high functional load is *(b)ol-* 'to become'. Besides occurring with its (dynamic) lexical meaning, it behaves as a suppletive of copula forms.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

One can (with few exceptions) trace back their historical origin. As far as negative copulae are concerned, Turkic has two of them, in complementary distribution (see Table 1): one goes back to **är-mäz* (COP.VB-NEG.INTRA), whereas the other is represented by {DEĞİL} – of unclear origin – surfacing in various phonetic shapes such as Turkish *değil*, Azerbaijani *deyil* and Khalaj *da:y*. Sakha, on the other hand, displays a special form, *buolbataχ* (*buol-bataχ*), going back to **bo:l-ma-dok* (become-NEG-PN). Copulae expressing TAME-specification can be traced back to copular (**är-* 'to be') and/or postural verbs, of which the most productive is **tur-* 'to stand up, to stand'. The existential predictors {BAR} and its negative counterpart {YOK} are originally adjectives meaning 'existing' and 'not existing', on the one hand, and via suffixless nominalization 'existence' and 'nonexistence', on the other.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Turkic displays the predicative inflection construction (Subtype IIIa) to typically mark SAPs. In present-referring situations, Subtype IIIa-markings are directly added to the non-verbal predicate nucleus and occur with any kind of non-verbal predicate. Turkic predicative markers of 1st and 2nd persons originate from the cliticization of the independent personal pronouns. Third persons form a separate category. Demonstrative pronouns serve as 3rd person pronouns in the majority of Turkic languages. An exception is Sakha displaying *kini* (singular) and *kini-lär* (plural). Some Turkic languages mark 3rd persons with the copular clitic =*Dİr* or the corresponding copula *dur(u)*, going back to **tur-ur* (stand up/stand-INTRA) in Subtype IIIa. Few varieties employ forms going back to the distal demonstrative **ol*.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

No. Proper inclusion and identity predication are not distinguished.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The specificity parameter does not interact with non-verbal predication. Turkic languages do not have special markers to express definiteness/specificity; they lack definite articles. They mark the definite interpretation of nominal phrases by using demonstratives, possessives and genitive constructions. Definite nominal phrases can occur both as subjects and heads of nominal predicates.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

With respect to constituent order and focus, the various types of Turkic non-verbal predication do not behave differently.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Turkic appears to display typologically widespread strategies to express ostension, especially consisting of elements stemming from imperative forms of the verb ‘to see’ and/or demonstratives. Dedicated grammaticalized forms occur in Turkish and Azerbaijani. The Turkish ostensive marker *işte* is etymologically rather obscure. Corresponding older forms such as *ošte* and *ušde* may be traced back to Middle Turkic *uš teg* ‘like that’. This etymological trajectory is, however, rather questionable. Spoken Azerbaijani dedicated ostensive are formed by the proximal demonstrative *bu* or the distal demonstrative *o* combined with *de:*, or simply *de:*, in all likelihood resulting from the merging of the additive particle *da* with the exclamation particle *ey*. Ostension shows some special features with respect to constituent order (cf. e.g. 161 and 162).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Inverse-locational clauses are rather systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses. Turkic languages mostly display two different ways to express plain-locational vs. inverse-locational predication. The former is realized with locative-marked adverbial nuclei, whereas the latter employs the existential predictors {BAR} and {YOK} combined with locative arguments.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Yes. In the absence of an expressed location, the existential predicators {BAR} and {YOK} indicate pure existence vs. non-existence of the subject.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Plain-possessive predication is expressed with the existential predicators {BAR} and {YOK} and consists of two main types: genitive-possessor type (§4.1) and oblique-possessor type (§4.2). In the oblique-possessor type construction, the possessor is marked with the locative. Peripheral types of plain-possessive constructions include the incorporated-possessee type (§4.3) and the transpossessive type (§4.3.2), developed as contact-induced features in Siberian and Iranian Turkic, respectively.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication is expressed by using possessive adjectives as heads (mine, yours, his/hers, etc.), e.g. Azerbaijani *Bu kitab mən-İM-dİR* (this book 1SG-GEN-COP) 'This book is mine.'

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a "noun + quantitative modifier" in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a "noun + quantitative modifier" in the role of possessee?*

In Turkic, quantification is expressed by adjectives and accordingly occurs in non-verbal predicates expressing inclusion.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Nominal predicates in Turkic languages show flagging (case and adpositional marking). Accusative arguments can, however, occur with nominalized participles (cf. e.g. 122).

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Focus markers can be used but are not compulsory. Other discourse elements such as assertion markers can also occur, both as adverbs or sentence-final particles.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

Yes, the argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, and, like semantically monovalent verbs, non-verbal predicates cannot take a direct object.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Turkic languages have two different negation strategies in non-verbal predication. One regards the negation of inclusion, identity and locational predication, whereas the other concerns negation of inverse-locational predication as well as possession.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Imperative clauses always demand a copular verb.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

The insertion of non-verbal predicative constructions in complex constructions generally requires a copular verbal form.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Turkic predicative nouns preserve the following nominal features: number, possession, adjectival modification, and the possibility of having determiners (demonstratives).

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Turkic predicative adjectives preserve all features of adjectives.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Non-verbal predicate elements share with TAME-marked verbal forms subject-agreement markers, referred to as “pronominal-type” in Turcological studies.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Turkic copulae are related to the class of auxiliaries.

Brigitte Pakendorf

Chapter 8

Non-verbal predication in the so-called Paleosiberian languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

In Yukaghir and Nivkh adjectives are a subclass of verbs; the predicative behaviour of Ket adjectives is clearly distinct from that of verbs; and although adjectival predicates in Chukchi and Alyutor are very verb-like, they do show some differences (§2).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

In Ket, adjectives take predicative inflection that is missing in nouns in the unmarked (absolutive or nominative) case, and in Chukchi and Alyutor adjectival predicates show similarities to verbs, while nominal predicates show varied behaviour (§2, §4.2, §4.3).

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

Ket and Alyutor might distinguish between contingent and permanent attributes through the type of marking carried by adjectival predicates (§4.3).

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

There is hardly any information on adverbial predicates, and what little there is, is restricted to spatial adverbials (§4.4).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Not enough information is available on possible constraints on particular word classes in predicative position.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

2.1. Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?

Copular constructions, juxtaposition and predicative inflection are all found in the Paleosiberian languages (§5).

2.2. If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?

Juxtaposition is mainly found for identity/inclusion predication with unmarked TAM and 3rd person subjects, but with variation in the details (§5.2).

2.3. If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?

All languages have several copulas. Ket uses distinct copulas for generic existential/inverse-locational/possessive clauses vs. past tense non-verbal predication; Yukaghir uses distinct copulas for 1st/2nd person identity/inclusion vs. a very verb-like form for existential/inverse-locational/possessive clauses vs. ‘become’; Chukchi has distinct copulas for identity/inclusion, location, and ‘become’; the difference between the different copulas found in Nivkh is not clear (§5.1).

2.4. If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?

Not enough information is available on the origin of the copulas.

2.5. If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?

In Ket, Chukchi and Alyutor the predicative inflection indexes subject agreement with markers of pronominal origin; in Yukaghir the predicative inflection is verb-like via the bound copula (§5.3).

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

3.1. Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?

The Paleosiberian languages don’t seem to distinguish between identity predication and inclusion with nominal predicates, though in Ket and the Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages inclusion with adjectival predicates is distinct from inclusion with nominal predicates (§3.1).

3.2. How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?

There is not enough information on the interaction of specificity with non-verbal predication.

3.3. How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?

There is not enough information on the interaction of information structure and constituent order with non-verbal predication. However, in Ket the predicative inflection can be omitted when the subject and not the predicate is in focus (Vajda 2004: 85).

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Information is lacking on ostensive clauses in the Paleosiberian languages.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

In Ket, inverse-locational predication differs from plain-locational clauses; in Yukaghir and Chukchi it doesn't seem to differ (§3.2).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

In Ket, Yukaghir and Chukchi the construction used for inverse-locational predication also expresses other “existential” meanings (§3.2).

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

In Ket and Yukaghir, but not in Chukchi, plain possession is predicated in the same way as locational predication (§3.2).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

There is very little information on inverse-possessive predication. However, in Ket this is expressed by adding a nominalizing suffix to the genitive form of the nominal, and in Nivkh it can be derived from pronouns with a dedicated suffix *-nə* (§3.2).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

There is not enough information on quantification. However, in Yukaghir this is expressed in a verbal manner, either with the scalar quantifier verbs *təa*:- ‘be few’ and *ninge*:- ‘be many’, or with verbs derived from cardinal numerals (Maslova 2003: 310, 263, respectively).

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

In Yukaghir, the nominal predicate of ‘become’ is marked with the transformative suffix which also marks functive adjuncts of verbal predicates, and in the Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages the nominal predicate of identity/inclusion clauses carries equative case marking which also marks functive adjuncts (§4.2).

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Nivkh has a focus marker that occurs on nominal predicates, but it is unclear to what extent this is obligatory (§3.1).

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The subject argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs (§4.1).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

In Yukaghir and Nivkh, negation of all the types of non-verbal predication appears to be the same as negation of verbal predicates, while in Ket only identity/inclusion clauses are negated in the same way as verbal predicates. In Chukchi, all the types of non-verbal predication are negated differently; only the negation of adjectival predicates is structurally similar to verbal negation (§6).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

There is not enough information on the interaction of the parameter of illocutionary force with non-verbal predication.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

There is not enough information on non-verbal predication in subordinate sentences.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns?*

There is not enough information on the preservation of nominal features in predicative nouns.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives?*

There is not enough information on the preservation of adjectival features in predicative adjectives.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)?*

In the languages that have predicative inflection, non-verbal predicative elements acquire subject agreement marking (§5.3).

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

In all the languages except Ket the copulas also function as auxiliaries (§5.1).

Chapter 9

Non-verbal predication in Tungusic languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Adjectives in predicative position are distinct from verbs (§2).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Overall, adjectives in predicative position behave like nouns in predicative position, with a minor difference found in Nanai (§5.3).

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

Based on the existing descriptions, only Udihe makes a distinction between the predication of permanent and contingent properties (§5.3).

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Tungusic lects allow for a variety of adverbial predication, not only spatial (§5.4).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Not enough data are available to specify with certainty whether particular types of word class are excluded from non-verbal predication.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Copular constructions and juxtaposition are found in all Tungusic lects; in addition, Nanai (and marginally Even) shows predicative inflection (§3).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

The default construction is the copula construction, with juxtaposition being an option in the present tense with 3rd person subjects (§3.1, §3.2).

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

The most common copula is *bi-* 'be', but all languages also use *o(:)-* 'become' if a change of state is predicated. In addition, Nanai uses *ta:-* 'do' for 1st and 2nd persons (§3.1).

2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*
The non-verbal copulas found in Manchu are transparently derived from the verbal copulas *bi-* and *o-*; the copula *bi-*, in turn, is clearly related to the lexical verb *bi-* ‘live’ (§3.1).

2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*
Nanai (and its close relative Uilta) and marginally Even use possessive suffixes to index the argument of the non-verbal predication (§3.3).

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

There is no distinction between inclusion and identity predication (§4.1).

3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
As far as can be judged, specificity plays no role in the different types of non-verbal predication.

3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

In Udihe, topicalization has an effect on the structure of clauses that predicate inclusion and permanent possession (§8); information on other Tungusic lects is lacking.

3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Negidal lacks a dedicated ostensive marker. Ostensive clauses are identity clauses with a demonstrative element in subject position (§4.4). No information is available for the other Tungusic lects discussed in this paper.

4. Locational and possessive structures

4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Inverse-locational clauses are distinct from plain-locational clauses and pattern with generic existential clauses (§4.2).

4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Although inverse-locational predication is structurally similar to generic existential constructions, the latter lack a location phrase (§4.2).

4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Different types of plain-possessive predication are found; some pattern with inverse-locational predication, some pattern with generic existential predication, and a third type makes use of a proprietive-marked noun phrase (§4.2).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication is expressed via a special suffix $-\eta(g)i$ that does not occur in plain-possessive predication (§4.2).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Predication of quantity is aligned with adjectival predication. In possessive constructions, the quantifier in Even and Negidal tends to function as a modifier of the possessee, with the exception of the scalar quantifier ‘many’ in existential-like possessive constructions in Even (§4.3).

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Nominal predicates tend not to show overt flagging (§5.2).

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Nominal predication is not characterized by the use of discourse markers. However, in Udihe adjectival predicates in juxtaposition often carry the focus clitic particle $=dA$ (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 622–623).

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of non-verbal predicates is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs (§5.1).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

The Siberian Tungusic lects use a noun-like element to negate locational, existential, and possessive predication, while inclusion and identity are negated in the manner of verbal predicates. In Manchu, it is possessive and existential predication that is negated in the manner of verbal predicates (§6).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

No information is available on the interaction of illocutionary force with non-verbal predication.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Non-verbal predicates as elements of complex constructions tend to lack plain juxtaposition; with adjectival predicates, if the copula is omitted, the adjective carries case and possessive-marking to index its role in the sentence (§7).

5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns?*

Predicative nouns retain the ability to take possessive suffixes and number marking; in addition, they can be modified in various ways (§5.2).

5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives?*

Predicative adjectives optionally retain number agreement, but in Evenki they lose the case agreement found for attributive adjectives (§5.3).

5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)?*

Practically no verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements, with the exception of subject indexation in predicative inflection in Nanai (and marginally Even) (§3.3, §5.2).

5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

All the verbal copulas also occur as auxiliaries in analytical verbal constructions, with the default copula *bi-* having the widest range of auxiliary functions (§3.1).

Chapter 10

Non-verbal predication in Yupik-Inuktitut-Unangan

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

There is no morphosyntactic class of adjectives. Functions served by predicative adjectives in other languages are served by verbs in these languages. The verb stems in these constructions may be simple roots or derived. Functions served by attributive adjectives in other languages may be expressed with appositive nouns or suffixes on nouns (Section 2).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*
See 1.1.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

There is no formal distinction between contingent and permanent functions.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

There is not a distinct class of adverbs. Functions expressed by adverbs in other languages are expressed by suffixes to verbs or particles. Locational predication is accomplished by full verbs.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

In the Yupik languages all predicates are verbs.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

All of the languages in the family have verbal constructions for nominal predication (both proper inclusion and identity), quantificational predication, locational predication (both plain and inverse), ostensives, and possessive predication (plain in all of the languages, inverse as well in the Inuktitut and Unangan languages).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

The Inuktitut languages and Unangan contain additional constructions for predicating identity based on ostensive demonstratives. The demonstrative may be used on its own juxtaposed to a nominal representing the category predicated, or it may connect two absolutive nominals of any kind. The initial demonstrative picks up a previously mentioned referent or points to one in the speech situation.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Unangan is the only language in the family with a dedicated copular verb. There is just one copula.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

All of the languages have a derivational verbalizing suffix, added to nominal bases, which serves functions similar to copular verbs in other languages in nominal predication. The suffixes are descended from the copular root 'be', whose reflex survives as such in Unangan.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

There is no predicative inflection construction.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

The same constructions consisting of a verb formed from a nominal base plus verbalizing suffix are used for proper inclusion and identity predication (Section 3, examples 10–30). The Inuktitut and Unangan constructions based on demonstratives are used just for predicating identity (Section 3, examples 37–41, 43–45, 48–49).

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?* Specificity is not distinguished, but throughout the family, only definite referents can be cast as absolutes of transitive clauses. Indefinite referents are obligatorily oblique. This means that the transitive possessive constructions cannot be used for indefinite or generic possessions (Section 7).

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The nominal predication constructions with demonstratives in the Inuktitut and Ungangan languages are used to pick up referents from previous linguistic or non-linguistic context (Section 3, examples 37–41, 43–45, 48–49).

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Ostensive clauses in all of the languages are based on demonstratives with special ostensive affixes. There are no indications of historical origins (Section 6, examples 89–106).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Both plain-locational and inverse-locational predication can be expressed syntactically with full lexical verbs with meanings like ‘stay’ or ‘be at’ and a locative nominal (Section 5, examples 62–63). In Unangan, the copular verb ‘be’ can be used (Sections 3–5, 7, examples 31–35, 46, 78–79, 129).

Both plain-locational and inverse-locational predication can also be expressed with a verb based on a nominal stem indicating the Ground followed by a verbalizing suffix with a meaning such as ‘be located’, or ‘be far in the direction of’ (Section 4, examples 64–75).

In the Yupik and Inuktitut languages, inverse-locational predication can be expressed with verbs built on a nominal base identifying the Figure (the entity located) followed by a verbalizing suffix ‘have, exist’, and a locative nominal indicating the location (Section 5, examples 80–83).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

The construction used for inverse-locational predication is also used for existential statements ‘there is/are’, with or without a locative nominal specifying the location (Section 5, examples 84–86).

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Plain-possessive predication is expressed with full verbs. In the Yupik-Inuktitut languages this may be an intransitive verb consisting of a nominal base indicating the type of possessum followed by a verbalizing suffix. The verbalizing suffixes are the same as those used in locative predication. The possessor is the single core argument (Section 7, examples 107–115).

In all of the languages plain-possessive predication is also expressed with transitive verbs consisting of a verb beginning with a nominal base indicating the type of possessum followed by a different verbalizing suffix. The possessor is the ergative and the possessum the absolutive (Section 7, examples 116–124). The Unangan verbalizing suffix has a root cognate in the language (Section 7, example 122).

In the Inuktitut and Unangan languages, inverse-possessive predicative constructions can consist of a demonstrative, often an ostensive form, with juxtaposed possessed nominal (Section 7, examples 125–128). In Unangan the general

copular verb ‘be’ can be used with a possessed nominal for this purpose as well (Section 7, example 129).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication is not accomplished with a predicate phrase that is an adnominal possession construction.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Quantification is predicated with regular verbs whose stems have such meanings as ‘be many’ or stems consisting of a numeral base plus general verbalizing suffix (Section 4, examples 50–52, 55–58). There is no indication that these constructions are used to avoid existential constructions. Attributive quantification can be accomplished by suffixes on nominal bases or by appositive numerals (Section 4, examples 53–54).

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

There are no nominal predicates apart from the demonstrative constructions in the Inuktitut and Unangan languages, where the nominal element has the same form as other nominals unmarked for case. Otherwise nominal predication is accomplished by regular verbs with the same derivational and inflectional possibilities as other verbs (Section 3).

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Nominal predication is not characterized by any particular discourse elements (Section 3).

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The arguments of the verbs used in these predicative constructions are the same as those of other verbs. All are intransitive except for one of the possessive constructions (Section 7).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

The same strategies for negation are used for these verbs as other verbs: verb suffixes (Sections 5, 7, examples 2, 30, 87–88, 115, 119–120).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Illocutionary force has no effect on the constructions. Interrogative pronouns can serve as the initial nominal roots in the verbs (Sections 3, 5, 7, examples 18–22, 35, 42, 46–47, 68–69, 72–73).

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions?*

The constructions under discussion here behave like other clauses with respect to clause combining (Sections 3–5, 7, examples 12–13, 59–60, 81, 121).

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

The nominal roots that serve as the foundation of nominal predication constructions show no distinctions of number, gender, or definiteness themselves. The nominal roots themselves do not distinguish referentiality, just like incorporated nouns in languages with noun incorporation and the dependent nouns in compounds in other languages. Clauses built on such verbs can also contain independent nominals, including numerals and demonstratives, which do distinguish number.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

There are no adjectives.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

All the equivalents of non-verbal predication (apart from the demonstrative constructions) are full-fledged verbs, with all of the derivational and inflectional possibilities of other verbs.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

There are no auxiliaries in the languages of the family.

Chapter 11

Non-verbal predication in Western Apache (Athabaskan/Dene), with comparisons to Hän Athabaskan

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Western Apache does not have a morphosyntactic class of adjective at all. However, there is some evidence for such a class in Hän. In both languages, quality concepts are lexified as stative verbs, and they can sometimes be added to nouns, forming a noun-stative verb compound, which is, however, not used predicatively. In Hän, but not in Western Apache, there are quite a few verb stems that can be used without any specifically verbal morphology, and the resulting Noun + Verb stem constructions look very much like examples of non-verbal predicative adjectival constructions. So, unlike Apache and most Athabaskan languages, Hän does have genuine adjectives. This Hän construction is discussed in Section 8.2 of the chapter.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Western Apache has no adjectives. As seen in Section 8.2 of the chapter, Hän adjective behavior is similar to the behavior of nouns, since they can be used as non-verbal predicates. However, unlike Hän adjectives, Hän nouns cannot be attributive modifiers of nouns.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

It does not appear that the languages distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive functions of non-verbal predicates. If such a distinction has to be made, for Western Apache one of 22 verbs, most of them not copular, translatable as 'to be' or 'to be in/at a location', has to be used.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Locational non-verbal predication is common in both languages. Other adverbial types exist, at least in Western Apache, such as temporal non-verbal predication, and something that can be called dative or benefactive predication, but further research is needed on this topic.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

The word classes that cannot be used in predicative position are: clausal and sentential particles (tense, aspect, modal, evidential, mirative, subordinating, and discourse-pragmatic distinctions such as focus, topic, and specificity), ideophones, and interjections. Demonstratives, numerals, and quantifiers can be used in predicative position only when they are pronouns.

