

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Nonverbal Predication in Amazonian Languages*.

Edited by Simon E. Overall, Rosa Vallejos and Spike Gildea.

© 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

Nonverbal predication and the nonverbal clause type of Mojeño Trinitario

Françoise Rose

Dynamique Du Langage, CNRS / Université de Lyon

Mojeño Trinitario, an Arawak language spoken in Bolivia, makes frequent use of clauses without a verb or a copula. These encode some of the most common semantic types of nonverbal predication – equation, inclusion, attribution (as understood by Payne 1997), but also typologically neglected types, like quantification and temporality. Possession, existence, and two unattested semantic types – motion-presentational and quantified existential, are actually encoded in Mojeño Trinitario with verbal clauses and copular clauses. The non-copular nonverbal constructions present a very regular morphosyntactic pattern, even though they make use of predicates that belong to different classes (nouns, adjectives, adverbs, numerals, demonstratives and prepositional phrases). These constructions can be subsumed under a major clause type distinct from the verbal clause type, and are characterized by a nonverbal predicate either juxtaposed to its argument, or standing by itself if it is suffixed with a person index. Nonverbal clauses share some properties with verbal clauses, like some of the inflectional morphology (e.g. negation, plural, TAM), but they however neatly differ in three respects – constituent order, argument indexing, and irrealis marking. In conclusion, Mojeño Trinitario shows a nonverbal clause type clearly distinct from the verbal clause type, and this draws a robust major distinction among lexical classes between on the one hand, verbs, and on the other hand, non-verbs (nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and numerals).

Keywords: clause type, copula, parts-of-speech, word order, Arawak

1. Introduction

Mojeño, an Arawak language spoken in Bolivia, makes frequent use of nonverbal clauses, as defined by Dryer (2007). This paper investigates nonverbal clauses in the Trinitario dialect, on the basis of a corpus of 6 hours of spontaneous texts and some elicited data collected in the field between 2004 and 2010. The New Testament

translation (New Tribes Mission 2002) has been searched for additional examples. Specific elicitation concerning locative clauses was conducted using the 71 pictures of the *Topological Relations Picture Series* stimuli (Bowerman & Pederson 1992), with three different speakers. The examples presented in this paper are all labeled for their source.¹

Most semantic sub-types of nonverbal predication are expressed in Mojeño Trinitario with non-copular nonverbal clauses, involving a nonverbal predicate which is either nominal, adjectival, adverbial, or numeral. Although this clause type covers six semantic types of predication (equation, inclusion, attribution, location, quantification and temporality) and concerns predicates of four different lexical classes (nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and numerals), it shows a very regular morphosyntactic pattern, similar to verbal clauses in many respects but with a couple of specific properties. This leads to identifying a clause type that will be referred to as “nonverbal clause”, and brings together nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and numerals as predicates, revealing a higher level distinction among lexical classes between verbs and non-verbs.

In this paper, we will use the term ‘nonverbal clauses’ to refer to the clauses in which the semantic content of the predication is embodied in a non-copular nonverbal element, the term ‘nonverbal predicate’ to refer to that nonverbal element, and the term ‘nonverbal predication’ to refer to the functions these clauses generally convey cross-linguistically – i.e. inclusion, equation, attribution, location, existence, and possession (as identified by Payne 1997: 111). Section 2 offers a grammar overview with basic information on parts of speech and syntax that will be necessary to compare nonverbal clauses and verbal clauses. Section 3 adopts a functional perspective on nonverbal predication, and presents the Mojeño Trinitario linguistic devices for the expression of a diversity of functions of nonverbal predication. Section 4 then adopts a formal perspective: it focuses on the Mojeño Trinitario nonverbal clause type and compares it with the verbal clause type.²

1. The very great majority of the examples are taken from spontaneous texts and are labeled with the following tag {text01.001}, where the first number points to the text within my corpus, and the second number to the sentence within the text. A handful of examples are tagged as {elicited}, even fewer as the result of elicitation based on a stimuli {stimLocal}, and one is taken from the New Testament {John18:37}.