2. **Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction**

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

There are three construction types in Western Apache; at least (1) and (3) also exist in Hän.

- (1) verbless juxtaposition constructions are the most common (see Sections 3 and 6 of the chapter for Apache and Section 8 of the chapter for Hän);
- (2) juxtaposition constructions, which I analyse as colloquial abbreviations of verbful constructions with a (non-copular) locational verb (see Section 5 of the chapter);
- (3) copular constructions with optional and often common deletion of the copular verb (see Section 4 of the chapter).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Verbless juxtaposition (Type (1) above), constructions are in competition with verbful predicative constructions, and I get the impression that the verbful constructions are typical of sustained or formal oral discourse or written prose, whereas verbless juxtaposition constructions are more common in colloquial oral discourse and conversation. The same stylistic differences can be observed regarding Type (2) above, the verbless construction being far more colloquial than the verbful non-copular construction, and regarding Type (3) above, the verbless construction being more colloquial than the verbful copular construction.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Western Apache has three copular verbs, the semantics of which are described in Section 4.1.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

Yes, one can trace their origin to copular verbs at least as far as the Proto-Athabaskan language. (I am not sure, however, if any verbless constructions can be traced that far back, but it seems likely.)

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

There is no predicative inflection construction in any of the two languages.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Regarding Western Apache, in verbless non-verbal predication, there is no way of distinguishing them. In copular non-verbal predication, they can be distinguished to some extent by using different copulas, see Section 4.1 in the chapter. I do not have enough information regarding Hän.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
- In Western Apache, there is a formal distinction between identity and inclusive predication, so in this language there is an interaction between non-verbal predication and the specificity parameter (as involved in identity predication.)

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

I have not studied that issue in depth, but as discussed under examples (26b) and (63) of the chapter, (and see also (53–54)), there is a strong tendency to order the constituents in a topic-comment sequence, or in a not-in-focus-focused sequence, from the point of view of information structure. From a syntactic point of view, since Western Apache and Hän are strongly verb-final, it not surprising that clause final non-verbal predicates, in the position of a full verb, are much more common than clause-initial ones. See the discussion in Section 5.1. of the chapter regarding clause-initial non-verbal predicates. In Western Apache clauses, adverbs and NPs are generally preverbal. If they are not, they can be interpreted as: (1) afterthoughts (assuming there is prosodic confirmation of that), (2) prominently focused elements (for which there must be some prosodic evidence), or (3) contamination from English syntactic structures, since almost all fluent speakers are very fluent in English (and in many cases dominant in English). The well-documented cases of *hayú* ‘where’, which is very common in juxtaposed non-verbal predicate constructions, show that it can be in initial position as well as in final position, (see examples (56–63) in the chapter), and I have conjectures about the difference, as explained in the chapter, but there are no prosodic differences between the two possible orders.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

In both languages, there is no dedicated ostensive marker. In Western Apache, what can be used as an ostensive marker is the locative adverb *kū* ‘here’, but its usage as a clear locative adverb is much more common than its usage as an ostensive element (see Section 5.2 of the chapter).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

It is not very systematically distinguished. Inverse-locational sentences often start with a demonstrative locational adverb, glossed as ‘here’ but then again, many locational adverbs, in all types of predicates, can occur sentence initially.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Not as far as I know.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

There are various verbal plain possessive predication strategies. In Western Apache, one can use one of the 14 verbs meaning ‘to have (on one’s body)’; these 14 verbs are semantically distinct by classifying the object(s) possessed according to its/their shape, consistency, or number. Or one can use a possessed noun (optionally followed by modifying quantifiers or numerals) and followed by the verb *gółł* ‘it exists’ (see example (85) in the chapter). The non-verbal predication strategies include possessed noun and quantifier juxtaposition (see examples (79–80), (83–84), (94–97) in the chapter), and possessed noun and numeral juxtaposition (see examples (89–90) in the chapter). The only relationship locational predication is with the verb *gółł*, often used with locational adverbs, and which actually means ‘to live (at a location)’ with an animate subject. I do not consider it to be copular.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication includes, for Western Apache, constructions such as a possible verb meaning ‘it is mine, yours, his/hers, etc.’ (not quite understood, so I do not mention it in the chapter) or a construction of the type of “this N [is] possessor’s N”, (see Section 4.2 in the chapter). There are no reduced forms.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

In non-verbal predication, the quantifier tends to be in the predicate and sentence-final position. Of course, quantifiers can also be modifiers within NPs. On the basis of what is explained in Chapter 1, Section 4.3, the answer to the second question would be: that is most likely.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

There is no case marking whatsoever in Athabaskan languages. Athabaskan languages have quite a collection of postpositions, but they all contribute to the semantics of the predicate. So, there is no functive flagging in Athabaskan.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Focus markers might well be a bit more common after nominal predicates than after verbal predicates, (see ex. (40b) in the chapter), but I have not researched the issue in depth.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, not surprisingly, since there is no case marking of arguments. Some arguments might include topic markers, but these are just as commonly attached to arguments of verbful sentences.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

No, the negation strategy is the same as in verbal predication.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Non-verbal predication types can be statements/assertions or questions/inquiries, not different from those found in verbal predication. I have not come across cases of non-verbal predication types in commands/orders/suggestions. Western Apache and Hän do not have a dedicated imperative mood. What can be used as an imperative is the 2nd person form of the Imperfective aspect, and that is not considered very polite. One can therefore ask if the 2nd person Imperfective of any of the three Western Apache copular verbs can be used as an imperative, parallel to English ‘Be a man! Be a soldier!’, etc. As far as I can tell, such usages of the copular verb would be extremely infelicitous pragmatically, and probably not even understood. Several verbful paraphrases are used instead, translatable as: ‘one has to behave or act like a man’, ‘one can/must enlist as a soldier’, ‘this is the way one acts’, ‘one can/should be like that’ (in which the verb ‘be like that’ is definitely not the copular one), etc.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

I have not come across many examples of non-verbal predication types in complex (i.e. multi-clausal) construction, but I do not think they interact in any way. A nice example of a non-verbal predicative construction inside a subordinate clause is (68).

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

There is no gender/noun class in Athabaskan languages. Only a few nouns referring to humans or kinship terms can be marked for plural, and I do not think there would be a constraint about plural marking in predicative nouns. Predicative nouns can be possessed, and that is the only nominal feature they retain (see examples (26–33), (36–37), (44–45), (53–55), (73) in the chapter). There are a few cases, in my data, of possessor-possessee phrases used as predicative nouns, (see ex. (48): “Mexican food”) or more complex and lexicalized possessor-possessee (see ex. (52): “Wednesday”).

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

The Western Apache language has no adjectives, only stative verbs (see Section 2 of the chapter). The Hän language has predicative adjectives, (see Section 8.2 of the chapter), but no features of number are preserved in it. Athabaskan languages have no gender/noun-class.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Generally, no verbal features are acquired at all. However, the derivational prefix *ná-* ‘back, homewards’ (see examples (30–33) in the chapter), typically occurs on verbs but can occur with the noun ‘mind’. See also Section 9 of the chapter, for an example of verbless nominal predicates verbalized as verbful non-verbal predicates.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional differences)?*

There are a few particles that could be interpreted as auxiliary verbs in Apache, and two constructions contain particles that are homophonous with copular verbs. There is: (1) a construction with *doo* [inflected verb in the second person] *át’ēē da*, which expresses prohibition, and (2) a construction with the final particle *ndih* ‘even’, followed by *át’ēē*, which expresses a non-immediate or rather tentative future tense. Both of these occur only in verbful clauses.

Chapter 12

Non-verbal predication in Algonquian languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

As discussed in §2.2, Algonquian languages do not have a robust morphosyntactic class of adjectives. Notional equivalents of property-denoting items are either comparatively unremarkable verbs or bound elements, some of which appear to be rather remarkable regarding their phonological and morphosyntactic autonomy but whose exact status is often not well understood yet.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*
See 1.1 above.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

Algonquian languages do not systematically distinguish between contingent and permanent attribution.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

A systematic comparative investigation of adverbial predication in general and locational predication in particular has to be tackled by future research.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Restrictions on specific word classes – in particular, adverbs and particles – in predicative function has to be explored by further research.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predication

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Verbal predication and verbalization play a central role, but juxtaposition, copulas, and predicative affixation are also found (see summary in §3.1.4).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Factors relevant for the division of labor between different constructions for identity predication (§3.1.1) and proper inclusion (§3.1.2) are both pragmatic and grammatical. The former include the neutrality vs. saliency (probably: focus) of

referents, whereas the latter comprise the lexicality vs. indexicality of arguments on the one hand and distinctions made regarding person/number, tense, order (i.e., modality and, partly, the matrix-subordinate clause divide), and illocutionary force on the other.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Some languages (Blackfoot, Arapaho, Ojibwe) have verbal copulas. Others have non-verbal copulas (Cree-Montagnais-Naskapi, Passamaquoddy). See §§3.1.1–3.1.2.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

Not much is known about the prehistory of Algonquian verbal copulas. Non-verbal copulas are erstwhile demonstratives (Cree-Montagnais-Naskapi). In some uses, these elements may occur reinforced (Passamaquoddy), or fused with focus markers (Innu). See §3.1.1.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

All Algonquian languages use verbalizing suffixation for the expression of proper inclusion; the suffixes' etymons can typically be traced back to the proto-language and are usually assumed to be erstwhile verbs (Goddard 1990). Some languages (Blackfoot, Menominee; see §3.1.1) also have invariable copulative affixes, used with personal pronouns and demonstratives for the expression of identity predication; nothing is known about their origin.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Some languages (Arapaho, Blackfoot) have distinct (sets of) strategy types for expressing identity predication and proper inclusion. Others (Menominee, Ojibwe) have partly overlapping strategies, and in yet others proper inclusion can be expressed via several different strategies, one of which is used for identity predication. In no language are both functions formally conflated (§§3.1.1–3.1.2).

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Despite the dedicated non-specific nominal marker found in Blackfoot and Fox, specificity is not a prominent grammatical category in Algonquian languages. In particular, I have not found the use of bleached demonstratives/articles to interact with the constructions that express identity predication or proper inclusion, but this is an under-studied area.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

In some languages, constituent order is either flexible or fixed and does not interact with non-verbal predication structures; in Innu, juxtaposition occurs in complementary orders for identity predication and proper inclusion (§§3.1.1–3.1.2).

Future research shall survey interactions of non-verbal predication with information structure.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Several languages appear to use simple demonstratives for ostension, but some languages have dedicated ostensive elements (§3.3). While the Arapaho ones are etymologically opaque, the Menominee ones are built upon default demonstratives.

4. Locative and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

All languages have verbs (either one or two) that conflate the notions of existence and location (§3.2.1).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

I have not identified either a distinction between plain- and inverse-locational clauses nor a distinction between different kinds of existential meanings in Algonquian.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

As detailed in §3.2.2, all languages have three verbal strategies for the expression of plain-possessive predication: a ‘have’-verb, a verbalized possessed noun, and a verb featuring a medial possessee. Some ‘have’-verbs typically occur in the same constructions as high-transitivity verbs, but others occur in semitransitive constructions usually employed with low-individuation or non-specific patients in Arapaho and Blackfoot. The second and third types are variants of the S-possessor, proprietive, type; they show not only homogeneity across the family but also stability in the course of time. The ‘have’-verb can, but need not, be related to an existential-locational verb.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication seems to be only seldom found, and also less frequently used, in Algonquian; some languages (Cree-Montagnais-Naskapi) have ‘belong’-verbs (§3.2.2).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Quantification is expressed verbally in Algonquian (§3.3), either via general verbs ('be many') or via numeral verbs ('be three'); such verbs routinely conflate pure quantification ('they are many') and quantitative existence ('there are many').

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Apart from the spatial enclitics and particles found in some languages, nominals do not show functive or other kind of overt flagging.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

The use of focus markers in non-verbal predication, particularly in clefts and related structures, is the matter of future research.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs (i.e., unmarked).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

A detailed account of negation and non-verbal predication has to be addressed by further research. At this point, it can roughly be said that languages that make ample use of juxtaposition constructions and/or non-verbal copula constructions have negative particles in verbful and verbless sentences; languages that use verbal copulas use their default negative verbal preverbs instead.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

For identity predication (§3.1.1), Arapaho uses different strategies in declarative (verbal copula) vs. interrogative clauses (juxtaposition). Blackfoot uses a verbal copula for both, but different ones. Other languages seem to have the same lexicon and grammar for both sentence types.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in 5.5)?*

I have not found any interactions between the coding of non-verbal predication and the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions in Algonquian.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Verbalized nouns are compatible with modifying preverbs (adjectival and numeral) but incompatible with determiners. The Algonquian-specific possessive constructions impose some restrictions on the nominal elements involved in the stems (§3.2.2): possession is either obligatory (PNC) or excluded (MPC); modi-

fying preverbs are either possible (PNC) or obligatory (MPC); number and gender marking, as well as determiners, are excluded.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Algonquian languages do not have adjectives (§2.2).

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Verbalized nominals are indistinguishable from other verbs, but non-verbal predicative elements normally do not acquire all verbal features. Indexicals usually can bear some TAM markers either related or identical to their verbal counterparts; some argument indices seem to (variably?) occur on Blackfoot copulative suffixes, but otherwise nominal elements largely keep their morphological make-up.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Algonquian languages do not feature Indo-European-like auxiliaries; if at all, the verbal copulas would be the sole members of such a class.

David Beck

Chapter 13

Non-verbal predication in Lushootseed

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

There is no morphosyntactically distinct class of adjectives.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*
Not relevant.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

Not relevant.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication is not limited to locational predication.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Lushootseed distinguishes between potentially predicative words (noun, verb, adverb, and numeral) and non-predicative words (determiners, prepositions, and clitics).

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Lushootseed uses the juxtaposition construction. It has no copula.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Not relevant.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Not relevant.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

Not relevant.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Not relevant.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Inclusion and identity predication are not distinguished.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The specificity parameter is not relevant.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The use of non-verbal predicates is governed by Information Structure.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Ostension is expressed using a predicate adverb, *diɬ*.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Plain-locational predication is expressed using a juxtapositional construction; inverse-locational predication uses the verb *ʔa* 'X is there'.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other "existential" meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

The construction used for inverse-locational predication is available to express existential meanings.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

There are a variety of means of expressing possessive predication, one of which uses the verb *ʔa* 'X is there' found in inverse-locational predication.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Not relevant.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a "noun + quantitative modifier" in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a "noun + quantitative modifier" in the role of possessee?*

Lushootseed makes use of both numeral predicates and existential constructions with noun + numeral.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Nominal predicates show no functive flagging.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Nominal predication is not characterized by a particular discourse marking element.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Negation of non-verbal predicates resembles negation of verbal predicates; there is a special construction used for existential negation extending to possessive usages.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Not relevant.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Non-verbal predicates are freely used in subordinate and nominalized clauses.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Predicative nouns have the same features as nouns used as arguments.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Not relevant.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

No exclusively verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicates other than the potential to host pronominal subject clitics and predicate particles.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Not relevant.

Chapter 14

Non-verbal Predications in Uto-Aztecan languages from northwestern Mexico

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

The morphosyntactic class of adjectives in UAnwM languages is usually represented by a small set of non-derived adjectives and a large set of adjectives derived by suffixes also used for deverbal nominalizations. Except for present predications encoded by juxtaposition, the predicative behavior of both types of adjectives is distinct from verbs and similar to nouns and adverbs, since they need the presence of a copulative element. Pima Bajo is the only UAnwM language that can encode adjectival predications in non-present situations without the presence of a copula (see example (72)).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

The predicative behavior of adjectives and nouns are usually identical in UAnwM languages. The only difference that has been observed is found in Guarijío with the copula *reé* that seems to be restricted to adjectival predication.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

The distinction between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates is not found in UAnwM languages.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

In UAnwM languages, adverbial predication is mainly limited to locational predication, but temporal predication is also possible, as shown in (35), (38c) (64–65), (73–74).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

UAnwM languages do not seem to exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position. However, more empirical data would be needed to be more categorical.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Juxtaposition and different copulae are the two main strategies for non-verbal predications in UAnwM languages. The use of verb-like inflection directly attached to the non-verbal predicate head is only found in Tepiman languages, with the possibility to be combined with a copula (see §3.1.3).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Juxtaposition in UAnwM languages is only found in present and habitual contexts. This zero-coding strategy is sometimes in competition with a copula. In non-present contexts, a copulative suffix or a different copula is needed. In Tepiman languages, a non-verbal predicate with verb-like inflection is commonly used in non-present situations, sometimes with the concomitant presence of a copula. Guarijío and Tarahumara have a copula specialized for negative locational predication.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Guarijío and Tarahumara have two different copulae, according to present vs. non-present situations. This distinction appears to be important in UAnwM languages, since the use of a copulative suffix is found in Yaqui only in non-present, as well as the use of verb-like inflection in Tepiman languages. Additionally, Guarijío seems to have a copula *reé* restricted to adjectival predication, and Guarijío and Tarahumara present two different locational copulae used in different polarity (affirmative vs. negative locational predication).

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

The diachronic origin of locational copulae is discussed in §5. We propose that some existential and positional verbs seem to undergo the semantic bleaching of their original meaning, which could lead to the creation of a locational copula, and to a change from verbal to adverbial predication. In addition to these verbal origins, the study has also proposed that a different copula could come from a demonstrative in Pima Bajo.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

The use in UAnwM languages of different copulative suffixes attached to the non-verbal predicate head could be considered instances of a predicative inflection construction, that is Subtype IIIa construction, as detailed in Chapter 1. The markers involved in this type of construction (*-tu* in Yaqui, *-ru* in Tarahumara, *-ga* in Guarijío, *-ka* in Northern Tepehuan) most likely come from copular verbs that have been firstly cliticized, and then attached as verbalizing suffixes.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

UAnwM languages tend to have the same strategies for encoding proper inclusion and identity predications.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
The specificity parameter seems to be not relevant for the different non-verbal predication types in UAnwM languages.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

More discourse data are required to answer more appropriately, but the use of the topic marker *ko* in Tarahumara (as in (27) and (42)) shows that word order changes and potential pausings found in ostensive predication strongly suggest an important role of information structure and constituent order in this type of predication.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

UAnwM languages do not seem to have a dedicated marker for ostensive predication. Instead, they use a nominal predication with a demonstrative in the role of argument, linked to the nominal predicate by juxtaposition or a copula, as in identity predications.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Inverse-locational clauses in UAnwM languages are not systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses (see §3.1.2.3 and §4.2).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

In UAnwM languages, ILP constructions also express “existential” meanings without reference to spatial locations (see examples 48–49, 60c, 61b, 62b, 66a–66b).

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

The most usual plain-possessive predications in UAnwM languages are verbal predications corresponding to the transpossessive type and the incorporated-possessee type. However, regarding the TAM marking, these incorporated-possessee constructions are sometimes treated as nominal/adjectival predications (see §4.1). These constructions do not seem to be related to locational predications. Tepiman languages are the only ones that can express plain-possessive predication by juxtaposition (see examples in (17)).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

In some cases, inverse-possessive predication and adnominal possession are formally indistinct, since third person subject pronouns can be unmarked in UAnwM languages. See some examples from (19) to (24).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

UAnwM languages are under-documented. More data are needed for the study of quantification predication.

5. **Morphosyntactic issues**

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show factive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

No.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

No.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The arguments of non-verbal predications are always coded like the arguments of semantically monovalent verbs.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

No. The only case in which negation and non-verbal predication seem to have a particular interaction is found in Guarijío and Tarahumara, with a copula that is specialized for negative locational predications (see examples (61) and (62)).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The parameter of illocutionary force does not seem to be relevant for the different non-verbal predication types in UAnwM languages. No special markings are involved.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

More discourse data are required to answer this question.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

All nominal features seem to be preserved in predicative nouns.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Adjectival features such as number are usually preserved in predicative adjectives. It is worth noting that some degree of overlap between nominal and adjectival predication may be common in UAnwM languages. Diachronically, the predication headed by derived adjectives most likely comes from a nominal predication in which the predicate phrase corresponds to a deverbal nominalization. Originally, this adjectival predication would thus be a nominal predication in which the predicate phrase is the subject nominalization of a stative verb (*The house is the one who is green* > *The house is green*, *The horse is the one who is slow* > *The horse is slow*).

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

In UAnwM languages, non-verbal elements in predicative functions accept the same TAM features as those used in verbal predications. However, these non-verbal elements usually require to receive TAM markings the presence of a copulative suffix (Yaqui) or of a copula different from the one used in unmarked present and which is the one that receives TAM markings (Tarahumara and Guarijío). In Tepiman languages, TAM markings can be attached directly to the non-verbal predicate head, with the possible presence of a copula.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

No, although the locational copula *atí* from Tarahumara seems to be on the way to becoming auxiliary (see example (89)).

Chapter 15

Verbless clauses and copula clauses in Arawak languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Generally, yes on both counts (§1.2.4).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*
Yes (§1.2.4, §2).

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

Attested just for Tariana (§3, ex. (23)).

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Manner words and locationals occur in non-verbal predication (§1.2.4).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

No.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Non-verbal predication is pervasive. Copula clauses are found in just some languages (§§4–5). Non-verbal predication can no more be considered juxtaposition than a core argument (e.g. the subject) and a verb in a verbal clause. Clauses with non-verbal predicates across the family constitute a special clause type.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Change of state may be expressed with copula clauses, with non-verbal predication expressing identity, attribution, location, existence, and possession (§4.3). Copula clauses in Tariana (§5) are the outcome of contact-induced change.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Different copulas express attribution and equation in Alto Perené (§4.3), and attribution, existence, location, and change of state in Tariana (§5). Copulas are uncommon across the family.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*
 Copulas go back to verbs meaning ‘become, go back, appear’; or they can be borrowed (§4.3, §5).
- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*
 Many languages mark the subject of a non-verbal predicate in the same way as the subject of a stative verb using pronominal suffixes in some languages (pronominal enclitics in others, depending on the language, with some similarities to the construction IIIa of Chapter 1). Pronominal prefixes mark the subject of a transitive verb and of an active intransitive verb. The discussion of various patterns of this unusual split-S marking is in §2 and in the references.
- 3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication**
- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*
 No.
- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
 No interactions attested.
- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
 None attested.
- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*
 Generally, there is no dedicated marker. A proximal demonstrative as non-verbal predicate expresses “ostension”.
- 4. Locational and possessive structures**
- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*
 This distinction is not made.
- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*
 Existence can be expressed with a copula verb (if available) (§4.3, §5.2).
- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*
 Goal-schema is widespread across the family (§4.1), with the exception of Tariana (§5.2). An additional strategy, in some languages, is the so-called “proprietary” construction.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Topic-schema is used in many languages for inalienably possessed items (§4.1). The emergence of possessive verb ‘have’ tends to result from areal diffusion (§5.2).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

No special construction: a quantifier appears in the non-verbal predicate slot (§4).

5. **Morphosyntactic issues**

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

As mentioned in §2.5 above, non-verbal predication often takes the same subject marking as subjects of stative verbs (see §2 for the distribution of patterns across the family).

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

In some languages only (Baure, Baniwa of Içana-Kurripako and Piapoco: §3).

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

Marking the subject of non-verbal predicates in the same way as S_o (the subject of stative verbs) is the most archaic pattern (§2).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Generally, no (details are in §4.2).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Not relevant.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Non-verbal predicates can occur in some dependent clauses, but not in all types of these ((iii) of §3). In some languages they cannot occur in dependent clauses.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

All the features are preserved (except core case in Tariana) (§5.1).

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

All the features are preserved.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Non-verbal predicates have fewer categories than verbs as predicates (including stative verbs); this includes limitations on occurrence in serial verb constructions and commands, and restricted sets of aspects and modalities (§3). This is different from copula verbs and copula clauses (for those languages which have them) which typically have all the aspects and modalities as any other verbs.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Generally, no. The copula 'become' may be considered an auxiliary depending on the analysis (§4.3, §5.2).

Chapter 16

Non-verbal predication in Tupian, especially Tupí-Guaraní (TG) languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

The family does not have adjectives as a particular class distinct from nouns, attribution being expressed by predicative nouns.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Predicative nouns are characterized by specific person marking, different from that of verbs.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

There is no grammatical distinction between contingent and permanent attributive function.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

In the language family, adverbial predication comprises locational and similarity predication. Other kinds of adverbial non-verbal predication are not found.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Adverbs are excluded from predicative position.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction types are found in the language family?*

Predicative inflection constructions of Subtype IIIb are found throughout the whole language family. Copula constructions are characteristic of Amazonian TG languages and all branches of Tupian. Copula-like constructions are found in the whole language family, with the exception of TG branches I-III, in TG branch II only in Sirionó.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

In all languages the most common construction is predicative inflection marked by a person marking prefix, according to person agreement in the predicate.

When there is no ambiguity in the context, this marker may be omitted, although mere juxtaposition is not a third form but a “lighter” form of construction.

- 2.3. *If the language family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Copula constructions are not uniform.

- 2.4. *If the family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origins?*

Copulas and copula-like particles differing from language to language are not traceable back to any kind of proto-language. On the contrary, they seem to be innovations of the individual languages or family branches. Only Emerillon *kob* and *dati* may be traced back to a specific lexical root and, respectively, to a negative construction in TG languages. Predicative inflection in all languages corresponds with the synchronically functioning person markers, whose historical origin generally may be traced back.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Various Tupí-Guaraní languages use the predicative inflection construction of Subtype IIIb (with morphological marking of the subject), which is regarded by many as the original structure. However, in Tupí-Guaraní languages that have lost this morphosyntactic mechanism, and also considering the Tupian family at large, the person markings attached to the noun in juxtaposed nominal predication might be viewed as a kind of Subtype IIIa construction. This might have conspired to the gradual abandoning of Subtype IIIb, no longer observable in the whole Tupí-Guaraní branch.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language family distinguish between the way in which inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

The language family generally does not distinguish between the way in which inclusion and identity predication are expressed.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Some TG languages have preserved the “referrer”-suffix *-a* in its original function, which is a specificity parameter referring to a specific person or object (marked by *-a*) or a class of persons or objects (unmarked element). This parameter allows distinguishing identity predication from inclusion predication as well as plain-locational from inverse-locational predication.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Traditional constituent order being SOV in transitive verbal clauses, the information structure in existential clauses is topic – predicate, in all other cases of non-verbal predication the constituent order is subject – predicate, possibly subject – predicate – pronominal topic. In copula constructions the copula gen-

erally is in the final place (subject – predicate – copula or predicate – subject – copula) but may also show the order subject – copula – predicate (see example [112]).

- 3.4. *In the language family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language family to express ostension?*

No dedicated ostensive constructions have been so far described in literature.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, what kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Inverse-locational clauses may be distinguished from plain-locational clauses in those TG languages that have preserved the “referrer”-suffix *-a* in its original function (see above 3.2.). Subjects marked by the “referrer”-suffix are understood as plain-locational clauses, unmarked subjects give the clause an inverse-locational reading. In all other languages the difference only may result from the context.

- 4.2. *In the language family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

In the family the construction used for ILP is the basic construction for frequent existential clauses, especially with reference to non-localizable entities.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

The strategy used in the family to express plain-possessive predication basically is existential, not locational. It also may be expressed by a verbal construction with a verb meaning ‘to have/possess’.

- 4.4. *Does the language family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication is expressed by inclusion predication (see example 10) or possessive predication (see example 12).

- 4.5. *In the language family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

The construction type used for quantification is existential predication. The “existence” of a nominal root meaning ‘big quantity/a lot’ expresses quantification. Quantitative modifiers also are used, for example ‘(a) few’ (Mbyá *mbovy*, Kagwahiva *hykav*, Wayäpi *miti*), numerals such as ‘two’, ‘three’, or diminutive and augmentative formations. The latter occur in verbal and non-verbal predication.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Nominal predicates in TG languages, whenever there is existential predication, show functive flagging by the use of a person marker.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Assertion markers and focus markers are used in the same way in verbal and non-verbal predication. Nominal predication is not characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The most common non-verbal predication being existential, there is no argument in this kind of nominal predication. The argument (subject) of inclusion and identity predication is unmarked, like the subject of a semantically monovalent verb, unless it is marked by the “referrer”-suffix *-a*, which allows distinguishing arguments referring to a specific person or object from those referring to a class of persons or objects.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Negation strategies are the same in verbal and non-verbal predication. Different forms are used for declarative and prohibitive clauses as well as for word formation (privative formations and similar lexical negations).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Is not applicable to the family.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Nominalized subordinate clauses are frequently used as arguments or adnominal complements (relative clauses). In this case there is no change of predicative marking.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/ demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Predicative nouns are characterized by nominal person marking, which may also be understood as possession marking. Number and gender are unmarked on all nouns independently of their syntactic function. Demonstratives generally are differentiated according to distance and to presence in or absence from the speech act. There are no articles, but numeral specification in its traditional form is from ‘one’ to ‘three’ or ‘four’.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Is not applicable to the family.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Non-verbal predicative elements have their own morphology of person agreement. Person marking differs from verbs mainly with regard to the increase of valency typical of transitive verbs. TAM features, in the different languages of the family, partly are the same as in verbal predication, partly are specific of nominal predication. Tense markers often are accompanied by discourse particles with regard to evidentiality or aspect.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Copula elements are not related to the small number of possible auxiliaries.

Chapter 17

Non-verbal predication in Zaparoan languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

All the Zaparoan languages exhibit a distinct morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and their predicative behavior is generally distinct from that of verbs in that they require a copula to function predicatively. The one exception to this generalization is found in Arabela, where in present tense, a juxtaposition construction is employed for third-person subjects, and thus resembles a verbal predication construction.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

In general, the predicative behavior of adjectives is the same as that of nouns in Zaparoan languages. Although Iquito adjectives exhibit morphosyntactic behavior that distinguishes them from both nouns and verbs, the predicative behavior of nouns and adjectives in NVP is the same. The same appears to be true for Arabela (compare [81] and [89]) and Sápara (compare [99] and [100]).

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

None of the Zaparoan languages distinguishes between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates. For Iquito compare, e.g., (14) and (12).

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Sufficient data to generalize exist only for Iquito, in which the vast majority of adverbial predication is locational. Non-locative adverbial predication is restricted to a small set of adverbs denoting stage-level bodily or emotional states (see §5.1).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

In general, in Zaparoan languages, it appears that while nouns and adjectives appear freely in predicative position, the appearance of adverbs is restricted. For Iquito, except for a small set of adverbs used to predicate stage-level bodily or emotional states, adverbs must undergo adjectivalization before being able to serve as the nucleus of a non-verbal predication (see §5.1).

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

2.1. Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?

All Zaparoan languages exhibit copula constructions. Iquito only permits NVPs using a copula construction, while Arabela exhibits a juxtaposition construction, copula constructions, and a Subtype IIIa predicative inflection construction. Available data from Sápara suggest that it only permits NVPs via a copula construction.

2.2. If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?

In Arabela, the sole language that exhibits multiple NVP construction types, the juxtaposition construction is used for non-locative third-person NVP clauses that lack TAME morphology. The Subtype IIIa predicative inflection construction is used for first- and second-person inclusion and identity predication (see §8.1). All locative predication requires the use of the *ki* copula, as do non-locative NVP clauses with any TAME morphology.

2.3. If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?

Iquito exhibits three types of copula. The standard copula $taá^{LL} \sim {}^Ht\ddot{a}i \sim ta$ is used for inclusion predication, identity predication, and quantification (see §2.1). The copular verb $kuúki^L$ is used in irrealis and notionally future contexts. The copular verb $iiki^L$ is used for locative and non-locative adverbial predication.

Arabela exhibits only one copula, *ki*, which is used for locative NVP in all contexts and for all types of NVP in clauses that bear TAME morphology (see §8.1).

Data from 20th century Sápara show that it exhibited two copula constructions, one involving a standard copula *ta* and another involving the locative copula *iki*. In 21st century data, however, *iki* has entirely overtaken the functions formerly filled by the standard copula *ta*, becoming the sole copula in Sápara.

2.4. If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?

The standard copula found in Iquito, and with a reflex in Sápara, can be traced back to Proto-Zaparoan (see §9). In all the Zaparoan languages, the locative copula seems to result from semantic bleaching of a verb, reconstructable to Proto-Zaparoan, whose other senses include ‘to reside’ and ‘to live in a certain way’.

2.5. If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?

Arabela exhibits a Subtype IIIa predicative inflection construction for first-person and second-person inclusion and identity predication (see §8.1).

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

3.1. Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which inclusion and identity predication are expressed?

The languages of the family do not distinguish how inclusion and identity predication are expressed.

In Iquito, identity and inclusion predication are structurally identical and only differ semantically, in that in identity predication, the argument and the predicate are understood to be equireferential (that is, provide two descriptions of a single referent or set of referents). This equireferentiality may be inferred from world knowledge or context, or it may be overtly marked by use of a determiner. In Arabela, in cases of present temporal reference, both inclusion and identity predication are expressed with the juxtaposition NVP construction for third person and with a Subtype IIIa predicative inflection construction for first and second person.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
In Iquito, specificity does not interact with non-verbal predication types. Available data from Arabela and Sápara are not sufficient to answer this question.
- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Iquito is the sole language for which sufficient data exist to answer this question comprehensively, although there is a small quantity of evidence for Sápara that speaks to this question.

In Iquito, the pragmatically unmarked constituent order in the Basic Copula Construction is PRED COP ARG for both identity and inclusion NVP constructions. If the positions of the predicate and the argument are reversed (ARG COP PRED), the result is an argument focus construction. Additionally, in switch-topic constructions, the topicalized element appears at the left edge of the utterance; a resumptive pronoun appears in the coreferential argument position (it is null if third person). These phenomena are amply exemplified in §3.

In Iquito locative predication, which employs the copular verb *iiki*^L, the pragmatically unmarked constituent order is ARG COP LOC.PRED. If the locative predicate is focused, it is fronted (LOC.PRED ARG COP); see §5. The same is true in non-locative adverbial predication: the pragmatically unmarked constituent order is ARG COP ADV.PRED, but if the predicate is focused, it is fronted (ADV.PRED SBJ COP); see §5.1.

Finally, the small amount of available evidence for Sápara suggests that the same constituent order facts hold for locative predications with focused and non-focused arguments (see §8.2).

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Iquito exhibits an ostensive particle, *atiha*, that is used interjectively as well as in conjunction with BCC ostensive constructions. The language also has a relatively large but closed set of demonstrative determiners and demonstrative pronouns

that can be used ostensively. Available data from Arabela and Sápara are not sufficient to answer this question.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Iquito does not exhibit dedicated inverse-locational clauses. Available data from Arabela and Sápara are not sufficient to answer this question.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Not applicable.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

All Zaparoan languages exhibit a transpossessive predication involving a lexical verb meaning ‘have’ (Iquito: *mii* ‘have’, Arabela: *hiit’a* ‘have, possess, own’, Sápara: *mī*).

Iquito, in addition, exhibits two subject-possessee constructions: an oblique-possessor construction and a genitive-possessor construction. These two subject-possessee constructions make use of the existential predicate *iiki*^L, which is historically related to, and homophonous with, the locative copula, but is distinguishable from it under negation; see §7.

Arabela also exhibits an incorporated-possessee subject-possessor construction where the nucleus of the NVP bears either a proprietive suffix *-raka* or the privative suffix *-hu*. Both strategies are unrelated to the locative predication construction, which uses the copula *ki*; see §8.1.

Sápara exhibits the same incorporated-possessee subject-possessor construction involving the proprietive suffix *-raka*, but no information is available about its negative polarity counterpart.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive constructions are attested in Iquito and Sápara, and in both languages the possessive predicate consists of an adnominally possessed form of the noun denoting “possession” or “belonging”.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Iquito uses the basic copula construction for quantification (see §4), as does 21st century Sápara. No data are available for quantification predication in either 20th century Sápara or Arabela. Only in Iquito do sufficient data exist to be able

to speak to the question of whether it is used to avoid the construction types mentioned in the question, and for Iquito it does not appear to be the case.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Nominal predicates show no functive or overt flagging in the Zaparoan languages.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse-marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Synchronically, nominal predication in Zaparoan languages is not characterized by the use of discourse-marking elements.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

In both Iquito and Arabela, the arguments of NVP constructions are coded in the same way as the arguments of a semantically monovalent verb. In Sápara, however, when the argument is pronominal, it is drawn from the paradigm of pronouns otherwise used for the objects of transitive verbs.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

In general, Zaparoan languages are not attested as having different negation strategies in NVP constructions, with the exception of certain constructions used to express possessive predication in Iquito and Arabela.

Iquito exhibits two subject-possessee constructions (genitive and oblique possessor constructions) that employ the existential verb *iiki*^L, which does not negate with the standard negation *kaa*, but instead exhibits the suppletive negative existential *ááhàpàki*.

Arabela exhibits an incorporated-possessee type subject-possessee construction that involves a proprietive suffix in cases of positive polarity possession, and a distinct privative suffix in cases of negative polarity possession, rather than a combination of the standard negation strategy and the proprietive suffix.

Finally, we mention an interaction between negation and the standard copula in Iquito: the *taá*^{LL} allomorph cannot be immediately preceded by the negation element *kaa*; in that environment, the ^H*tì* allomorph surfaces instead.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The choice of the NVP construction type does not depend on illocutionary force in any Zaparoan language.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Iquito is the only Zaparoan language for which sufficient data exist for us to be able generalize about how NVP constructions are affected by inclusion in

complex constructions. In this language, the standard copula exhibits allomorphy, with one allomorph, *taá^{LL}*, being conditioned by inclusion in a dependent clause (or by the presence of a third person focused NVP argument).

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

In Iquito, all nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns. The data available suggest that the same is true for Arabela and Sápara.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Iquito is the sole Zaparoan language for which sufficient data exists to evaluate the preservation of adjectival features of predicate adjectives in NVP constructions, and in this language predicative adjectives have the same features as attributive adjectives.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

In general, in Zaparoan languages, non-verbal predicative elements do not acquire verbal features. Verbal features such as TAME features and person agreement are instead generally borne by copulas. The one notable exception is the Arabela present tense non-locative predication NVP construction, which both lacks TAME morphology and an overt copula. In this case, the nucleus of the non-verbal predication bears verbal subject person agreement for first and second persons (see §8.1).

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Iquito does not exhibit auxiliary verbs, nor are any attested in the existing data for the other languages of the Zaparoan family.

Simon E. Overall

Chapter 18

Non-verbal predication in Chicham

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Yes, the languages all have a small class of adjectives which are distinct from verbs.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Adjectives are morphologically noun-like and do not differ from nouns in their predicative behaviour.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

This distinction has not been explicitly described.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

There are also examples of predication with time words, quantifiers, and numerals.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

There is no evidence for this.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Copula construction using a copula verb or semi-copulas, predicative inflection construction (Subtype IIIa) using an enclitic inflected copula, and juxtaposition.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

The evidence suggests that where the juxtaposition construction is possible, it is in free variation with the predicative inflection construction (Subtype IIIa) using the enclitic copula. Of course, there are likely to be pragmatic factors behind the choice but these have not been described.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

A verbal copula and a predicative inflection construction (Subtype IIIa) with an enclitic copula are in complementary distribution conditioned by grammatical

criteria including include tense, mood, dependent clause status, and presence of number marking.

Semi-copulas are used for location predication.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*
Formal overlap of verbal copula and existential verb (both *a-*) suggests a common origin. The enclitic copula (/aita/, with various reduced allomorphs) appears to have originated as a separate verb that has become phonologically bound. The enclitic copula is not obviously related to the verbal copula, and no further etymological sources are apparent.
- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*
Subtype IIIa, whereby all or some of the same morphology as verbal predicates is affixed to the non-verbal predicate. However, the verbal morphology must be mediated by the presence of the enclitic copula.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*
There does not seem to be any grammatical distinction.
- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
There is some evidence that locational constructions may differ depending on specificity, but this has not been described in those terms.
- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Constituent order is typically predicate-final, whether the predicate is verbal or non-verbal. Just one construction (described in §2.1) involves the predicate in clause-initial position, and it is not clear what the motivation is for this construction.

Juxtaposition requires SUBJECT PREDICATE order, and also typically includes the topic marker =*ka* attached to the subject NP.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

No dedicated ostensive marker has been described.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*
Yes, an existential type construction. The Figure is expressed as subject of the existential verb, and the Ground as a locative marked NP.
- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Yes, the same construction expresses pure existence.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Plain-possessive predication makes use of the existential verb *a-*, conforming to the S-possessee type with genitive possessor. Alternatively, applicative derivation may be added to the existential verb, deriving a transitive clause with the possessor encoded as P and the possessee as A. There is also an incorporated-possessee construction that makes use of an attributive marker (§3.1).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive is expressed with a copula clause in which the predicate is a possessive form derived with the suffix *-nau* (§3.1).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Quantifiers are usually NP modifiers. Quantifiers and numerals may also function as non-verbal predicates, forming constructions of the type “My brothers are three” = “I have three brothers”. There is not enough data to say whether this is more or less systematic.

5. **Morphosyntactic issues**

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

No, unless the bound copula is considered to fulfil this role.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Subjects of non-verbal predicates, often take topic marking with enclitic *=ka*, especially in juxtaposition clauses.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

Subjects of non-verbal predicates are encoded in the same way as those of verbal predicates.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Negation of nominal predicates involves a nominal negator, different from the negation strategy used with verbal predicates (§2.1).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

This seems to be as for verbal predication except for the deontic uses of NOMINALIZATION + COPULA constructions described in §4.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Either the verbal copula or the predicative inflection construction can be involved in clauses that are part of a complex construction, taking either a dependent verbal form or a nominalized form.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Predicative nouns (i) can be possessed (marked on the possessed noun) and (ii) retain the nominal morphological properties of hosting negation and polar interrogative clitic (§2.1).