2. I wish to thank Natalia Cáceres and anonymous reviewers for commenting an earlier version of this paper.

2. Grammar overview

In this section, the parts of speech of Mojeño Trinitario and the basic syntactic structures are presented, as a necessary basis to later compare the constructions used for nonverbal predication with the verbal clauses. Mojeño Trinitario is an agglutinating language, with a large number of suffix/enclitic slots and a few prefix slots. Lexical and grammatical morphemes display several surface forms, due to a rich system of morphophonemic rules and a pervasive process of vowel deletion (Rose 2014b). Because of that, the phonetic realization of utterances (given in the first line of the examples, in the standard orthography) may differ from their underlying form, given in the second line. When possible, elided parts of morphemes are added into parentheses in the example line to help with morpheme identification.

In Mojeño Trinitario, nouns and verbs differ only statistically in the major functions they are used for without derivational morphology. Nouns are most often used as arguments, and verbs as predicates, but nouns can also be used as predicates without overt marking, as this paper will show, and verbs can sometimes be nominalized without overt marking. For this reason, I use morphological combinatorics as a defining criterion for nouns and verbs. Nouns are defined as the lexical class that can combine with both person prefixes (for possessors – on the subset of possessible nouns, as in (1)) and person suffixes (for the sole arguments of nominal predicates, as in (2)). Transitive verbs are defined as the lexical class that also combines with both person prefixes (for A) and person suffixes (for O), but furthermore takes the active suffix *-ko ~-cho ~-'o* (3). Intransitive verbs combine with person prefixes only, and among them, active verbs, but not stative verbs (5), take the active suffix (4). There is moreover a slight distinction in the paradigm of person prefixes that nouns and verbs can take (see Table 1). Third person prefixes on nouns must always be semantically specified for humanness, number, gender, and gender of the speaker (see Rose 2015b: for more details on the paradigm). For a third person S/A, verbs can take either one of these semantically specified prefixes, or the non-specified third person prefix *ty-*. This prefix is normally found on intransitive verbs for S, and on transitive verbs for A when P is a first or second person (see Rose 2011b for further details). Person indexes are obligatory for pronominal referents on the possessee and on the verbal or nonverbal predicate. Also note that there is no third person suffix in Mojeño Trinitario.

- (1) **n-owsa**
 1SG-village
 ‘my village’
- (2) **’jiro-nu=po**
 man-1SG=PFV
 ‘I was a man then’.

- (3) *n-echji-ko-'e*
1SG-talk.to-ACT-2PL
'I am talking to you'.
- (4) *n-ute-k=po*
1SG-come-ACT=PFV
'I just came'.
- (5) *n-uuna*
1SG-be.good
'I am good'.

Table 1. Mojeño Trinitario person paradigms

	Prefixes (Poss, A, Sa, Sp)	Suffixes (P, argument of nonverbal predicate)	Pronouns	Demonstrative formatives	Articles
1SG	<i>n-</i>	<i>-nu</i>	<i>nuti</i>	–	–
2SG	<i>py-</i> (~ <i>p-</i>)	<i>-vi</i>	<i>piti</i>	–	–
1PL	<i>vy-</i> (~ <i>v-</i>)	<i>-(wok)ovi</i>	<i>viti</i>	–	–
2PL	<i>a-</i>	<i>-'e</i>	<i>eti</i>	–	–
3M(SG.H) speaker ♂	<i>ma-</i> (~ <i>mu-</i> , <i>m-</i>)	–	<i>ema</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>
3M(SG.H) speaker ♀	<i>ñi-</i> (~ <i>ñ-</i>)	–	<i>eñi</i>	<i>ñi</i>	<i>ñi</i>
3F(SG.H)	<i>s-</i>	–	<i>esu</i>	<i>su</i>	<i>su</i>
3PL(H)	<i>na-</i> (~ <i>n-</i>)	<i>-woko</i> (3PL)	<i>eno</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>no</i>
3NH(SG/PL)	<i>ta-</i> (~ <i>t-</i>)		<i>eto</i>	<i>jo</i> (SG) <i>ma</i> (PL)	<i>to</i>
3	<i>ty-</i> (~ <i>t-</i>) on verbs; <i>-ono</i> (3PL)				

This paper will show that all lexical parts of speech other than nouns and verbs (adjectives, adverbs and numerals) can take person suffixes only, when used as predicates. This basic common morphological feature of nonverbal predicates will be discussed in Section 4.2. Adjectives and numerals usually modify a following head noun (6), and adverbs modify a constituent other than a noun, in either clause-initial (7) or post-verbal position. Numerals must take a classifier in almost all contexts, generally the default human classifier *-na* (8).

- (6) *n-nos=yore te pjoka 'chope wkugi*
1SG-stay=FUT PREP DEM.NH.PROX big tree
'I am going to stay in this big tree.' {text19.056}

- (7) **juiti** v-naekcho-w=yore=po to... v-ye'e gravasión...
 today 1PL-start-MID=FUT=PFV ART.NH 1PL-GPN recording
 'Today we are going to start our recordings.' {text30.001}
- (8) **api-na=ejí** semana s-jich=yore.
 two-CLF:hum=RPT week 3F-make=FUT
 'She'll be staying two weeks.' {text26.026}

Two further parts of speech are free pronouns: personal pronouns (fourth column of Table 1) and demonstratives. There are several sets of demonstratives, commonly made of one form of the personal paradigm given in the fifth column of Table 1, preceded with *p-* and followed by a demonstrative suffix indicating distance or epistemicity, as in *p-jo-ka* 'DEM-NH-PROX' (6). Three other very common demonstratives are *ene* and *oni*, which both have proximal, distal and manner meanings, and *onogi* 'there'. Finally, there is a single simple preposition in Mojeño Trinitario: *ye'e*. It takes a person prefix agreeing with its complement. Its most frequent form is *te*, reduced from the non-human form *ta-ye'e*, as in Example (6).

In verbal clauses, the inflectional morphology of verbal predicates is rich (Figure 1). There are many TAM markers, though TAM marking is not obligatory. Arguments are optional. The basic constituent order is AVO in transitive clauses (9) and VS in active (10) and stative (11) intransitive clauses. This is linked to the fact that new referents are generally introduced in post-verbal position. Topicalization is marked by fronting, in either a left-dislocated or a preverbal position. Therefore, pronominalized O systematically occur in the pre-verbal position (12).³ There is no nominal case. Referential noun phrases are always introduced by a determiner (article (6) or demonstrative (7), see Table 1), while non-referential noun phrases and nominal predicates are not. Genitive phrases follow the order POSSESSEE POSSESSOR, and a possessive prefix agreeing with the possessor attaches to the possessee, as in (30). The possessive prefix is added to the generic possessive noun *ye'e* if the possessee does not belong to a class of nouns that take prefixes, as in (13). Finally, verbs can be nominalized with a determiner, a nominalizing suffix, both devices as in (11) or none of them as in (10) (see Rose 2016: for more details on the diversity of nominalizations).

NEG 1/2/3-IRR-stem-IRR-MID/1/2/3-PL=TAM=D

Figure 1. Inflectional morphology of verbal predicates

3. The preverbal position of O may trigger a change in A indexing on the verb in special circumstances, very likely for reference-tracking purposes (see Rose 2011b).