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Adjectives are noun-like but cannot be possessed. As predicates, they retain the nominal morphological properties of hosting negation and polar interrogative clitic (§2.1).

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

The predicative inflection construction described in §2.1 allows the non-verbal predicate to host verbal grammatical categories (as opposed to the non-verbal predicate hosting an inflected verbal copula clitic), verbal categories of tense, person of subject, and mood (with some restrictions, as described in §2.2).

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Yes, the verbal copula and the enclitic copula may function as auxiliary verbs forming complex predicates, as shown in §4.

Chapter 19

Non-verbal predication in the Pano languages of Western Amazonia

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Pano languages have a distinct adjective class clearly different from verbs (§2.2).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Unlike predicative nouns/nominals, adjectives/adjectivals may bear case-marking in Amawaka (§4.4).

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

Iskonawa and Matses may distinguish predicative contingent versus permanent attribution. This might be restricted to adjectives.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Aside from locative, there is marginal temporal and manner adverbial predication (§5.3).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Only locative adverbs, few temporal adverbs, and adverbials like Shipibo-Konibo *jakontani* 'good/well' and Chakobo *toka* 'like this' have been attested in predicative position (§5.3).

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

The construction types found in Pano involve: juxtaposition, copular verb, connecting particle, and posture verb with copula function.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

This topic requires further research.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Marubo has a possessive/existential copular verb. Matses features the copular verbs *ne* and *ik*. Predicate nominal clauses more frequently use *ne*. Copula selec-

tion distinguishes permanent (*ne*) versus temporary (*ik*) notions. Predicate adjectival clauses use *ik* when positive, but *ne* when negative. Positive locative predicates and existential clauses use *ik* but are negated with the negative copula *nibid*.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*
The copular verb found in most languages might be historically related to the intransitive pro-verb (?)*i(k)*. The Matses copula *ne* is reminiscent of the intransitive verb *nid* '(be) stand(ing)'.
- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*
Not applicable.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*
No formal distinction between proper inclusion and identity predication has been attested.
- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
Not applicable.
- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
This topic requires further research.
- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*
No dedicated ostensive marker has been found. Ostension is encoded via predicate nominal or locative clauses. Shipibo-Konibo often includes *hisí* [see.IMP] 'look'.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*
Plain-locational clauses and inverse-locational clauses differ in that the latter is more likely to be coded by an existential construction.
- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other "existential" meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*
Not applicable.
- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*
Locational and possessive structures are different. Most Pano languages employ an S-POSSESSOR type construction involving a proprietive or privative marker.

Matses has a dedicated possessive verb, while Marubo has a possessive/existential verb (§6).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

In the inverse-possessive predicate construction the possessor NP generally bears the ending =*na*, composed of =*n* (genitive) + *-a* (nominalizer). This structure also has a benefactive reading in Shipibo-Konibo (§6.5).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Predicative quantification is included under attributive constructions (§4.5)

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Not applicable.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Not applicable.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

In Shipibo-Konibo and Amawaka =*ma* (~ =*mama*) exclusively negates non-verbal predicates. Several languages have a dedicated negative existential verb, *jama*, which has developed into the verbal negative marker in Shipibo-Konibo, Amawaka, and Chakobo. *Jama* may also negate predicate possessive clauses (§3.6, §6.1). Matses has a dedicated negative locative/existential copula, *nibid* (§7.3).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Chakobo has four connecting particles which additionally indicate clause type: *so* ‘declarative’, *ní* ‘interrogative’, *kiá* ‘reportative’, and *ki* ‘declarative, posterior’ (§3.5). The Shipibo-Konibo interrogative =*rin* is exclusively used in verbless content and polar questions (§3.6).

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

There is no particular interaction between non-verbal predication and complex constructions.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Predicative nominals may preserve: plural marking, demonstratives, possessives, adjectival modification, numerical specification.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Plural marking occurs on the last NP word, which may be an adjective.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

In the juxtaposition construction, nouns, adjectives, adverbs/postpositions may take verbal morphology directly, in which case they get a sort of inchoative interpretation which can be translated as ‘become x’ or ‘change into x’. This is analyzed as zero-verbalization (§2.2). See also the Iskonawa permanent attribution construction in §4.2.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

The/a copular verb found in most languages is historically related to the intransitive pro-verb (?)i/ik/ki (§2.1, §3.2).

Chapter 20

Non-verbal predication in Guaycuruan and Mataguayan

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Guaycuruan languages have a small class of adjectives, except for Kadiweu, where property concepts are expressed through verbs. The morphosyntactic properties of Pilaga, Qom and Mocovi adjectives are partially like those of nouns and partially like those of verbs.

Mataguayan languages lack adjectives; property concepts are expressed by way of intransitive stative verbs.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Syntactically, there is no formal distinction between a nominal and an adjectival predicate in Pilaga, Qom and Mocovi. Morphologically, some property words inflect more or less like nouns (gender and number, but not possession) or more like verbs, though not for all verbal categories. They only display the third person prefix and the aspect suffix.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

No.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

No adverbial predication was attested in Guaycuruan and Mataguayan (henceforth G&M) languages.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverbs)?*

Adverbs appear to be excluded from predicative functions in both language families.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

In G&M languages, the copula and the juxtaposition constructions are usually found, and to a lesser extent the non-verbal predication with verb-like inflection (Subtype IIIa), which are restricted to the Mataguayan family.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Juxtaposition is mostly used for proper inclusion and identity predication and in some languages in possessive and locational predication, whereas the copula construction is the main type employed for locational-predication and possessive predication. The juxtaposition construction is a clear distinction between G&M languages; while the former make only use of that type, in the latter, it is present only in two languages as an alternative construction. Copula construction, however, is the type of construction used in locational and possessive predication. The predicative inflection (Subtype IIIa) is exclusively used in proper inclusion and possessive predication constructions in Mataguayan languages.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copulas, and what are their respective functions?*

G&M languages have two different copulas, one for plain-locational predication ('BE LOCATED') and another for inverse-locational and possessive predication ('EXIST'), except for Mocovi (Guaycuruan) and Wichi (Mataguayan), which employ the same plain-locational predication (or a form thereof) for both inverse-locational and possessive predication. In addition, G&M languages (other than Mocovi and Kadiweu, for which no data is available) have two different forms for positive and negative predication in inverse-locational and possessive copula.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

Not to date.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Unlike Guaycuruan languages, three of the four Mataguayan languages use predicative inflection only for proper inclusion and identity predication.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

No.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

This is a topic that needs further investigation.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The copula is the same for inverse-locational and possessive predication in G&M languages. However, while in the former construction the constituent order is flexible (EXIST NP OR NP EXIST), the constituent order in possessive predication is fixed (POSS-NP EXIST).

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Dedicated ostensive constructions are not found in G&M languages.

4. **Locational and possessive structures**

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

No.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Yes, only for the Mataguyan languages Nivañle and Wichi, and the Guaycuruan language Qom.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

G&M languages employ the same form for inverse-locational and possessive predication.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

No.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Quantifiers functioning as predicates in G&M languages would require further investigation.

5. **Morphosyntactic issues**

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

There is a predicative-inflection construction of Subtype IIIa in some cases analyzed in Section 4.2.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

No.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument is coded like the argument of a semantically monovalent verb.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

G&M languages employ standard negation for inclusion and identity, plain-locational, and inverse-possessive predications. However, for inverse-locational and plain-possessive predications with the 'EXIST' copulas, G&M use a different negation strategy: suppletive forms. Consequently, they have two distinct 'EXIST' copulas – one for positive predicates and another, formally different, for negative predicates. Wichí is an exception in this regard, as this language employs two strategies for inverse-locational negative predicates: a negative 'EXIST' copula and a verbal construction with the 'BE.LOCATED' copula, which is negated like all other verbs. Wichí also differs in possessive predication, as it does not use the 'EXIST' copula but rather the 'EXIST/BE.LOCATED' ones, whose negation is formed using standard negation.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

This would require further investigation.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Non-verbal predicates are coded in the same way in simple and complex clauses. There is no difference with respect to verbal predication.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Gender is a morphological category for some adjectival predicates only in Guaycuruan. Nominal predicates retain the same morphological properties regardless of their predicative function: number, determiners, classifiers, possession.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Pilaga, Qom and Mocoví distinguish between nominal adjectives (those having nominal properties such as gender and number) and verbal adjectives (those having verbal properties such as aspect and number). Regardless of their function as nominal attributes or predicates, adjectives display the same morphological behavior.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

In Mataguayan languages, the non-verbal predicative element, the noun, can acquire the following verbal features: person agreement, tense, aspect, mood, negation, inchoative, locative, nominalizer, benefactive/goal/source.

In Guaycuruan languages, non-verbal predicates can acquire negation, directionals or locative suffixes and plural agreement.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

These languages do not have auxiliaries.

Chapter 21

Non-verbal predication in Old Zamuco

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Old Zamuco has a morphosyntactic class of adjectives. Their predicative behavior is different from that of verbs (§1).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

In non-verbal predication, adjectives align with nouns. They share the same type of nominal suffixation that flags, among other features, their predicative function (§1.1). The differences between nouns and adjectives in this respect are very marginal and concern the fact that adjectives inflect for gender (along with case), while gender shift is a derivational operation in nouns (§2.1, fn. 4). Also, adjectival predicates are not topicalized in clause-initial position (§2.2).

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

Old Zamuco does not distinguish between the contingent and permanent attributive function of the non-verbal predicate.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication is not limited to locational predication but also expresses time, manner, accompaniment and other relationships resulting from a metaphoric extension of the spatial uses of adpositions (§4–5).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

In Old Zamuco, all word classes may have predicative function except for possessive classifiers, ideophones and interjections (§10). In Ayoreo, however, one can find ideophones with predicative function.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

The language has copula constructions, juxtaposition constructions and predicative inflection constructions of Subtype IIIb. The latter is, by large, the preferred and presumably original strategy. Old Zamuco also exhibits the fourth type of predicative construction addressed in Chapter 1, consisting in the combination of the copula construction and the predicative inflection construction (§2.6).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

The predicative inflection construction of Subtype IIIb is used for identity and inclusion predication (§2.1), quantification (§8) and adverbial predication expressing time and manner (§5). This construction requires paradigms with case marking, so that the predicative and argument function of the NPs involved are clearly distinguished. When this is not possible, the juxtaposition construction is used (§2.5, §5). Similar considerations apply to locational predication and other types of adverbial predication: a copula construction is the default construction when the predicate is an adpositional phrase or a question word (§3), but when the copula is omitted, the juxtaposition construction is found (§5). However, the juxtaposition construction plays a marginal role in the language. Old Zamuco also has copula constructions for identity and inclusion (§2.7). The combination of copula and predicative inflection construction only occurs with nominal and adjectival predication, and when the subject is a SAP (§2.6).

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Old Zamuco has a dedicated SAP-copula for inclusion and identity predication (§2.6) and a locational copula *si* that is also used for some types of non-spatial adverbial predication (§3–4) and possession (§7). Constructions with the existential predicator =*uz* (§6) are the most frequent way to express possession (§7). In some cases, the locational copula *si* appears in existential predication, although this is not its predominant use and is most likely an innovation (§6). The available data show that Old Zamuco was developing a new copula *u* for identity and inclusion predication (§2.7).

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

The SAP-copula developed out of the irrealis forms of the verb ‘be like’ (§2.6). The locational copula *si* stems from the verb ‘live’ and still retains this meaning in some instances (§3). The origin of the existential predicator =*uz* is unknown, but it certainly dates back to Proto-Zamucoan (§6). The Old Zamuco emerging copula *u* for identity and inclusion predication originated from a Proto-Zamucoan demonstrative (**u*) and fully developed as a copula in Ayoreo, where it competes with the predicative inflection construction of Subtype IIIb (§2.7).

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

The language widely adopts the predicative inflection construction of Subtype IIIb, which presumably is the original strategy.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Proper inclusion and identity predication are usually expressed in the same way. However, when the subject is a free pronoun, different configurations emerge that might be related to the distinction between inclusion and identity predication (§2.6).

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The argument case of nouns and adjectives distinguishes between a form that is used by default, the so-called “argument form”, and a form that overtly indicates that the referent is non-specific, called “argument indeterminate form” or simply “indeterminate form” (§1.1). In predicative inflection constructions of Subtype IIIb, the indeterminate form on the predicate encodes the question word ‘what’ (§1.1).

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

While the typical constituent order in non-verbal predication is subject-predicate, it is possible to place the nominal predicate in clause-initial position to topicalize it (§2.2). Other cases of topicalization are more speculative because we lack the pragmatic context of the examples.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Old Zamuco has a dedicated ostensive marker that stems from the demonstrative pronoun ‘this’, possibly combined with a demonstrative locative adverb or pronoun (§9).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

In Old Zamuco, there is no distinction between plain- and inverse-locational predication (§3).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Some constructions with the locational copula *si* may have an existential reading depending on the context.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

The language has three strategies to express plain-possessive predication (§7). The first is the MODIFIED-POSSESSEE type, which occurs with the existential predicator =uz or the locational copula si. The latter is also involved in the OBLIQUE-POSSESSOR type, which is thus related to locational predication. Finally, the language has the PROPRIETIVE type, which is morphosyntactically an instance of adjectival predication with the predicative inflection construction of Subtype IIIb.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

In the corpus, the only instance of inverse-possessive predication involves using the noun ‘property’ as a possessive pronoun in a predicative inflection construction of Subtype IIIb (§10).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Number words and quantifiers have an inflection similar to adjectives, so the predicative inflection construction of Subtype IIIb is the only construction used for quantification (§8).

5. **Morphosyntactic issues**

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Nominal predicates do not show functive flagging. The only type of flagging on nominal predicates is the threefold system described in §1.1, which consists of a predicative form, an argument form and an indeterminate form.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

No discourse markers are documented in Old Zamuco non-verbal predication.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs (§1.1, §2).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Verbal and non-verbal predication have the same negation strategies (§11).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Although illocutionary force is related to the presence of a dedicated ostensive predicator, in the corpus there are no data to address this parameter and its interaction with non-verbal predication.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

All types of non-verbal predication can occur in dependent clauses. In addition, a whole clause can be the subject or predicate in identity or inclusion predication (§13).

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Predicative nouns preserve all features of non-predicative nouns. Their port-manteau suffix expresses gender (masculine vs. feminine), number (singular vs. plural) and the typical Zamucoan threefold system that distinguishes between a predicative form, an argument form and an indeterminate form (§1.1). Predicative nouns can also express their possessor and be followed by modifiers (§1.1, §1.3, §2.1). If the subject pronoun follows the predicative adjective, it cannot inflect for number (§2.3).

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Like predicative nouns, predicative adjectives preserve all features of non-predicative adjectives. The main difference between nouns and adjectives is that the latter do not inflect for possessor (§1–2). Similarly to predicative nouns, if an adjective is the predicate head followed by a subject pronoun, there is no number agreement with the subject (§2.3).

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Non-verbal predicative elements have no verbal features. The only feature shared by verbs and nouns is person, but while verbs index the person of the subject, nouns index the person of the possessor.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Old Zamuco has no class of auxiliaries.

Chapter 22

Non-verbal predication in Maltese

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Maltese has a class of adjectives that can be used as adnominal modifiers without additional devices. Adjectives have dedicated morphological patterns, or share them with nouns. Some adjectives are derived from nouns by suffixes, or from verbs. Lots of adjectives are loans from Sicilian, Italian and English. As predicates, they are uninflected for TAM, unlike verbs, and like nouns (§2.4 *Adjectives*).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*
Not applicable.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

There is no distinction between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates with the juxtaposition strategy (§3.2.2 *Adjectival predication with an overt argument*) and the verbal copula (§6.2 *Adjectival predication*). On the other hand, contingent states are rarely expressed with the nominal copula (§4.2 *Adjectival predication*).

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

No.

- The adverbial-locative copula *qieghed* (§5.1.2 *Non-spatial uses*) can also be used (i) when the predicate has a functive function (rare); (ii) in gnomic clauses; (iii) for inclusion predication; (iv) for existential predication; and (v) in a conventionalized temporal interrogative utterance.
- The locative copula of prepositional origin *fi* (7.1 *Inverse-locational predication*) can be used in several metaphors (§7.2 *Metaphorical uses*).
- The two adverbial copulas (8.1 *Inverse-locational predication*) are also used for existential predication (§8.2 *Existential utterances*), with predicative numerals (§8.3 *Predicative use of numerals*), and as presentationals (§8.4 *Presentational utterances*).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

I am not aware of any types of restrictions.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

- Juxtaposition.
- Copular predications of various types and origins.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Juxtaposition is a receding strategy for all types of non-verbal predication, however not a marginal one. It is the sole strategy that can mark ostension (§3.1.4 *Ostension*). The copula construction is the most productive strategy.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

- The copula of pronominal origin is gaining over juxtaposition for nominal and adjectival predications (§4 *The pronominal copula*), but is rare for plain-locational predication (§4.3.1 *Spatial uses*) (as juxtaposition, §3.3.1 *Spatial uses*).
- Adverbial predication, in particular for inverse-locational predication is much more frequent with the locative *fi*-copula (§7.1 *Inverse-locational predication*) and with adverbial copulas (§8.1 *Inverse-locational predication*). Only the latter can occur in presentational constructions (§8.4 *Presentational utterances*). Adverbial predication is limited to inanimate subjects with the *fi*-locative copula (§7.1 *Inverse-locational predication*). No such limitation exists for the adverbial copulas, which are more productive.
- The ‘be’ copula is used to specify TAM (§6 *The verbal copula*) in nominal, adjectival and adverbial predications, and it is more frequent for plain-locational predication than the juxtaposition and pronominal copula strategies (TAM features are retrievable from the context with all other non-verbal strategies, even if present reference prevails). The ‘be’ copula can be used as a TAM auxiliary with the other non-verbal strategies, except with the pronominal copula and the locative preposition.
- For adverbial predication, the ‘stay’-locative copula can express both contingent and permanent locations (§5.1.1 *Spatial uses*), as well as inclusion in oral register (§5.1.2 *Non-spatial uses*).

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

Yes, for all of them. Copulas go back to personal pronouns, locative prepositions, locative adverbs, the active participle of a verb meaning ‘stay’, and a ‘be’ verb.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*
Not applicable.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

There is no distinction between inclusion and identity predications, which can all be expressed by the juxtaposition strategy, the pronominal copula, the ‘be’ copula, and the ‘stay’-locative copula. Note however that the ‘stay’-locative copula is restrictive to the functive function, and that for inclusion it is limited to the oral register (considered as incorrect although widespread) (§3.1.1 *Identity*, §3.1.2 *Inclusion*, §3.2.2 *Adjectival predication with an overt argument*, §4.1.1 *Identity*, §4.1.2 *Inclusion*, §4.2 *Adjectival predication*, §5.1.2 *Non-spatial uses*, §6.1.1 *Identity*, §6.1.2 *Inclusion*, §6.2 *Adjectival predication*).

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
For inclusion, the predicate must be non-specific, i.e. indefinite; it must be specific, i.e. definite, for identity predication (§3.1.1 *Identity*, §3.1.2 *Inclusion*, §3.2.2 *Adjectival predication with an overt argument*, §4.1.1 *Identity*, §4.1.2 *Inclusion*, §4.2 *Adjectival predication*, §5.1.2 *Non-spatial uses*, §6.1.1 *Identity*, §6.1.2 *Inclusion*, §6.2 *Adjectival predication*).
- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Topicalization marked by word order change is possible for:

- Inclusion predication with the juxtaposition strategy (§3.2.2 *Adjectival predication with an overt argument*, ex. 16), the pronominal copula (§4.2 *Adjectival predication*, ex. 41), and the ‘stay’ copula (§5.1.2 *Non-spatial uses*, ex. 69).
- Adverbial predication with the juxtaposition strategy (for ostension) (§3.3.1 *Spatial uses*, ex. 20), the ‘stay’ copula (§5.1.1 *Spatial uses*, ex. 60), the adverbial copulas (§8.1 *Inverse-locational predication*, for the Ground of locative constructions, ex. 98; §8.2 *Existential utterances*, for the Figure in existential constructions, ex. 109).

For focusing:

- The negative pronominal copula is regularly used for focusing all categories of constituents, verbal and non-verbal (§4.5 *Other uses of the negative copula*).
- Word order change with the ‘be’ copula, marks focusing for inclusion predication (§6.1.2 *Inclusion*, ex. 77; §6.2 *Adjectival predication*, ex. 81).

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

There is no dedicated ostensive marker. Ostension is marked with a demonstrative or, possibly, a locative adverb in first position in a juxtaposition construction (§3.1.4 *Ostension*, §3.3.1 *Spatial uses*).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

There are three copulas that mark inverse-locational predication, the locative preposition *fi* (§7 *The locative copula fi*) and two adverbial copulas (§8 *The adverbial copulas*). They are all of the “there_be-ILP construction” type. Plain-locational clauses are regularly expressed with the ‘stay’-locative copula (§5.1.1 *Spatial uses*), and the ‘be’ copula (§6.3.1 *Spatial uses*), rarely with the juxtaposition strategy (§3.3.1 *Spatial uses*), or the pronominal copula (§4.3.1 *Spatial uses*).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

In Maltese, only the there_be-ILP construction with one of the adverbial copulas (*hemm*) is available to express other “existential” meanings when no Ground is specified, but it is very rarely used for the expression of “pure existence” (§8.2 *Existential utterances*, ex. 106).