- (9) ene takepo ma t(y)-siso 'chane [...] ma-m=po ma 'chane.
and then ART.M 3-black person 3M-take=PFV ART.M person
'And then the black man took the man.' {text8.045}
- (10) ene ty-ute-k=pu=iji ema ma viya
and 3-come-ACT=PFV=RPT PRO.M ART.M man
[t(y)-ekie-ri-k=ri'i]
3-transform-PLURACT-ACT=IPFV
'Then came the man who transforms people.' {text6.003}
- (11) ty-uuna to y-ponre-ru to v-yosio-s-ra
3-be_good ART.NH 1PL-think-SP.PAT.NZ ART.NH 1PL-ask-ACT-ACN.NZ
ma viya
ART.M God
'It is good to think of asking God.' (lit. Our thought of our questioning God is good) {text24.060}
- (12) ene eto ma-k-emptone ma 'chane
and PRO.NH 3M-VZ-work ART.M person
'And this is the work of the man.' (lit. And this works the man) [after a long sequence explaining how one prepares a field] {text21.068}
- (13) ene ma-tan-ko=po to ma-ye'e pak-gira
and 3M-search-ACT=PFV ART.NH 3M-GPN dog-DIM
'And he searched for his little dog.' {text11.026}

More specific information on Mojeño Trinitario can be found in the literature (Rose 2015c), more specifically on person indexing on verbs (Rose 2011b), on negation and irrealis (Rose 2014a) and on nominalization and subordination (Rose 2016).

3. The expression of nonverbal predication in Mojeño Trinitario

The literature on nonverbal predication (Payne 1997; Dryer 2007; Dixon 2010a) lists the major functions of nonverbal predication. The ten functions discussed in this paper, and listed in Table 2, also include minor types more rarely discussed in the literature, like quantification, temporality and presentation.⁴ Table 2 also specifies for each of these nonverbal predication functions the Mojeño Trinitario clause types

4. The benefactive function suggested by Dixon (2010a) is not included in the present paper since a benefactive element carrying the major semantic content of a clause is not attested in the corpus.

that express it, the nature of the predicate, as well as constituent order. The first six functions are expressed with nonverbal predicates without a copula. They show a regular pattern of juxtaposition of the argument and the nonverbal predicate; the latter also found as a stand-alone predicate with a person affix. This pattern that I call ‘nonverbal clause’ is examined in Section 4 where it is compared to the verbal clause. The expression of existence differs in its use of a copula, while possession is generally expressed in a verbal clause. The constructions used for all ten functions of nonverbal predication are now detailed. The examples in this section present the predicate in bold. The predicate is identified as the element on which TAM and sentence negation are marked.

Table 2. Summary of Mojeño Trinitario nonverbal predication

Functions	Clause type	Predicate	Constituent order	Section
equation	nonverbal	N	PRED NP ~ PRO PRED	3.1
inclusion	nonverbal	N	PRED NP ~ PRO PRED	3.2
attribution	nonverbal	Adj	PRED NP ~ PRO PRED	3.3
quantification	nonverbal	Num, Adj	PRED NP ~ PRO PRED	3.4
location	nonverbal	PP, ADV.DEM	PRED NP ~ PRO PRED	3.5
	verbal	V (<i>ow</i>)	location V NP/PRO	
	existential	DEM-(<i>o</i>) <i>jo</i>	PRED (NP)	
temporality	nonverbal	ADV, N	PRED NP ~ PRO PRED	3.6
existence	existential	PRO-(<i>o</i>) <i>jo</i>	PRED NP	3.7.1
		~ PRO-TAM		
		~ PRO.INDET-IRR		
motion-presentation	existential	PRO-(<i>o</i>) <i>po</i>	PRED NP	3.7.2
quantified existence	?	PRO- <i>ini</i>	PRED	3.7.3
possession	verbal	V (<i>ko</i> -N)	NP PRED	3.8
	verbal	V (<i>koy'e</i>)	NP PRED NP	
	existential	PRO-(<i>o</i>) <i>jo</i>	PRED possessedNP	
		~ PRO-TAM		
		~ PRO.INDET-IRR		
	nonverbal	Adj (<i>ma</i> -N)	?	

3.1 Equation (or identity)

Payne (1997: 112) defines equative clauses as follows: “Equative clauses are those which assert that a particular entity (the subject of the clause) is identical to the entity specified in the predicate nominal”. Equative clauses in Mojeño Trinitario are

built by simple juxtaposition of a nominal phrase to the predicate nominal phrase,⁵ as in (14). Importantly, nominal predicates are not introduced by an article, which distinguishes them from argument NPs. The argument nominal phrase is optional, though almost always present. In a pragmatically unmarked context, the argument nominal phrase follows the nominal predicate, as in (14) and (17), except when it is expressed as a free pronoun as in (15) and (16), when it then precedes the nominal predicate. The argument is cross-referenced on the nominal predicate with a suffix for 1st, 2nd person, or 3rd person plural, as in (15). Remember there is no 3rd person suffix in Mojeño Trinitario. Note that when the nominal predicate is a possessed noun (16), or a nominalized verb (17), it also carries a person prefix for its possessor. The person prefix participates to nominal morphology, while the person suffix participates to nonverbal predicate morphology.

- (14) **Francisco Luna** mu-ejare
Francisco Luna 3-name
'His name was Francisco Luna.' {text15.022}
- (15) nuti **presidenta-nu** te pjuena 'tsekreTIPNIS.
PRO.1SG president-1SG PREP DEM.NH.DIST Secure-Tipnis.
'I am president of the Secure-Tipnis region.' {text33.016}
- (16) nuti **p-chicha-nu**
PRO.1SG 2SG-child-1SG
'I am your child.' {text19.141}
- (17) **ta-emna-k-sare=r'i** ma 'moperu, to sap-gira
3NH-love-ACT-HAB.PAT.NZ=IPFV ART.M boy ART.NH toad-DIM
'He was the friend of the boy, the small toad.' {text11.041}

3.2 Inclusion

Payne (1997: 112) defines the inclusion function of nonverbal predication as follows: "Proper inclusion is when a specific entity is asserted to be among the class of items specified in the nominal predicate". Here too a nominal predicate is juxtaposed to its argument (18), and takes a person suffix for a 1st, 2nd or 3rd person plural argument (19). The argument follows the nominal predicate, except when

5. There are some rare examples in which the argument is an adverb, rather than a nominal phrase :

- (1) Sáwaru=rip=tse 'chochu.
Saturday=PFV=contrast tomorrow
'But tomorrow is already Saturday.' {text37.015}

expressed by a free pronoun. There is thus no constructional difference between inclusive clauses and the equative clauses presented above: they pertain to the same nonverbal clause type.

- (18) *esu s-omuire movima=ri'i, psena*
 PRO3F 3F-also Movima=IPFV DEM.F.DIST
 'She is also a Movima, that woman there.' {text20.034}
- (19) *nuti sontaa-nu=u'i*
 PRO.1SG soldier-1SG=IPFV
 'I was a soldier.' {text22.027}

3.3 Attribution

Payne (1997: 111–112) gives the following definition of attributive clauses. “Predicate adjectives are clauses in which the main semantic content is expressed by an adjective. [...] Semantically, these clause types can be described as attributive clauses”. Mojeño Trinitario has a small class of adjectives, i.e. terms that can be used attributively to modify a noun. However, these are most often used as predicates, in attributive clauses like (20) and (21). Attributive clauses follow the same pattern as equative and inclusive clauses: the predicate is juxtaposed to the argument noun phrase, and takes a person suffix when the argument is 1st, 2nd or 3rd person plural. The argument follows the adjectival predicate, except when expressed by a free pronoun. Notice that in the two following examples, the predicate takes a TAM marker. This fact will be discussed in Section 4.1.