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

The constructions are of the transpossession type. Maltese has developed three suppletive pseudo-verbs from a locative preposition ‘at’, and from the ‘be’ copula, to which bound possessive pronouns were agglutinated, either directly for the former, or indirectly via a dative preposition for the latter, which became special inflectional morphemes, different from verbal inflection. The pseudo-verb whose origin is the preposition ‘at’ is clearly related to locational predication (§9. *Predicative possession*).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication can be an instance of nominal predication, with the juxtaposition strategy (§3.1.3 *Inverse-possessive predication*), the verbal copula (§6.1.3 *Inverse-possessive predication*), or, rarely, the pronominal copula and the genitival preposition (§4.1.3 *Inverse-possessive predication*).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

When used predicatively, numerals occur in the juxtaposition construction (§3.4 *Predicative use of numerals*), combine with the nominal copula (§4.4 *Predicative use of numerals*), the locative ‘stay’ copula (§5.2 *Predicative use of numerals*), and the verbal copula (§6.4 *Predicative use of numerals*). They can be used in the inverse-location construction with the adverbial copulas (§8.3 *Predicative use of numerals*), which may be the preferred construction, but this issue is not addressed in literature for predicative numerals.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

No.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

No.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of non-verbal predications is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs (which actually is not different from the subject of bivalent verbs).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negative strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

There are two types of strategies in non-verbal predication: (i) the negative copula for identity predication (§4.1.1 *Identity*) inclusion predication (§4.1.2 *Inclusion*, §4.2 *Adjectival predication*), inverse-possessive predication (§4.1.3 *Inverse-possessive predication*), locative-adverbial predication (§4.3.1 *Spatial uses*), and (ii) the discontinuous verbal negation with the ‘be’ copula (§6 *The verbal copula*), the inverse-locational predication with *fī* (§7.1 *Inverse-locational predication*), the adverbial copulas (§8.1 *Inverse-locational predication*, §8.2 *Existential utterances*), and the pseudo-verbs for transpossession (§9 *Predicative possession*). In verbal predication, the negative discontinuous morpheme is used for standard negation (as in [ii]), but the negative copula of non-verbal predication (as in [i]) is used for focused negative verbal predication (§4.5 *Other uses of the negative copula*).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

All non-verbal predication types can occur in assertive and interrogative utterances. With the juxtaposition type, negative utterances are impossible; a negative copula of pronominal origin has to be added.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

There are no types of complex constructions that would require a change in the type of non-verbal predicative marking.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Predicative nouns preserve all their nominal features: gender, number, (in)definiteness, possession, adjectival modification, and numerical specification.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

As with attributive adjectives, predicative adjectives preserve their features so that they agree in gender and number with the subject.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Adverbial predication with locative prepositions gave rise to pseudo-verbs, *fi* 'in, at', *hemm* 'there' and *hawn* 'here' for inverse-locational predication, and *għand* 'at' for transpossessional predication. The verbal feature acquired by them all is the use of the negative verbal discontinuous marker, and for the last three copulas, the possibility to combine with TAM auxiliaries. *Għand*, like the two other constructions based on the verbal copula, is part of a TAM system, where it marks an Imperfective. As with transitive verbs, *għand* displays differential object marking, and person agreement is compulsory.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

The 'be' copula functions also as a TAM auxiliary. The 'stay'-locative copula is also used as a progressive auxiliary (§5.3 *Other use of the locative copula*), the transpossessional pseudo-verbs are also used as modal auxiliaries (§9.4 *Other use of the predicative possession*).

Chapter 23

Non-verbal predication in the Nilotic languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

There is no homogeneity in the predicative behavior of adjectives (if present). Depending on the language, they may be introduced by a copula or a copular verb; alternatively, juxtaposition with the nominal or pronominal subject may occur.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

In languages with extensive sets of adjectives, their morphosyntactic behaviour as predicates is similar to that of nouns. There is a tendency, historically (and synchronically in languages with few adjectives), to conjugate adjectives as stative verbs.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

The analytical issue concerning contingent and permanent states has to remain largely unsolved for Nilotic, as the morphosyntactic descriptions are incomplete and, at times, contradictory.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication is not limited to locational predication.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

There is no evidence from the descriptions available to date for the exclusion of certain types of adverbs.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Depending on the language involved, this type of predication may be expressed by means of a copula, a copular verb, or juxtaposition.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

There is a strong tendency to use juxtaposition in interrogative sentences (both yes-no questions and content questions) in Nilotic languages which use a verbal or non-verbal copula in declarative statements.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

There is usually one copula or copular verb, but in aspectual languages like Western Nilotic Anywa, several types of copula are attested.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

The most widespread copula, which is also reconstructable for Proto-Nilotic as *a, predates Nilotic. While its original function has been retained in different Nilotic languages, reflexes of this marker may also express focus marking on adjacent constituents; alternatively, it has been retained as a tense-aspect marker in some languages.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Whether predicative inflection tends to be similar to verbal predication, or whether nouns and adjectives behave differently, depends on the language. Languages like Southern Nilotic Nandi and Western Nilotic Luo, which are typologically rather distinct from each other in other morphosyntactic domains, conjugate nouns and adjectives like verbs when they occur as predicates.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

There are unsolved analytical issues, because it is not always clear what the morphosyntactic expression of contingent versus permanent states looks like; this also applies (albeit to a lesser extent) to the distinction between inclusion versus identity predication.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The specificity parameter interacts with the formal expression of non-verbal predication. In Nilotic, as well as in other Nilo-Saharan subgroups, there is a formal marker, called the selective marker in the contribution on Nilotic, which shows structural similarities to the use of construct case (status constructus) in other language families. In Southern Nilotic languages, as well as in Western Nilotic Luo, this marker can also be used with unmodified nouns.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Information structure (focus marking and/or topicalization) is relevant for constituent order in verbal as well as non-verbal predications in Nilotic languages.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

No relevant comparative data are available on the status of ostension and non-verbal predication.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

The same construction is used for plain-locational and inverse-locational clauses.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Nilotic languages do not use non-referential markers like ‘there’ or ‘it’ in constructions expressing existential meanings.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

With the exception of Southern Nilotic Kalenjin, Nilotic languages tend to use a locative verb ‘exist’ in order to express plain-possessive predication. In such constructions, the Figure expressing the possessee is usually expressed as a subject, whereas, depending on the language, the possessor is introduced by juxtaposition or a preposition.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inversion of possessor and possessee is common with possessive constructions, but such sentences either involve non-verbal predication or verbal predication (with the verb ‘exist’), depending on the language.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

For Nilotic languages where information is available on numerals as predicates, no separate morphological operation has been identified so far, with the exception of Eastern Nilotic Lopit. This may be due to the lack of relevant data.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Subjects in non-verbal constructions tend to follow the predicate (parallel to the position of the verb) in Southern Nilotic Kalenjin, where subjects are assigned

nominative case. In verb-initial Eastern Nilotic languages, the subject tends to precede the non-verbal predicate, as a result of which the subject receives absolutive case.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

In different Nilotic languages, the (archaic) copula *a* also functions as a focus marker. Where the function of copula or focus marker has been lost, the same marker is attested synchronically as a tense-aspect marker (as in Eastern Nilotic Teso-Turkana languages).

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of a monovalent (intransitive) verb in Nilotic languages with case marking, whenever the subject follows the non-verbal predicate.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

The use of a single negative marker in Southern Nilotic corresponds to multiple negation markers elsewhere in Nilotic, depending on the tense-aspect marking or information structure expressed in a non-verbal or verbal sentence. There are almost always two separate and morphologically unrelated verbs involved when expressing the existence/location of some entity as against its non-existence.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Not relevant.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Not relevant.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Nouns in predicative function show no change in their nominal features, unless they are used in order to express a contingent state, as in Eastern Nilotic Turkana, in which case they are changed into (derived) verbs.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Whether adjectives retain their features or tend to be changed into stative verb constructions depends on the language (and the adjective involved). The latter tendency seems to be strongest in languages with small sets of adjectives.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Non-verbal predicative elements acquire verbal inflectional features (person or tense marking) if the language uses pronominal subject marking on the verb, with the additional condition that the language does not use a copula in non-verbal predications between the pronominal subject and the predicate (as in Western Nilotic Luo and Southern Nilotic Kalenjin).

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Contrary to non-verbal copula elements, verbal copula elements are related to the class of auxiliaries.

Chapter 24

Non-verbal predication in the Cushitic languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

A few languages do; this is typically the case in Central Cushitic and Highland East Cushitic languages. In other languages (many East Cushitic languages) adjectival concepts are expressed by verbs. The distinction in their predicative behavior is based upon a separate morphological marking (§3.2). The very existence of “adjectives” is debated in certain languages (most often, Somali and related Omo-Tana languages of East Cushitic).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Languages with a separate class of adjectives basically treat them as nouns.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

No.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Many Cushitic languages have no adverbs (§4). Locational predication generally exploits dedicated verbs (§5).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Considering the general absence of adverbs, it seems that no particular constraint applies.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Juxtaposition (§2.1) and copula constructions (§2.4) are the two major types; a predicative nominal form is found in very few languages (§2.2), where it seems to be the relics of a former copula. This seems to be the case in Beja (Northern Cushitic) and Highland East Cushitic languages (§2.3).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

With one exception (Dhaasanac), juxtaposition is limited to nominal non-verbal predication (§2) and to clauses not marked for tense, aspect and mood.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

In a few languages there is only one copula. In others, different copulas are used with different subtypes of nouns or in locative or possessive predication.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

In general no, but the present-day copulae of certain languages of the Highland East Cushitic group could derive from the reanalysis of gender and/or demonstrative markers. Moreover, the status of certain elements as copulae is uncertain.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Predicative inflection is limited to very few languages, and it is hard to trace back its origin. Subtype IIIb (§2.2) is found in Konso and Dullay varieties, while IIIa (§2.3) is found in Beja (Noth Cushitic), Arbore and 'Afar (the latter two belonging to different subgroups of East Cushitic).

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

In general no, but a copula dedicated to identity predication (§2.3) is attested in Kambaata, K'abeena and possibly other Highland East Cushitic languages.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

In a few languages (of the Highland East Cushitic group) there are, at least apparently, dedicated markers of identity predication, but only used with pronouns and proper names. In all other languages the specificity parameter does not play a role.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Although the languages are generally strict verb-final, in a few cases (as in South Cushitic and Dahalo; §2.4) the copula is affixed to the subject in pre-predicative position; still, this does not seem to interact with information structure.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

There is no dedicated ostensive marker.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

No, at least on the basis of the available evidence.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

No, or at least it has not been reported.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

The most common strategy (§6) involves a stative (‘to have’) or action (‘to get, hold’) verb. In a few languages a locational strategy is used (‘to be at’).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication is found in a few languages, sometimes associated with the use of a special copula. In adnominal possession, different patterns are attested, with the possessor flagged by a genitive case or a locational case.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Clauses expressing quantification are aligned with nominal or adjectival predication.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

In a few languages predicative nominal forms are found; in others, nominal predicates are never found in the subject form and remain in the absolute (see below). In still other languages no functive flagging occurs.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

For languages where this information is available, no special discourse marking is found in non-verbal predication.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

Yes, the argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of monovalent verbs, and this applies both to languages with morphological case-marking and to languages lacking any nominal case system.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

In a few languages special negative copulae are used (§2.5); negative copulae may either replace juxtaposition or a copula in declarative non-verbal predication. The negative copula may be either invariable or inflected.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

For languages where this information is available, it may be the case that focus marking is excluded in non-verbal predication (southern Somali varieties); on the other hand, in Oromo what is a copula in certain varieties is apparently an emphasis marker in others.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Not much is known about complex constructions in many Cushitic languages; in Somali, a non-verbal predication with the declarative marker *waa* must be replaced by an inflected form of the verb ‘to be’.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Gender and number are always preserved. Many languages have no article; when there is, it can be preserved.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

On the basis of what is known, where there are adjectives and they are predicates they do not lose gender and number.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Leaving aside languages where adjectival concepts are expressed with stative verbs, the adjectives of other languages may become self-standing verbs with inchoative derivations and the like. The usual TAM markers of the language (usually expressed with verbal suffixes in Cushitic) are used with these deadjectival verbs.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Considering that many Cushitic languages do not employ copulae but juxtaposition or, more rarely, predicative verbal forms, auxiliary verbs do not play a major role in non-verbal predication. In a few languages, such as Somali and Oromo, auxiliaries are part of syntagmatic verbal forms. An auxiliary ‘to be’ is likewise used in these languages in nominal or adjectival predications when they occur in non-present and non-positive contexts. Moreover, defective negative verbs are used in many Cushitic languages.

Chapter 25

Non-verbal predication in Mande

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

In Mandinka, the existence of a morphosyntactic class of adjectives is problematic, since there is no homogeneity not only in the predicative behavior of the lexemes acting as qualifying modifiers of nouns, but more generally, in their behavior in constructions other than the noun-modifier construction (§2.1.3–2.1.4, §2.6). This is a common situation among Mande languages, but the details vary considerably from one language to another, even between very closely related languages such as Mandinka, Maninka and Bambara. This is all the more remarkable given the obvious typological homogeneity of the Mande language family in most respects. It is common in Mande languages that, among the lexemes that equally act as qualifying modifiers of nouns, some behave in all other respects like typical verbs, or behave predicatively in a way that allows analyzing them as a sub-class of verbs, while some others can only be used predicatively in the form of a derived verb, and yet others are used predicatively in combination with the same copula as nouns (which, however, does not imply that their predicative behavior coincides entirely with that of nouns).

The following two possibilities are also attested in some languages:

- qualifying modifiers of nouns lending themselves to a predicative use in combination with an adverbial copula (Gban);
- qualifying modifiers of nouns lending themselves to a predicative use in a juxtaposition construction in languages in which nominal predication requires the use of copulae (Maninka).

Even a succinct account of the way the predicative behavior of the lexemes acting as noun modifiers vary across Mande languages would require much more space than available here.

1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?* See 1.1 above.

1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

I am aware of no Mande language having a systematic distinction between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

In all the Mande languages for which a detailed description of adverbial predication is available, adverbial predication has a wide range of non-locational uses.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

I am aware of no Mande language in which some words or phrases semantically analyzable as predicates would be completely excluded from the predicate function. However, it may happen that some of the lexemes used as qualifiers within NPs cannot be used predicatively by themselves, but only as part of a nominal predicate (see §2.6 for Mandinka).

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

In most Mande languages, as illustrated by Mandinka, the only fully productive construction type is the copular one. The juxtaposition type is productive in some Mande languages only (see 2.2 below), and no case of predicative inflection *stricto sensu* is attested, although constructions showing some similarities with the predicative inflection strategy are found in some languages (see 2.5 below).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

The juxtaposition construction is productive for nominal predication in Dzuun, Bobo, Soso and Jalonke. However, in Soso and Jalonke, the routinization of argument topicalization in the juxtaposition construction *Predicate (FOC) Argument POSTP* results in the emergence of a construction *Argument Predicate COP* with a copula *nàará*. Historically, *nàará* is the contraction of the sequence *nân* (focus marker) + *à* (3rd person pronoun resuming the topicalized argument) + *rá* (the postposition that initially flagged the NP in argument function), but this decomposition is not relevant anymore, since *nàará* is also used with 1st or 2nd person pronouns in argument role.

In Soso and Jalonke, the juxtaposition strategy is also productive in adverbial predication, in competition, however, with the use of an optional copula resulting from the grammaticalization of the adverb *nàa* 'there'.

In Maninka and Kakabe, copulae can be optionally dropped in contact with a focalization marker, and the juxtaposition construction is productive in the predicative use of a subclass of lexemes acting as qualifying modifiers within NPs. Jalkunan has a construction that at first sight seems to involve mere juxtaposition, but the argument NP undergoes a tonal modification that can be accounted for straightforwardly by positing a construction *Argument COP Predicate* with an enclitic copula consisting of a floating high tone.

2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

In Mandinka, non-verbal predication mainly relies on non-verbal copulae. Verbal copulae are almost exclusively used to compensate for the impossibility to express TAM variation in constructions with non-verbal copulae, and their text frequency is considerably lower than that of non-verbal copulae. However, in some other Mande languages (for example Seenku), verbal copulae play a much more prominent role.

As regards the number of distinct non-verbal copulae and their distribution, the configuration with two distinct positive non-verbal copulae for nominal and adverbial predication and a negative non-verbal copula found both in nominal and adverbial predication (as in Mandinka) is common, but other possibilities are attested:¹

- languages with two distinct positive non-verbal copulae (nominal and adverbial), each one with its own negative counterpart: Vai, Kakabe, Soninke;
- languages with a positive non-verbal copula found both in nominal and adverbial predication: Maninka, Mauka, Kong Julia, Koro, Bolon, Kagoro, Jalkunan, Jeli, Tigemaxo, Jenaama, Mende, Kpelle, Looma, Mano, Kla-Dan, Mwan, Guro, Yaure;
- languages with a special nominal copula in clauses in which the argument of the nominal predicate is not expressed: Bambara, Kong Julia, Jalkunan, Looma;
- languages with two possible constituent orders in nominal predication (*Argument COP Predicate* or *Predicate COP Argument*) in which the choice of a copula in nominal predication is related to constituent order: Koro, Kpelle, Tura.
- languages having no specific negative strategy for non-verbal predication (see 5.4 below).

San has been described as having two copulae equally used for nominal and adverbial predication, one of them encoding that the clause expresses “new information”, whereas the other is found in clauses referring to “general states of affairs”.

2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

In Mandinka, the historical origin of non-verbal copulae cannot be traced back, except for the variant *jé* of the adverbial copula, whose origin is the grammaticalization of the imperative of the verb ‘see’ used as an ostensive marker (§2.2.2.2). The same grammaticalization path can be reconstructed for copulae found in several other Mande languages (Creissels 2017b).

The coincidence between copulae and term focus markers in verbal clauses is widespread across Mande languages, and the languages in which a copula is

¹ See §3.7 for further details on this question.

optionally elided in contact with a focus marker (see 2.2 above) suggest the possible reanalysis of focus markers as copulae.

The other possible scenarios for the creation of non-verbal copulae are deverbalization of copular verbs and grammaticalization of demonstrative pronouns or adverbs into copulae. Evidence of such evolutions can be found in some Mande languages, such as the grammaticalization of *nàa* ‘there’ as an adverbial copula in Soso, the grammaticalization of the verb *ɖɛ* in Eastern Dan (Vydrin 2020), and the grammaticalization of demonstrative adverbs into copulae in Eastern Dan (Vydrin 2020).

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

No instance of the predicative inflection strategy as defined in the introductory chapter of the printed volume is attested in the Mande language family, but in Mandinka and some of the other Mande languages that have argument-predicate reversal in the sense given to this term in §2.3.3, the behavior of the focus marker in nominal predication is reminiscent of constructions combining the copula strategy and the predicative inflection strategy, in the sense that the non-verbal predicate receives some kind of marking.

Jenaama is another language with a construction showing some similarity to the predicative inflection strategy, albeit with different details. In Jenaama, NPs in predicate function are consistently marked by an enclitic *nì* which is found in no other function. Moreover, if the argument of the nominal predicate is expressed, Jenaama has a construction *X gà Y nì* ‘X is Y’ where X is the argument of the nominal predicate Y, and *gà* is a copula also found in locational predication. However, the problem for an analysis in terms of predicative inflection is that *nì* is not a suffix, but an enclitic attached to the last word of the noun phrase, and the word to which *nì* attaches is not necessarily the noun acting as the nucleus of the noun phrase, since in Jenaama, as in the other Mande languages, NPs are not head-final. Moreover, *nì* can be separated from the last word of the noun phrase by other enclitics such as the focus marker *wò* or the past marker *tùⁿ*.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Mandinka does not distinguish inclusion and identity predication by the use of distinct constructions, but in some conditions, the distinction may follow from definiteness marking (§2.3.1). This is the common situation across Mande languages, with the possible exception of Jeli (see 5.1 below).

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Jeli is the only Mande language in which the use of distinct constructions for identity and inclusion has been signaled. In Jeli, the locative postposition *kɔŋ*

marks the nominal predicate in the construction expressing inclusion, whereas no flagging occurs in the construction expressing identity.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The rigidity of constituent order patterns is general in Mande languages, and non-verbal predication constructions are no exception. However, the phenomenon described in §2.3.3 as argument-predicate reversal, which combines alternation in constituent order and flagging, has a clear link with information structure. The list of the languages in which this phenomenon is attested is given in 5.1 below.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

In Mandinka, ostension is expressed by means of the imperative of the verb ‘look’ (§2.5). This way of expressing ostension is widespread in Mande languages, and the grammaticalization of ostensive markers into copulae is common (Creissels 2017b). An early stage of this grammaticalization process is attested, among others, in Mandinka and Soninke.

It is, however, difficult to propose generalizations about the relationship between ostension and nominal predication in Mande languages, since many descriptions mention clauses consisting of a single NP combined with a marker whose status as coding ostension or nominal predication with an unexpressed argument to be retrieved from the context is unclear (see footnote 13 in the chapter).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

In all Mande languages, the same construction with the same *Figure COP Ground* order is used indiscriminately in the contexts in which some languages have a distinction between plain- and inverse-locational predication (§2.4.2). This constitutes in fact an areal feature of the languages of the Sudanic belt, see Creissels (2019b).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other ‘existential’ meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

In Mandinka, pure existence (being an element of the universe), especially with reference to non-localizable entities, can be expressed by clauses formally identical to locational clauses in which the adverb *jěe* ‘there’ is interpreted as non-referential. Alternatively, the same meaning can be expressed by means of verbs glossable as ‘occur’ or ‘be available’ (§2.4.3). The expression of pure existence

involving an adverb ‘there’ interpreted as non-referential is attested in Dan, Bobo and Tigemaxo. The possibility of clauses consisting just of an NP followed by the adverbial copula acting as an existential predicator is sometimes mentioned (for example in Boko) with translations varying between presence at place of utterance, presence at an unspecified place, and pure existence, but indications about the productivity of this pattern are often omitted. The problem is that, as illustrated by Mandinka (§2.4.1) and other Manding varieties, the possibility of using an adverbial copula as an existential predicator may be limited to a handful of fixed expressions.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

In Mandinka, plain-possessive predication is commonly expressed either by encoding the possessor and the possessee like the Ground and the Figure in locational predication, or by encoding the possessor and the possessee as the subject and the object of the transitive verb *sòtó* ‘have’ (§2.4.6).

In most Mande languages, the only usual way of expressing plain-possessive predication is an oblique-possessor construction, and the postposition flagging the possessor NP is often cognate with the noun ‘hand’.

In addition to Mandinka, the have-possessive type is attested as an alternative to the oblique-possessor type in Bisa and Boko.

The modified-possessee type is attested as an alternative to the oblique-possessor type in South Mande (Dan, Guro, Gban) and East Mande (San).

In Bisa, the oblique-possessor type does not seem to be productive, whereas the have-possessive type, the modified-possessee type and the comitative-possessee type are all mentioned as being productive. The comitative-possessee type is also mentioned as relatively productive in Bobo, but in most Mande languages, it seems to occur only sporadically.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

In almost all the Mande languages for which the relevant data are available, inverse-possessive predication is formally an instance of nominal predication construction with the reduced form of a genitival construction in predicate role (see §2.3.4 for Mandinka). A construction involving an adverbial copula and a benefactive postposition (literally ‘Possessee is for Possessor’) is signaled in Gban.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

The predicative use of numerals is not common in Mandinka, but when used predicatively, numerals combine with the nominal copula (§2.3.5.2). Similar constructions are attested in Dan, Kla-Dan, etc. In Bobo, the juxtaposition con-

struction, productive for nouns in predicate function, is also used for numerals. However, unfortunately, most descriptions do not provide data about a possible predicative use of numerals.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

A remarkable property of nominal predication in Mande languages that has no equivalent in verbal or adverbial predication is not only the possibility of leaving the argument unexpressed, but also the existence of relatively important cross-linguistic variation in the order of the core terms and their flagging characteristics, sharply contrasting with the uniformity of linear ordering and flagging patterns in verbal and adverbial predication across Mande languages. Six distinct patterns can be distinguished.

The *ARG COP PRED+adp* pattern is particularly widespread. The adpositions used to flag the predicate NP are sometimes multifunctional adpositions, which makes it difficult to decide which of their meanings may explain their use in nominal predication, but in general, they are also found in verbal clauses with a functive or comitative function (i.e., as the equivalent of English *as* or *with*). A locative postposition ‘in’ is also attested as a nominal predicate flag in Jeli.

The *PRED COP ARG+adp* pattern is mentioned as the only possibility in the sources I have been able to consult on Manyá, Koranko, Mende and Loko. It alternates with the *ARG COP PRED+adp* pattern in Mandinka (§2.3.3), Niokolo Maninka, Guinean Maninka, Xasonka, Kakabe, Soninke, Kpelle, Looma and Tura.

The *PRED ARG+adp* pattern is found in Soso and Jalonke.

The *ARG COP PRED* pattern, with no flagging of either nominal term, is mentioned as the only possibility in Seenku. In Jeli, it alternates with *ARG COP PRED+adp*.

The *ARG PRED COP* pattern with no flagging of either nominal term, and the copula in final position, is found in Beng and Vai.

Finally, a juxtaposition construction *ARG PRED* with no flagging of either nominal term is productive in Dzuun and Bobo.

5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

In Mandinka, nominal predication involves a particular use of the focus marker *lè* (§2.3.2, §2.3.3), and a similar phenomenon occurs in Maninka, Kakabe, Soso, Jalonke, Soninke and Gban.

Moreover, as already mentioned in 2.4, the coincidence between copulae and term focus markers in verbal clauses is widespread across Mande.

5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

In all Mande languages, the argument of adverbial predicates is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs. The situation in nominal predication is more complex. In many languages, the argument of nominal predicates is coded like the argument of monovalent verbs, and the nominal predicate like a functive or comitative adjunct, but constructions with the nominal predicate coded like the subject of intransitive verbs and its argument coded like a postpositional oblique can also be found (see 5.1 above).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

In Mandinka, in negative clauses expressing non-verbal predication, it is impossible to isolate a negation marker that could also be found in other constructions (§2.2.1), and this is the usual situation across Mande. Dzuun, Jalkunan, Jeli, Soso and Jalonke, with negation markers shared by verbal and non-verbal predication, are exceptions.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

As regards the interaction of illocutionary force with non-verbal predication, Mandinka attests the incipient stage of the process by which ostensive markers grammaticalize as copulae (§2.5), and this situation is common across the Mande language family (Creissels 2017b).

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

In Mandinka, the only interaction between non-verbal predication types and the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions is that, in complex constructions requiring the use of dependent verb forms, non-verbal copulae must be replaced by copular verbs (§2.2.3). This situation seems to be general across Mande languages, although relatively few descriptions provide the relevant data.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

I am aware of no Mande language in which nouns in predicate function would show a change in their nominal features.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

In Mande languages, even in those in which the recognition of a part-of-speech adjective is relatively uncontroversial, the qualifying modifiers of nouns are not inflected. Consequently, the question of whether predicative adjectives preserve the features that characterize attributive adjectives or not does not arise.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

I am aware of no Mande language in which non-verbal predicative elements would acquire verbal features.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

In Mandinka, the adverbial copula (but not the nominal copula) is used as an auxiliary in combination with dependent verb forms (§2.4.10). The use of copulae as auxiliaries in combination with dependent verb forms (sometimes also with bare verb stems) is pervasive in the Mande language family. The details vary, however, from one language to another. For example, Mandinka has a resultative tense formed by combining the adverbial copula with the resultative form of the verb (§2.4.10.1), whereas in closely related Bambara, the auxiliary in the resultative construction may also be the nominal copula. However, an obvious generalization is that the use of the adverbial copula as a progressive, incomplete or future auxiliary is particularly common.

Chapter 26

Non-verbal predication in Cuwabo (Bantu)

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Although very restricted, Cuwabo has a morphosyntactic class of adjectives whose predicative behavior is distinct from that of verbs. Property concepts are normally expressed by verbs inflected for perfect(ive) (§2.4).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Adjectival predication is identical to nominal predication (§4).

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

There is no systematic distinction between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication is not limited to locational predication (§5.2).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Cuwabo does not exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Cuwabo has a rich system of non-verbal predicative constructions which includes: two verbal copulae, i.e. a copula verb *li* (§3.1.1) and a semi-copula verb *kála* (§3.1.2); a non-verbal class-inflected pro-copula, such as *ddi*, *ba*, etc. (§3.1.3); predicative inflection through H tone deletion (Subtype IIIb, §3.2.1); predicative inflection involving the cliticization of subject indexes + copula *a* (Subtype IIIa, §3.2.2). Most copular constructions based on *li* and *kála* also imply predicative H tone deletion (HTD) on the following noun or adjective (§3.3), thus giving rise to a mixed type (Type I + Subtype IIIb).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Predicative HTD (Subtype IIIb) is restricted to nouns and adjectives used in the third person singular and plural. Predicative inflection involving the cliticization

of subject indexes + copula *a* (Subtype IIIa) is in turn limited to speech act participants. Class-inflected pro-copulae are very much used in clefts as well as attributive copula-connective constructions. The two verbal copulae have a wider use and can often substitute the aforementioned strategies. The main difference is their capacity to refer to non-present situations.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Cuwabo has two verbal copulae and a paradigm of non-verbal class-inflected pro-copulae. Verbal copulae may be used in all types of non-verbal predication: *li* is restricted to present and past situations (§3.1.1), whereas *kála* may host any TAM inflection (§3.1.2). Class-inflected pro-copulae serve to introduce clefts, and they are also used in connective-based attributive constructions (§3.1.3).

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

Following Meeussen (1967: 120), the verbal copula *li* was reconstructed to Proto-Bantu as **di* with the meaning ‘be’, and the semi-verbal copula *kála* corresponds to **gad* ‘remain’. Class-inflected pro-copulae *ddi*, *ba*, etc., grammaticalized from demonstrative stems.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Predicative inflection through HTD (Subtype IIb) is historically linked to the existence of the so-called Bantu augment, whose reflex in Cuwabo is purely tonal (§2.2 and §2.3). The origin of the copula-like particle *a* used in predicative inflection of Subtype IIIa (in combination with subject indexes for speech act participants) is unknown (§3.2.2).

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Inclusion and identity predication are not strictly distinguished in terms of predicative strategies in Cuwabo, conforming to a cross-linguistically widespread tendency. However, while all strategies are commonly used for inclusion, identity predication is by default expressed by means of the copula verb *li* ‘be’, as seen in example (10). See also the next point.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Subtype IIb HTD is sensitive to the specificity parameter. When nominal predicates are proper names or are overtly made specific through modifiers, HTD does not operate. Instead, identity statements are normally expressed through copula constructions based on *li*. This was illustrated in example (34). However, HTD is not totally incompatible with identity predication. The sentence in (24), which displays nominal predication based on HTD, was extracted from a context in which it is clearly interpreted as an identity statement.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Non-verbal predicative constructions do not show a special behavior in terms of information structure (§7.2).

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Cuwabo has no dedicated ostensive markers. Ostensive clauses usually start with class-inflected pro-copulae (§4.2).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Inverse-locational clauses are systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses in Cuwabo. ILP has no dedicated marking and instead involves a permutation in constituent order, i.e. (Ground–)copula–Figure(–Ground). In terms of locative marking, two types of constructions can be distinguished (§5.1).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Cuwabo ILP constructions based on locative enclitics are available to express pure existence, i.e. with non-localizable entities, although in this case inverse constructions with no locative enclitics are more frequent (§5.1.2).

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Plain-possessive predication is expressed by encoding the possessor and the possessee as the subject and the object of either one of the two ‘have’ verbs: *káana* and *na* (§4.4.1).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

There are two forms of inverse-possessive predication, which differ in terms of genitive or possessive encoding. In the first, the predicate phrase is introduced by a class-inflected pro-copula and includes a possessive modifier or a possessive pronoun referring to the possessor. The second inverse-possessive predication encodes possession through the connective (genitive) linker, itself combined with the class-inflected pro-copula (§4.4.2).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Numerals and quantifiers in Cuwabo are most commonly found in ILP constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure, or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee. Albeit more rarely, numerals and quantifiers may also be used predicatively in constructions involving the copula verb *li* or only HTD (§4.1).

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Except when they are part of predicative constructions based on pro-copulae (§3.1.3), nouns (and adjectives) have a dedicated predicative form, flagged by means of HTD (§3.2, §3.3).

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Nominal (as well as adjectival) inclusion predication involves HTD, which is also the strategy used to mark focus on constituents immediately following a conjoint verb form (§2.3, §3.2.1).

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of non-verbal predication is coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

In addition to negating the copula verb *li* ‘be’, Cuwabo has two dedicated non-verbal negators, namely *kahíyo* ~ *kahíye* and *ka-sp-hí=LOC*, both translated as ‘(there/it) is not’, but the latter is limited to the context of locational-existential predication.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Illocutionary force does not seem to play any role in the expression of non-verbal predication constructions (§4.2).

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

The insertion of non-verbal predicative constructions in subordinate clauses built on dependent verb forms (such as *if/when*-clauses or subjunctives) necessarily relies on the semi-verbal copula *kála*. In relative clauses, non-verbal predication is instead expressed by the copula *li*. No other predicative strategy is available (§7.3).

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Nouns in predicate function show no change in their nominal features, except in HTD (Subtype IIIb) where they lose their first high tone, historically linked to the so-called Bantu augment (§2.3, §3.2.1).

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Adjectives in predicate function show no change in their number and gender/noun-class features.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Non-verbal predicative elements do not acquire verbal features. However, when nominal and adjectival predicates apply to speech act participants, the predicator combines an agreement marker formally identical to verbal subject indexes of first and second persons to the connective stem *a* (§3.2.2, Subtype IIIa).

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

The semi-copula verb *kála* (§3.1.2) is also used as an auxiliary in combination with infinitive verb forms to express duration or persistence (English ‘keep V-ing’).

Chapter 27

Non-verbal predication in Ju

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Ju languages do not have a large morphosyntactic class of adjectives. Rather, there exists a class of quality verbs, a small closed class of adnominal property modifiers, and a small separate non-verbal word class of quantifiers and determiners (see §1, e.g., (2a–b)). There are some ambicategorical quality/property lexemes that behave partly like adjectives when attributive and partly as verbs when predicative (see §2.2, e.g., (26) and (27)). This may be ground for considering a closed-class of adjectives, with membership varying across dialects.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*
Not applicable.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

Not applicable.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

In Ju languages, adverbial predication is expressed either with verbal demonstratives, *hè~kè* ‘be this one’ and *to’à* ‘be that one’ (see §1, e.g., (6) and (7)). Alternatively, the existential-locational verb *GE(A)* is a typical intransitive verb and requires the suffix *-a* for valency-external participants to permit a second nominal expression to express locational non-verbal predication (see §1, e.g., (4a–d) and §2.2.4, e.g., (44) to (49)).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Not applicable.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

The simplest type of non-verbal predication only involves a single noun phrase as the nucleus of the predicative expression. The basic syntactic template in Ju is [NP PART], where PART stands for the central element instantiating the assertion of presentation and identification, which, however, is not a verb but a PARTICle—a case of “verbless” non-verbal predication (see §2.1, §2.1.1, §2.2.2, and §2.2.3). In constructions with two nominal referents, Ju employs only copula

verb constructions where the single argument by default behaves like the subject argument of canonical intransitive sentences while the predicative nominal has grammatical features like any other postverbal object or oblique noun phrase (see §2.2).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Not applicable.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Ju languages overall use copula constructions with a typologically widely attested division of labor between one copula type—*O(A)* and *e* (!Xun only)—catering for equational predicates, and the other type—*GE(A)* and negative *KORA*—encoding location (see §2.2). However, there is one context in the entire Ju complex where equational *O(A)* is also relevant for plain-locational predication, namely if the Ground is represented by the question word ‘where’ (see §2.2.2, e.g., (33) and (34)). The functional extension from equational to locational non-verbal predication is particularly advanced in some !Xun dialects (see §2.2.2, e.g., (32)).

The table below gives an overview of the different elements discussed in the chapter and their functional range in different Ju languages (see §2.2 and §3).

Table 1: A mapping of non-verbal predication expressions in Ju in terms of form and function.

Element	<i>kòm/má/tsèm</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>O(A)</i>	<i>GE(A)</i>	<i>KORA</i>
Identification	NP <i>kòm/má</i>	NP <i>e</i>			
Presentation	NP <i>tsèm</i>	NP <i>e</i>		NP <i>GE</i>	NP <i>KORA</i>
Equation-inclusion		NP <i>e</i> NP	NP <i>O(A)</i> NP		
Equation-identity		NP <i>e</i> NP	NP <i>O(A)</i> NP		
Plain location			NP <i>O(A)</i> NP	NP <i>GE(A)</i> NP	NP <i>KORA</i> NP
Inverse location				NP <i>GE(A)</i> NP	NP <i>KORA</i> NP
Plain possession				NP <i>GEA</i> NP	NP <i>KORA</i> NP
Inverse possession			NP <i>O(A)</i> NP		NP <i>KORA</i> NP

NB. Shading is employed to indicate whether a construction and/or function is restricted to Jul’hoan (dark grey) or to !Xun (light grey) or is found across the Ju language complex (white).

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

The copula *e* in the construction [NP *e* NP] in !Xun can be traced back to a proximal demonstrative in a construction with a single noun [NP *e*] with presentational and identificational functions (see §3, e.g., (68) and (69); see also §2.2.1). The copula *O(A)* is a defective verb. The copula *O(A)* in Jul’hoan obligatorily requires an overt postverbal nominal phrase, unlike other (transitive) verbs which can be used without one. This is not the case in !Xun (see §2.2.2).

The existential-locational verb *GE(A)* behaves like a typical intransitive verb and requires the *-a* suffix for valency-external participants to permit a second nominal expression of location and then convey locational non-verbal predication (see §2.2.4). In one Ju language, the fused form *gea* has developed further to express possession, effectively developing into a transitive verb (see §2.2.4, e.g., (55), (56), and (57)).

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*
Not applicable.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

No distinction is made in Ju languages between inclusion and identity predication, with both semantic types expressed using the same copula constructions. In Jul'hoan and some !Xun varieties, this entails the copula *o(A)* (see §2.2.2, e.g., (14) and (19) for identity predication; (15) and (20) for inclusion predication). In other !Xun varieties, the copula *e* is used for both predication types (see §2.2.1, e.g., (11) and (12)). See §3 (Table 2) for a summary of the different elements and the functional overlap.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
Not applicable.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Ju languages are SVO and within canonical (unmarked) clauses, the initial nominal position conflates the two roles of semantic subject/agent and pragmatic topic in a grammatical subject relation. Postverbal constituents—including those following copulas—usually encode focal information. A marked information-structural status of the initial noun phrase is a general option in the language, with no special interaction with non-verbal predication types. Where there are two postverbal constituents, order is determined by animacy: human referents thus take the object position and the semantic object is encoded as an oblique argument. Furthermore, in the context of canonical possession, the possessor is mostly animate while the possessum is mostly inanimate. The possessive construction with *gea* (see §2.2.4) aligns the linear syntax with the animacy hierarchy in that the more topic-worthy animate referent, as the possessor/controller of an inanimate entity, precedes in the linear syntax as a subject phrase within a normal topic-focus sequence.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

The Ju languages do not exhibit a dedicated ostensive marker. Given the presence of verbal demonstratives in Ju languages, an expression such as ‘This is a house’ or ‘That is my house’ can simply be expressed with the proximal or distal demonstrative verb (see §1, e.g., (6) and (7)).

Some Ju languages also have particles with identificational and presentational semantics. The basic syntactic template is [NP PART], where PART stands for the central element instantiating the assertion of presentation and identification, which, however, is not a verb but a PARTicle — a case of “verbless” non-verbal predication (see §2.1, §2.1.1, §2.2.2, and §2.2.3).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Not applicable.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Not applicable.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Predicative possession in Ju!’hoan and parts of !Xun is expressed with a dedicated ‘have’-verb *kx’àè*: [NP_{POSSR} *kx’ae* NP_{POSSM}] (see §2.2.4, e.g., (54)). This is referred to as a “transpossessive” construction in terms of the present framework.

!Xun also has recourse to a similar construction type using *gea* which clearly derives from the existential-locational verb *GE(A)* discussed previously, [NP_{POSSR} *gea* NP_{POSSM}] (§2.2.4, e.g., (55)). If such a locational non-verbal predication is recruited for possession, it should be conceived of as the existence of the possessum at the location of the possessor, which implies the former to be the initial Figure in a structure [NP_{POSSM-FIGURE} *ge-a* NP_{POSSR-GROUND}] (§2.2.4 e.g., (58)). Such cases are rare, and for the shift of *GE(A)* from location to possession, we thus assume a covert form of argument-predicate reversal, without any reflex in the clausal morphosyntax other than linear order, but with a crucial impact on the nature of the verb *gea*. When taking an active syntactic principle of Ju into account, this shift is not difficult to understand. Animacy is one of the strongest determinants of the linear constituent order in Ju. In the context of canonical possession, the possessor is mostly animate while the possessum is mostly inanimate. The possessive construction with *gea* thus aligns the linear syntax with the animacy hierarchy in that the more topic-worthy animate referent, as the possessor/controller of an inanimate entity, precedes in the linear syntax, thereby restoring also a normal topic-focus sequence (see §2.2.4).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication is possible without any overt marking employing a copula construction with the copula typically attested with equational predication types (see §2.2.2, e.g., (23)).

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

In Ju languages, most quantifiers are inherently verbal, e.g., *#háí* ‘be many’ or */xòròhm* ‘be few’, and function as intransitive verbs. Alternatively, an existential construction is possible with a noun modified by the quantifier within a relative clause. Some quantifiers can be subsumed in the adjectival property word class, including ‘one’ and ‘two’, which express ‘alone’ and ‘both’ as predicates after the equational-identificational copula (see §2.2.2, e.g., (28) and (29)).

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

The existential-locational verb *GE(A)* behaves like a typical intransitive verb and requires the *-a* suffix for valency-external participants to permit a second nominal expression of location. In some dialects, the valency-external marker is replaced with a locative/comitative preposition */Xòà* or with a locative postposition *òsí* (see §2.2.4, e.g., (48) and (49)).

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Not applicable.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of a non-verbal predication does not exhibit special coding.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Negation in Ju languages is typically expressed by a pre-verbal negation particle. This strategy is found with equational predication types. The existential-locational verb *GE(A)* has a suppletive negative counterpart *KORA* (see §2.2.5, e.g., (62)). As the existential-locational verb expands to cover predicative possession in some Ju languages, *GE(A)* has come to be used with standard negation in those varieties (see §2.2.4, e.g., (56) and (57)).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

We are unable to detect any interaction between illocutionary force and non-verbal predication types, beyond that which is already described in previous sections for questions (see §2.2.2, e.g., (33) and (34)).

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

There does not appear to be any interaction between clause type and non-verbal predication.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

As far as we can tell, there is no difference between nouns in non-verbal predication and the behaviour of nouns as arguments in verbal predication.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Not applicable.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Not applicable.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

The existential-locational verb *GE(A)* appears as the first verb (=V1) in a certain kind of multiverb construction involving a linker (=LNK), with the surface structure [Subject V1 LNK V2 (Object)]. Historically, the construction derives from a bipartite, biclausal construction. Various intransitive verbs occupy function as auxiliaries in the V1 position. With the existential-locational verb, the construction typically expresses ‘keep on VERBing’, ‘carry on VERBing’, or even ‘begin VERBing’. An example is given below with instances of the construction.

- (1) *sì hìn gè tè kǔ ǔ tè hǎ hìn gè*
 PRO2 EMPH be.there LNK IPFV go and PRO1 EMPH be.there
tè kǔ n//ùrì kòà ...
 LNK IPFV try 4.place
 ‘They keep on going and he keeps on trying places [from which to escape].’

Abbreviations

Arabic numerals indicate agreement classes.

EMPH	emphatic
IPFV	imperfective
LNK	linker
PRO	pronoun
V	verb

Chapter 28

Non-verbal predication in the Oceanic languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

The question whether Oceanic languages have an adjective class depends on the language, but also on the assumptions of the describers. The most common case is to have a large class of “adjectival verbs” (Ross 1998), i.e. adjectives that behave like verbs when predicative, except they can modify a noun directly (which verbs can’t). This typical configuration is found in Mwotlap [►§3].

Teanu illustrates a less typical case, where adjectives and verbs are two formally distinct classes in all contexts; yet this does not prevent its adjectives to head predicates, or even inflect for tense and aspect [►§3.3].

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

Nouns present two behaviours in predicates. Most commonly, they form Standard noun predicates (SNP), or its variant Anchored noun predicates (ANP) – constructions which are not open to adjectives [►§4.1]. Less commonly, nouns can head a TAMP predicate, in which case they behave like adjectives or even verbs [►§4.2].

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

The default, unmarked non-verbal predicate (SNP for nouns, stative aspect for adjectives) does not distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function like Spanish *estar* vs. *ser* would. That said, the presence of TAM inflection forces a “contingent” reading (result of a change-of-state), for adjectives [►§3.2] as much as for nouns [►§4.2].

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication concerns mostly locational predication. However, one also finds predicates based on causal or purposive adverbial phrases ‘be for, be because’ [►§7.2]. Simulative predicates also belong to that category [►§7.3]. Some

Oceanic languages encode adverbial meanings using verbs ('stay, be at'; 'be like', 'be how' ...), but others, like Mwotlap, do without any verbal strategy.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Oceanic languages are omnipredicative: essentially, all word classes can head a predicate – including adjectives, nouns, numerals, prepositional phrases, and the majority of adverbs. The only lexical class that cannot access the function of predicate is that of "lexical postverbs" – a kind of adverb specialised as predicate modifiers [►§2].

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

The most pervasive type of non-verbal construction in Oceanic languages is the juxtaposition strategy: this is true for nouns, numerals, possessive classifiers, locatives, adverbials, and so on. In many languages (like Mwotlap), this juxtaposition type even allows the non-verbal predicate to inflect for tense-aspect-mood. A minority of languages (a few dozen, out of 500 in the family) have developed a verbal copula. Among them, Lo-Toga uses its copula only in restricted contexts [►§4.2.1]: with a negation, or with TAM inflection. Other languages (Nafsan, Lelepa, Lewo; Wayan) employ their copula(s) for every non-verbal predicate, whether adjectival, or ascriptive, or equative [►§4.4.1]; Nafsan has also developed a 'have' verb for its plain-possessive predicates.

Polynesian languages have an intermediate status [►§4.4.2]: they appear to have developed a copula for their equative predicates, yet it is optional, and also found outside predicate phrases.

Verbal strategies are more widespread for locational predicates, whether plain- or inverse- ('be at', 'be where', 'exist'), and for some adverbial predicates ('be like', 'be how' ...). However, many Oceanic languages – like Mwotlap – use the juxtaposition strategy even for these functions.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

The only language which features both types of constructions for noun predicates (i.e., with vs. without a copula) is Lo-Toga [►§4.2.1]. See question 2.1.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Very few Oceanic languages have one copula, let alone two. Wayan Fijian has two: one for ascriptives, the other one for equatives. Lo-Toga has a positive copula *da* for TAM-marked predicates, and a negative one *deda* for negating noun predicates [►§4.2.1]. Tahitian also has a special copula *e'ere* for negative predicates.

For plain-locational clauses, various Oceanic languages use a verb; even though it is often glossed 'stay' (or a posture gloss: 'sit', 'stand' ...), it may also be

analysed as a locational copula [►§7.1]. The same applies to inverse-locational clauses, which use existential operators; that operator may be analysed as a copula, whether or not it is a verb [►§8].

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*
The copula *da* of Lo-Toga is originally a verb ‘do, make’. The historical origin of the Nafsan copula *pi* is also a verb ‘do, make’. In Nafsan, the inverse-locational copula *pitlak* ‘have; be there’ is a former phrase *pi atlak* ‘be owner’.

The origin of the existential copula in north Vanuatu languages is an anaphoric oblique adverb (‘there’, ‘with it’, ‘at it’, etc.); the same applies in some Polynesian languages [►§8].

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*
The predicative inflection construction is not used in Oceanic.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Ascriptive (“inclusion”) and equative (“identity”) predicates are co-expressed in the majority of Oceanic languages. They are, however, distinguished in Wayan Fijian [►§4.1.1], and in Polynesian languages [►§4.4.2].

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
The specificity parameter generally does not interact with the non-verbal predication types of Oceanic; the only exception is the contrast between inclusion and identity predication, which is encoded in a handful of Oceanic languages (Wayan Fijian, and Polynesian languages like Tahitian) through contrasting formal constructions.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The parameters of information structure and constituent order do not show clear interactions with the various non-verbal predication types of Oceanic languages.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Many Oceanic languages have a dedicated ostensive marker [►§9]. In many languages, like Tahitian, they are transparently linked to deictics. In Mwotlap, the ostensive marker *ete* has its likely origin in the verb ‘see’.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

Oceanic languages usually make formal distinctions between inverse-locational clauses (ILC) and plain-locational ones (PLC); however, there are numerous bridges between the two. Thus, North Vanuatu languages have a dedicated

existential marker (ILC) not found in PLC; but its etymology is a former locative adverb ‘there’, which makes it an instance of the *there_be*-ILC type [►§8.1]. Likewise, the negative ILC operator (NEG:EX), in most Oceanic languages, encodes ILC when the subject is indefinite (‘There is no X’), but it encodes PLC if its subject is definite (‘X is absent’, ‘X is not at LOC’) [►§8.2].

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

The construction used for ILP can also express pure existence, even with reference to non-localisable entities.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

The most common strategy in Oceanic for encoding plain-possessive predication is derived from inverse-locational (existential) predication, combined with a possessed subject [►§8.3]: {*My house exists* = ‘I have a house’}.

Three other strategies are attested for plain-possessive predicates, albeit much rarer: 1) the “S-possessee” type {*a house is with me*}, in Teanu; 2) the “S-possessor” type {*I am with a house*} in Hiw; 3) the “transpossessive” type {*I have a house*}, in Nafsan.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication takes the form of a predicate phrase that is a reduced form of an adnominal possession construction: namely, a possessed NP deprived of its possessee head (*≈This house is* (Ø) *POSS you*). Some languages allow the possessive linker or classifier to head the predicate; others require a dummy noun for that function [►§6].

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Oceanic languages have numeral predicates, headed by the numeral itself. These can also have existential readings [►§5].

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Nominal predicates usually do not show functive or overt flagging. One exception are Polynesian languages, which use an indefinite quantifier (*(h)e*) for their ascriptive predicates [►§4.4.2].

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Tahitian has an optional particle 'o whose role is to highlight a noun phrase, whether they are arguments, topics or predicates; that particle 'o is very frequently used as a quasi-copula in equative clauses [►§4.4.2]. Also, Mwotlap uses a focus construction for certain forms of nominal (equative) predicates; for reasons of length, I chose not to discuss it in this paper.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The argument of a non-verbal predication is always coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

The negation strategies used in non-verbal predication vary across languages, but also across functional domains within a single language. In general, the standard negation used with verbs is also used with adjectives, and in many languages, it can be used with noun predicates (ascriptive and equative). Some languages, though, have a special copula for negating noun predicates – e.g. Lo-Toga *deda* [►§4.2.1], Tahitian *e'ere* [►§8.5].

Plain- and inverse-locational predicates often involve a different negation, the “negative existential” (*There is no X; X isn't there*) [►§8.3]. This is often an unanalysable predictor, which bears no obvious link with its positive counterparts, or with the other negations.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The parameter of illocutionary force does not interact particularly with the various non-verbal predication types. Non-verbal constructions follow the same syntax whatever the illocutionary force of the utterance is (statement, question, exclamation). Question words follow the same syntax as their positive counterpart, whether they form NP predicates ('who', 'what?'), or adverbial ones ('[be] why', '[be] how', '[be] where' ...).

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

The issue of subordination is orthogonal to non-verbal predication in Oceanic languages.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Essentially, all nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns, which can bear a determiner, adjectives and other modifiers, possessors, numerals. One

possible exception is that ascriptive predicates are generally unspecified for number: e.g. ‘They are women’ would often translate as {*they*_{pl} – *woman*_{sg}}.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

In Oceanic languages, there is no pattern of agreement (in number, gender or class, etc.) between adjectives and nouns. These languages are therefore not concerned by a loss of such features in predicative position.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Oceanic languages allow their adjectives and nouns to head a predicate, (1) in a neutral, unmarked way with respect to TAM [►§4.1], or (2) with additional TAM marking [►§4.2]. Arguably, the latter constructions show nouns acquiring “verbal” features, namely TAM inflection; however, I would personally challenge that view, and propose instead that TAM is not inherently “verbal” – precisely based on the syntax of Oceanic languages.

It is rare for Oceanic languages to acquire person agreement by virtue of being predicative. However, this happens in Araki (François 2002), even though I did not illustrate this in my study for reasons of length.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Oceanic languages do not have any clearly defined category of auxiliaries.

Chapter 29

Non-verbal predication in the Formosan languages

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

No, the Formosan languages do not have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives. Adjectival concepts are expressed by stative verbs.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*
Irrelevant.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

In some languages, e.g., as in Rukai, there seems to be no distinction whatsoever and all stative verbs are marked by a specific prefix *ma-* (which alternates with *ka-* in certain environments, see Zeitoun and Huang 2000). In other languages such as Paiwan, there seems to be such a distinction, expressed by an opposition between *ma-/ka-* (contingent attributive function) and \emptyset /*ka-* (permanent attributive function), but such a dichotomy has not been well studied.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication is found in only a few languages. When present, it is limited to locational predication. Other adverbial expressions, e.g., comitative or benefactive, cannot head a non-verbal predicate. To give an example, benefaction can be rendered in different ways, e.g. through the use of a different voice marking (cf. undergoer voice—circumstantial), as in Atayal (Huang 1995), Puyuma (Teng 2008) or Saisiyat (Zeitoun et al. 2015), the use of an oblique case marker, as in Rukai (Zeitoun 2000, 2007), or the use of a dative case marker, as in Saisiyat (Zeitoun et al. 2015).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

In Formosan languages, there are two major types of predicates, verbal and non-verbal. Non-verbal predicates are usually encoded through nouns, and exclude all other types of word classes, e.g., adverbs, with the exception of locational phrases in two languages, Amis and Paiwan. In addition, four languages (Bunun, Puyuma, Saisiyat and Rukai) have genitive, possessive and locative pronouns functioning as possessive predicates.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

2.1. Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?

Nominal predication includes identity or inclusive predication clauses, (pseudo-) clefts and (nominal) interrogative clauses. In the Formosan languages, these clauses are usually made up of non-verbal predicate juxtaposed to a nominal argument, with the exception of four languages (Paiwan, Kaxabu, Tsou and Puyuma) which also exhibit a copula. In these four languages, the copula differs quite significantly in form and function: it may be obligatory as in Kaxabu, optional (though productive, as in Tsou), encode distinctions of definiteness as in Puyuma, or yield a different word order, as in Paiwan.

2.2. If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?

To the best of my knowledge, the only two languages that encode two different types of constructions are Puyuma and Paiwan. As emphasized in the previous question and in the follow-up questions below, the use of a copula implies that the nominal predicate is definite in Puyuma.

In Paiwan, the occurrence of the copula *mana* yields a change in word order, which is seemingly identical to that of Mandarin Chinese (there is no reason so far to suspect this is a calque), i.e., with the subject occurring in sentence-initial position, rather than after the predicate, and the predicate occurring after the copula; when two nouns are juxtaposed, on the other hand, the predicate appears in initial position (i.e., unmarked position).

2.3. If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?

A copula is found in very few Formosan languages. It has been reported in Paiwan, Tsou, Kaxabu and Puyuma.

In Paiwan, there is a copula *mana* which yields a change in word order.

In Tsou, there is a copula *zou* which occurs in complementary distribution with auxiliary verbs which occur in verbal clauses. The copula is optional.

In Kaxabu, the nominal predicate must be preceded by the copula *ka*.

In Puyuma, nominal predicates which are introduced by a copula are definite.

2.4. If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?

Only the origin of the copula *ka* in Kaxabu is known. It originally functioned as a topic marker in that language and still does in some Formosan languages, e.g., Rukai.

2.5. If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?

Irrelevant.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

The only known language to make such a distinction is Puyuma. In this language, juxtaposed NPs are instances of inclusion predication; nominal predicates preceded by a copula are instances of identity predication.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

In Puyuma, the parameter involved is definiteness: juxtaposed NPs are indefinite and nominal predicates preceded by a copula are definite.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

At this point, it is believed that this is irrelevant.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

This is an issue that has not been thoroughly investigated in the Formosan languages.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

In a majority of Formosan languages, predicates heading existential/possessive and locative clauses are a subclass of verbs. Dedicated inverse-locational constructions have not been reported in the Formosan languages.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Irrelevant.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

In a majority of Formosan languages, verbs which head possessive predication are identical to those which head existential predication, and locational predication as well, though variation may be found in negative (as opposed to affirmative) clauses.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Bunun, Puyuma, Saisiyat and Rukai exhibit possessive and locative pronouns which may function as possessive predicates. Among these four languages, Bunun is the most peculiar. First, it has no possessive pronouns but only genitive pronouns which only mark possession. In other Formosan languages, geni-

tive pronouns encode both possessors and non-subject actors. Second, in Bunun a genitive pronoun can occur clause-initially and functions as part of the possessive predicate of the clause. It is followed by the nominative subject and a nominal phrase introduced obligatorily by *tu*, which introduces the second part of the predicate and thus such clauses can be viewed as instances of possessor raising (L. Li 2018: 429–431). Such type of clauses can be viewed as instances of inverse-possessive predication.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

In a majority of Formosan languages, quantification is encoded through stative verbs.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

In Paiwan, Kavalan, Puyuma, and Amis, nominal predicates are preceded by noun markers.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Irrelevant (at least, not to my knowledge).

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The arguments of non-verbal predicates are marked like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Some languages do, including Seediq, Atayal, Kaxabu, Kanakanavu, Kavalan and Puyuma.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Not enough information available at this stage.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

Not enough information available at this stage.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

There is one specific feature that is found with predicative nouns in a few Formosan languages, e.g., Mantauran Rukai. That is the marking of plurality. Such a feature is also found with certain stative verbs in this language.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Irrelevant.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Whether verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements really depends on the language, e.g., in Rukai, there is a very clear-cut distinction between verbal and nominal predicates, i.e., nominal predicates never take TAM markers. The distinction is less clear-cut in other languages, e.g., Puyuma.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

As mentioned above, a copula has been reported for only four languages (including Kaxabu, Tsou, Paiwan and Puyuma). In none of these languages is the copula related to a class of auxiliaries, a category absent in these languages with the exception of Tsou. Note that Tsou has developed a complex system of auxiliary verbs, which, unlike the copula (optional), are obligatory in all verbal clauses (see 2.3).

References

- Huang, Lillian M. 1995. *A study of Mayrinax syntax*. Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co.
- Li, Li-ying Lilian. 2018. *A grammar of Isbukun Bunun*. Hsinchu: National Tsing Hua University dissertation.
- Teng, Stacy F. 2008. *A reference grammar of Puyuma, an Austronesian language of Taiwan* (Pacific Linguistics 595). Canberra: Australian National University.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth. 2000. *Lukaiyu cankao yufa* [A reference grammar of Rukai] (Taiwan nandao yuyan 8 [Formosan Languages 8]). Taipei: Yuanliou.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth. 2007. *A grammar of Mantaauran (Rukai)* (Language and Linguistics Monograph Series A4–2). Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth, Tai-hwa Chu & Lalo a tahesh kaybaybaw. 2015. *A study of Saisiyat morphology* (Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication 40). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth & Lillian M. Huang. 2000. Discussion on *ka-*, an overlooked marker of verbal derivation in the Formosan languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39(2). 391–414.

Marian Klamer

Chapter 30

Non-verbal predication in three families of Papunesia: Teiwa, Tidore and Mian

Teiwa (Timor Alor Pantar family)

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

There is a morphosyntactic class of adjectives which can be used as predicates like verbs; but unlike verbs, they are undetermined with respect to the Realis/Irrealis opposition (Sections 2.1, 2.5).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

The predicative behavior of adjectives and nouns is largely similar in Teiwa. But unlike nominal predicates, adjectival predicates can be modified for degree. In Teiwa, this is expressed by encoding the subject of the adjectival predicate twice, as an NP and a short pronoun (see Section 2.5, example 52).

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

The distinction between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates is expressed with aspectual adverbs such as *yed* 'PROSPECTIVE' ('still, not yet') (Section 2.5).

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication in the sense that adverbs which modify predicates can also function as predicates, is not attested. Locative predications are generally verbs combined with deictic words, the classes of which are not yet clear (Section 2.7). Often, the relation between the located entity (Figure) and the spatial location (Ground) is expressed with the transitive locational (spatial) verb *me* 'be in, be at'. In such constructions, the Figure is the subject and the Ground the object (Section 2.7).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

There is no predication with adverbs as predicate nucleus.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

2.1. Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?

The most productive construction type for non-verbal predicates in Teiwa is the juxtaposition construction; the language has no copular verb and non-verbal predicates are not inflected. The juxtaposition construction is used with nominal, adjectival and quantifier predicates. However, locational and existential clauses are verbal.

2.2. If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?

Not relevant.

2.3. If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?

Not relevant.

2.4. If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?

Not relevant.

2.5. If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?

There is no predicate inflection in non-verbal predication in Teiwa.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

3.1. Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?

Inclusion and identity predication are distinguished by choice of pronoun of the subject of the predication. In identity predication, a third person pronominal subject is expressed with the pronoun *ga'an* '3sg' (instead of the regular subject pronoun *a'an*). The pronoun *ga'an* normally expresses 3rd singular objects, and has developed a secondary function as a demonstrative pronoun 'that (one)'. This pronoun is also used as (part of) the subject constituent in presentative or ostensive constructions, which otherwise use the juxtaposition construction, as any other non-verbal predication (Section 2.3).

3.2. How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?

Teiwa distinguishes identity from inclusion predication by employing different pronouns (see 3.1), so there is interaction with the specificity parameter.

3.3. How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?

My corpus shows little interaction between information structure (e.g. focus marking) and constituent order on the one hand, and non-verbal predication on the other, but this may also be due to lack of data.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Ostension does not involve a dedicated ostensive marker (Section 3.1).

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

The distinction “plain-locational” versus “inverse-locational” predication is irrelevant for Teiwa. Locational predication is verbal, using transitive verbs like *me* ‘be in’, where the Figure is the subject and the Ground is the object (Section 2.7).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Pure existence is expressed with the existential verb *wan* ‘exist (at)’ (Section 2.4).

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Possessive clauses are nominal clauses where the possessor is part of the nominal predicate, or verbal clauses with the existential verb *wan* ‘exist (at)’. There is no relation with locational predication (Section 2.4).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

There is inverse-possessive predication in Teiwa (Section 2.4)

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Numeral quantifiers and other types of quantifiers are used predicatively in the juxtaposition construction as the other non-verbal predications (Section 2.6). What is special about quantifier predications is that the subject is expressed twice: by an NP and (in case of a quantity larger than one) with the third person plural pronoun *iman* ‘they’, or the 3rd person singular short pronoun *a*, which in these contexts may also refer to plural subjects (Section 2.6).

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Verbal or nominal clauses can be linked to a nominal clause by the comparative adverb *mo* ‘like’ (Section 2.3).

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*
Nominal predication does not involve a particular use of the focus marker or discourse marking elements.
- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*
The subject argument of a non-verbal predication is generally coded like the subject argument of semantically monovalent verbs, with minor alternative coding of identity constructions and degree of adjectival predicates (Sections 2.3, 2.5).
- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*
Negation of non-verbal predicates is identical to negation of verbal predicates (Section 2.3).
- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
There is no special marking of illocutionary force on verbal or non-verbal predicates.
- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*
There seems to be no interaction between non-verbal predication and the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions.
- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*
Nouns in predicate function show no change in their nominal features (Sections 2.2, 2.3, 2.4).
- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*
Adjectives in predicate function show no change in their adjectival features (Section 2.4).
- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*
No verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements.
- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the category of auxiliary (e.g., by having the same phonetic expression, despite functional difference)?*
Teiwa has no copula elements, so this question is not relevant.

Tidore (North Halmahera family)

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

There is a morphosyntactic class of adjectives which can be used as predicates, like verbs; but unlike verbs, they cannot be nominalised by means of a nasal prefix (Section 3.2).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

The predicative behavior of adjectives and nouns is similar (Sections 3.3, 3.4).

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

The distinction between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates may be expressed with aspectual adverbs such as *rai* ‘already’ and *yang* ‘not yet’. In addition, there is a difference in the interpretation of underived adjectival predications, and predications consisting of adjectives that are nominalized with the prefix *ma-*. Underived adjectival predications express a temporary quality of the subject referent, while predicates with the nominal *ma-* form indicate more permanent properties (Section 3.4).

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

To express locative relations, Tidore employs the preposition *toma* ‘LOC’ to express non-human recipients and locations, and *soma* ‘with’ to express non-human instruments and comitatives. Prepositional phrases are used predicatively with the juxtaposition strategy. As the same PPs can be used as adjuncts in verbal clauses, according to Chapter 1 (Creissels, Bertinetto, and Ciucci, see the printed volume) this would qualify as adverbial predication (Section 2.4).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

The grammar does not mention the exclusion of, or constraint on, a specific word class in predicative position.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

The most productive and most frequently occurring construction type for non-verbal predicates is the juxtaposition construction. Non-verbal predicates can take a subject prefix (as a kind of “predicative inflection” of Subtype IIIa; see Chapter 1), but this is an optional minority pattern (Section 3.3).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

The juxtaposition construction is used with all non-verbal predications and in all contexts. Predicate inflection is always optional, and much less frequently used than juxtaposition; it is not used with complex noun phrases (Section 3.3).

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Not relevant.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

Not relevant.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Predicative inflection involves the indexing of person, number and gender features of the subject on the verb. There is no information on the historical origin of this prefix (Section 3.3).

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

In nominal predicates, predicative inflection (where the predicate has a subject prefix) may function to express an explicit distinction between inclusion and identity predication, where there is no subject prefix on the predicate (Section 3.2). However, as prefixing is always optional, inclusion can also be expressed by simple juxtaposition so that the distinction is no longer encoded.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The specificity parameter does not seem to interact with the non-verbal predicate types.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The source discusses no interaction between information structure, constituent order, and non-verbal predication.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Presentative (“ostensive”) clauses do not appear to involve a dedicated marker, and the source contains no discussion of ostension strategies.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

The distinction “plain-locational” versus “inverse-locational” predication is relevant for Tidore. Plain-locational predication is found with prepositional phrases headed by *toma* ‘Loc’ while inverse-locational predication is found with the preposition *soma* ‘with’ (Section 3.6). Existential predication is expressed with the verb *sema* ‘to be, exist’ and involves inverse-locational predication (Section 3.3).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Pure existence is expressed with the verb *sema* ‘to be, exist’ and the inverse-locational predication (Section 3.3).

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Possessive predication is expressed with a possessee in the nominal predicate. The nominal predicate can have a possessor prefix, or be a bare noun. The same construction can be used to express existence. Plain-possessive clauses also use the “comitative-possessee” strategy defined in Chapter 1 (Section 4.6.1).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

There is no report of inverse-possessive predication in Tidore.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Numeral quantifiers and other quantifiers are used predicatively in the juxtaposition construction, just like the other non-verbal predications. At least one general quantifier *dofu* ‘much/many’ is found in the same constructions as adjectives: used predicatively with the subject prefix, and used predicatively as a nominal predicate with the prefix *ma-* (Section 3.5).

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Nominal predicates do not generally show overt flagging. In comparisons, two NPs are connected by the nominal *gate* ‘manner’ (Section 3.4), and it may be that *gate* has a “functive/simulative” flagging function.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Nominal predication does not involve a particular use of the focus marker or discourse marking elements.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The subject argument of a non-verbal predication is coded like the subject argument of semantically monovalent verbs (Sections 3.1, 3.3).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Negation of non-verbal predicates is identical to negation of verbal predicates (Section 3.3).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

There is no special marking of illocutionary force on verbal or non-verbal predicates.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

There seems to be no interaction between non-verbal predication and the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Nouns in predicate function show no change in their nominal features.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Adjectives in predicate function show no change in their adjectival features.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

In the minor and optional cases of predicative inflection, non-verbal predicates take a subject prefix like verbal predicates (see Sections 3.1, 3.3).

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the category of auxiliary (e.g., by having the same phonetic expression, despite functional difference)?*

There are no copula elements in Tidore so this question is not relevant.

Mian (Ok family)

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

There is a morphosyntactic class of adjectives which can be used as predicates; but unlike verbs, they have to take a “predicator” enclitic =o (or =na ‘too’) when they are used predicatively; this is considered predicate inflection (Section 4.2).

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

The predicative behavior of adjectives and nouns is largely similar, except that only adjectival predicates occur in predicates with the enclitic =na ‘too’, see previous question and Section 4.3.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

The distinction between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates is not discussed in the Mian grammar (Fedden 2011), so information is lacking.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication is attested (e.g. with the adverb ‘for free, gratis’, Section 4.3). Locative predications are generally verbs combined with adjuncts that consist of directionals, nouns or postpositional phrases (Section 4.5).

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Numerals in predicative function must combine with a “light” verb to form a complex intransitive predicate (Section 4.4).

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Non-verbal predicates occur with the “predicator” =o, which is classed here as a “predicate inflection” construction, see Section 4.2. This construction is used with nominal, adjectival, adverbial and universal quantifier predicates. There are also nominal predicates that occur without =o. Structurally these are juxtaposition constructions. Locational and existential clauses are verbal.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Not relevant.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

The language has no copula construction.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

The source contains no information about the history of the predicator =o.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

See the answers to questions 2.1 and 2.4.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Inclusion and identity predication are distinguished by reversal and by choice of pronoun. In identity predication when the predicate term is a proper name or kin term, the order of subject and predicate is inverted (to predicate – subject), and the subject pronoun must be a focus pronoun (Section 4.2). Also, there is no predicator clitic =o on the inverted predicate, which makes these constructions instances of the juxtaposition construction.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The specificity parameter interacts with non-verbal predication; see 3.1.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The source does not provide information on the interaction of information structure and constituent order with non-verbal predicates.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

The source does not discuss ostensive clauses.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

The distinction “plain-locational” versus “inverse-locational” predication is irrelevant for Mian; only plain-locational predication is used. Existential predication is expressed with an existential verb *n/bi~bl-* ‘exist, stay, live, remain’. Expressions of locations can also involve other verbs, such as the location verb *daa* ‘abide’, handling verb *fâ* ‘put’, and the posture verb *mâa* ‘stand up’ (Section 4.5).

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Pure existence is expressed with the existential verb *n/bi~bl-* ‘exist, stay, live, remain’.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

Possessive predication can be expressed by using a possessive pronoun as a nominal predicate (Section 4.2). These constructions are instances of “inverse-possessive predication” as defined in Chapter 1. (Note that, by lacking a predicative marker =o, these are also juxtaposition constructions.) Mian also has plain-possessive clauses using the “comitative-possessee” strategy defined in Chapter 1 (Section 4.6.1).

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

See the previous answer.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

A universal quantifier can be used predicatively in the same construction as the other non-verbal predications. Numerals are used predicatively only in combination with a light verb in a morphologically complex intransitive verbal predicate (Section 4.4).

5. **Morphosyntactic issues**

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

The source contains no information on functive constructions.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Nominal predication does not involve a particular use of focus markers or discourse marking elements.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The subject argument of a non-verbal predication is generally coded like the subject argument of semantically monovalent verbs (Sections 4.1–4.3).

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

For non-verbal predicates there is only one negation (the enclitic =ba), while verbal predicates can have two. When pronouns are the nucleus of negated nominal predicates they must be derived with a special suffix -kob, and become negative pronouns (Section 4.2).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

The source does not discuss special marking of illocutionary force on non-verbal predicates.

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

The source does not provide information on the interaction between non-verbal predication and the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Though it is not explicitly discussed in the source, it seems that predicative nouns cannot take the determiner that marks gender.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Though it is not explicitly stated in the source, it seems that predicative adjectives cannot take the determiner that marks gender, while they can occur with it in headless NPs. My hypothesis is that notions like ‘My house is the old one’ might be expressed as ‘The old one is my house’, with the adjective functioning as a subject headless NP taking a determiner, and a nominal predicate.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Just like clauses with finite verbs, non-verbal clauses are marked for illocutionary force with enclitics.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the category of auxiliary (e.g., by having the same phonetic expression, despite functional difference)?*

Not relevant.

Chapter 31

Non-verbal predication in Nungon

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

Nungon has a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, divided among three morphologically defined subclasses. Unlike verbs, adjectives do not inflect for TAM or person/number; as non-verbal predicates, they do not agree with the nominal argument.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*

There is very little obvious differentiation between nouns and adjectives as non-verbal predicates, except for characteristics that stem from their different behaviors as arguments/modifiers: typically, adjectives are not modified by demonstratives or quantifiers.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

No, this is not distinguished. The closest thing would be the use of two different light verbs for 'being' and 'becoming'.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication can be used for possession as well as location, benefaction, and accompaniment.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

For most adverbs, there seems to be the sense that these are used elliptically when they are apparently the only element in the predicate (with an underlying verb understood); this contrasts with predicative use of nouns and adjectives.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Juxtaposition, and use of light verbs and an existential verb.

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Juxtaposition is the primary type for identity and inclusion predication. The existential verb can be used for locational predication, where it overlaps with adver-

bial predication. In negative existential predication, the negated existential verb is more widely used, for all contexts, while the negator-*cum*-negative existential predicate, *muuno*, is used in a restricted subset of contexts.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

There are no copulae, per se; one existential verb is used for existential predication, and two light verbs are used for inclusion predication.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*

Not applicable.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*

Not applicable.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

No.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Not obviously, although it may play a role in the use of *muuno* as negative existential predicate.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

This requires more investigation.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

The language has no dedicated ostensive marker.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

No.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

No.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

The usual ways to express possession in Nungon involve indication of the possessive relationship through an affix and/or enclitic (genitive and pertensive markers) on the argument and the existential verb *it*- ‘exist, stay, be’, with meaning ‘X’s Y exists’; see Section 3.4.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

In inverse-possessive predication, the predicate can be either the possessum or possessor; see Section 3.4.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

Quantification is expressed through nominal modifiers in Nungon. The interplay of quantification and non-verbal predication requires further study, but it is clear that both quantifiers alone and noun + quantitative modifier combinations can function as non-verbal predicates.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

There is no special morphological flagging of the nominal predicate.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

No.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The coding is the same for both the argument of a non-verbal predication and that of a semantically monovalent verb.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

Verbs and ex-verbal words in Nungon (those derived from verbs) are generally negated with a proclitic, *ma=*. In contrast, all other negatable word classes are negated with a stand-alone negator, *muuno*, which follows the negated word or phrase. This distinction is maintained with non-verbal predication, with the additional twist that *muuno* itself can function as a negative existential predicate.

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Polar and content questions are possible with non-verbal predication; commands, usually not (except an idiomatic, probably elliptical, exception).

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

I have identified verbless clauses that appear to function as relative clauses; these generally involve identity or inclusion predicates. Generally, though, subordinate clauses have strictly verbal predicates, not non-verbal predicates.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Nouns are in general not marked for number; this is thus also not marked when they serve as predicates; there is no system of articles. Possession, modification by adjectives and demonstratives, and specification for number, are all possible when nouns serve as predicates.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Adjectives do not agree in number or gender/noun class, as modifiers or as predicates.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Only the “attention-commanding” suffix *-a* can be attached to both verbal predicates and non-verbal predicative elements. No person agreement or TAM markers can attach to the non-verbal predicative elements.

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

There are no copular elements in Nungon.

Chapter 32

Non-verbal predication in Ngumpin-Yapa languages (Australia)

1. Non-verbal predication and word classes

- 1.1. *Does the language/family have a morphosyntactic class of adjectives, and if so, does their predicative behavior distinguish them from verbs?*

The existence of a class of adjectives is not strongly supported by morphosyntactic criteria in Ngumpin-Yapa languages.

- 1.2. *If in the language/family the predicative behavior of adjectives is distinct from that of verbs, is it also distinct from the predicative behavior of nouns, and if so, to what extent?*
Not relevant.

- 1.3. *Does the language/family distinguish between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates? Is the distinction restricted to specific word classes, e.g. adjectives?*

There is no systematic distinction between contingent and permanent attributive function of non-verbal predicates.

- 1.4. *In the language/family, is adverbial predication limited to locational predication? More generally, which types of adverbial predication are allowed?*

Adverbial predication is not limited to locational predication. A range of additional functional types are permitted, largely reflecting the semantics of case suffixes that can be used to form predication heads. See §4.2.

- 1.5. *Does the language/family exclude or constrain the usage of a specific word class in predicative position (for instance, excluding certain types of adverb)?*

Yes. Coverbs and non-finite verb forms are mostly excluded from acting as main predicates. Limited exceptions are described in §4.3.

2. Syntactic types of non-verbal predicative construction

- 2.1. *Which construction type(s) can be found in the language/family?*

Juxtaposition and copulae construction are both attested. Additionally, highly specialised constructions involving coverb and non-finite verb forms are attested (see §4.3).

- 2.2. *If two or three construction types are in competition, what is their respective distribution? In particular, if the juxtaposition construction is attested in the language/family, what are the factors that condition its use?*

Further language-specific research is required to determine the factors that condition the use of the copulae construction over the simple juxtaposition strategy. Some preliminary observations are made in §3.1.

- 2.3. *If the language/family adopts the copula construction, does it have different types of copula, and what are their respective functions?*

Polyfunctionality of copula forms is detailed in §3.1.

- 2.4. *If the language/family has copula elements, can one trace back their historical origin?*
Copulae in all languages have additional synchronic functions as postural verbs. Diachronic origin is not known.

- 2.5. *If the language/family adopts the predicative inflection construction, which precise kind of predicative inflection does it have? Is it possible to trace back its historical origin?*
Not relevant.

3. Semantic types of non-verbal predication

- 3.1. *Does the language/family distinguish between the way in which proper inclusion and identity predication are expressed?*

Inclusion and identity clauses are not morphosyntactically distinguished. In Warlpiri, identity clauses can be distinguished by prosodic criteria. See §4.1.2.

- 3.2. *How does the specificity parameter interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*
Not relevant.

- 3.3. *How do the parameters of information structure and constituent order interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Ngumpin-Yapa languages vary with respect to how the second position bound pronoun markers pattern in verbal/non-verbal predication. Details are provided in §3.2.

- 3.4. *In the language/family, do ostensive clauses involve a dedicated ostensive marker? If so, is it possible to trace back its historical origin? If not, what is the strategy found in the language/family to express ostension?*

Not relevant.

4. Locational and possessive structures

- 4.1. *In the language/family, are inverse-locational clauses systematically distinguished from plain-locational clauses, and if so, which kind of ILP-construction is used?*

The same construction is used for plain-locational and inverse locational clauses (§4.5)—there is no dedicated inverse-locational marking and constituent order is not a distinguishing characteristic. Demonstratives may be used to specify a Figure as definite as shown in (43) but there is no definite or focus marking which appears to be used consistently to encode a difference in plain- vs. inverse-locational predication.

- 4.2. *In the language/family, is the construction used for ILP available to express other “existential” meanings (in particular, pure existence, especially with reference to non-localizable entities)?*

Not applicable. Note that there is some evidence that pure existence, or pure “non-existence” can (at least in Warlpiri) be expressed via proprietive or privative predications involving copula constructions. See §4.2.6.3.

- 4.3. *What is the strategy used in the language/family to express plain-possessive predication? Is it related in some way or another to locational predication?*

There are a number of strategies for expressing possessive predication in the Ngumpin-Yapa languages (§4.7). None of them are intimately related with locational predications.

- 4.4. *Does the language/family express inverse-possessive predication by means of a construction in which the predicate phrase is (the reduced form of) an adnominal possession construction, or in any other way?*

Inverse-possessive predication has the form of nominal predication construction with the reduced form of a genitival construction in predicate role. See §4.2.5 for further possessive types.

- 4.5. *In the language/family, which construction type is used for quantification? Is it used more or less systematically to avoid existential constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of Figure or possessive constructions with a “noun + quantitative modifier” in the role of possessee?*

The use of predicative numerals is not common in Ngumpin-Yapa languages but, when used predicatively, they can occur with a copula or in a juxtaposition strategy.

5. Morphosyntactic issues

- 5.1. *In the given language/family, do nominal predicates show functive flagging or some other kind of overt flagging?*

Nominals do not exhibit functive flagging when functioning as predicates—they can simply exist in a juxtaposed or copula construction. Various adverbial predicates are formed from polyfunctional case-markers.

- 5.2. *In the language/family, is nominal predication characterized by a particular use of discourse marking elements such as assertion markers or focus markers?*

Certain types of nominal predication (namely identity statements) in many Ngumpin-Yapa languages tend to involve the use of a topic marker (a clitic =*ma* or an auxiliary base *ma*). See §4.1.1.

- 5.3. *Is the argument of a non-verbal predication coded like the argument of semantically monovalent verbs, or does it exhibit a different kind of coding?*

The valency of a non-verbal predicate is not always simply that of a monovalent predicate. Details in §3.4.

- 5.4. *Does the language/family have different negation strategies in non-verbal predication, possibly limited to a particular subtype thereof?*

A single negation strategy is used for verbal and non-verbal predication alike (see §4.2.6.1). Ngumpin-Yapa languages exhibit an asymmetry in the encoding of positive or negative commands. The latter involves the use of non-verbal predication (see §3.3 and §4.3).

- 5.5. *How does the parameter of illocutionary force interact with the various non-verbal predication types?*

Most Ngumpin-Yapa languages encode negative commands via a non-verbal predication strategy (§4.3).

- 5.6. *How does the coding of the various non-verbal predication types interact with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions (as illustrated in Section 5.5)?*

There are no relevant interactions in the coding of the various non-verbal predication types with the insertion of clauses as elements of complex constructions.

- 5.7. *Which nominal features are preserved in predicative nouns? Consider in particular number, gender/noun-class, and the possibility of having determiner (article/demonstrative), possession, adjectival modification, numerical specification.*

Nominals in predicate function show no change in their nominal features.

- 5.8. *If the language/family has adjectives, which features are preserved in predicative adjectives? Consider in particular number and gender/noun-class.*

Not relevant. See response to 5.7.

- 5.9. *Which verbal features are acquired by non-verbal predicative elements (nouns, adjectives, adverbials, quantifiers)? Consider in particular person agreement and the various TAM features available in the given language/family.*

Non-verbal predicates—like verbal predicates—exhibit the ability to assign case functions to arguments (including non-subject arguments). See §3.4. Non-verbal predicates—like verbal predicates—also exhibit the ability to have illocutionary force (see §4.3).

- 5.10. *Are the copula elements in the language/family in any way related to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. by being homophonous, despite functional difference)?*

Copulae in Ngumpin-Yapa languages are all polysemous across various additional functions (see §3.1). For some languages (e.g. Mudburra), the form of the copulae has functions similar to auxiliaries in other languages.