- (20) *powre=ripo to pjoka 'resia*
 poor=PFV ART.NH DEM.NH.PROX church
 'The church here is poor.' {text16.006}
- (21) *juiti 'chos-nu=po.*
 now old-1SG=PFV
 'Now I am old.' {text15.025}

3.4 Quantification

Predication on quantity is rarely discussed in the literature. “Another class of existential predicates in some languages involve numerals or quantifier expressions denoting quantity with meanings like ‘many’ or ‘few’ (Dryer 2007: 246).” Dryer considers quantifier and numeral predicates as a minor type of nonverbal predicates, and more specifically as a sub-type of existential clauses. This actually seems to be based on the fact that in English quantifier predicates translate as existential

clauses. “We thus do not generally say *The men in the room were three* but are more likely to express the intended meaning by saying *The men in the room were three in number* or *There were three men in the room*” (Dryer 2007: 246). However, in my opinion, there is no reason for sentences like *The men in the room were three*, or like the Hanis Coos Example (22) to be analyzed as existential predicates, on neither formal nor semantic grounds. These sentences do not predicate the existence of some entity, which is in fact presupposed. The major semantic content of the sentence is the quantity specification, carried out either by a numeral or a quantifier.

- (22) Hanis Coos (Frachtenberg 1922, cited in Dryer 2007: 246)
 kat^CE'mis hanL IE qaiLā'was
 five FUT the rollers
 ‘the rollers will be five (in number)’ (or ‘there will be five rollers’)

Mojeño Trinitario data also call for an analysis of predicates expressing quantification as distinct from existential predicates. Quantification predication is expressed with the same type of nonverbal clauses that has been described for equation and inclusion predication in the preceding sections, while existential predicates require an existential suffix *-ojo* (see Section 3.6), absent in quantification predicates. Examples (23) and (24) show nonverbal clauses expressing quantification predication: an argument is simply juxtaposed to a nonverbal predicate, a numeral (23) or a quantifying adjective (24). The argument follows the quantification predicate, except when expressed by a free pronoun. Quantification predicates take a person suffix when the argument is 1st, 2nd or 3rd person plural (23).

- (23) juiti **kuatru-na-wokovi**, viti seno-no, viti
 now four-CLF:hum-1PL PRO1PL woman-PL PRO1PL
 ‘Now we are four women, us.’ {text33.015}
- (24) **movera** to jani-ono
 numerous ART.NH wasp-PL
 ‘And the wasps were numerous.’ {text11.021}

3.5 Location

Locative predicates in Mojeño Trinitario do not make use of a copula or any special locative word. This contradicts Dixon’s claim that a verbless clause is unlikely to be used to express location (Dixon 2010b: 161). The Mojeño locative constructions follow the same pattern as the nonverbal constructions presented in the preceding sections. The locative predicate, either a *te* prepositional phrase (as in the second clause of (25)) or an adverbial demonstrative (26), is juxtaposed to the argument. Only the adverbial demonstrative can be suffixed by a person index referring to the

- (30) ene ma-(o)w-ri-ko⁹ te to ta-táwo-gi
 there 3M-be_at-PLURACT-ACT PREP ART.NH 3NH-branch-CLF:cyl
 to wkugi
 ART.NH tree
 ‘There he is, in the branches of the tree. [about a boy who normally lives in a house]’ {text18.031}

Some examples of locative clauses such as (31) use the existential construction (presented below in Section 3.7.1), in which the existential predicate is introduced by a pronoun suffixed with *-(o)jo* (realized *-ja* in this example). When the pronoun is a demonstrative, this latter includes a locative semantic component (i.e. distance from the reference point). An existential predicate built on a demonstrative pronoun is interpreted as a locative clause for two reasons: first, this use of the demonstrative generally entails that the referent has been introduced already (and therefore its existence is already given); second, the use of the demonstrative also locates the referent relative to the point of reference. Example (25) also shows a negative existential clause (*majina* ‘there is no one’) used as a locative clause meaning ‘he is not here’.

- (31) to mitsi, jen-ja=a’i [...] en te ta-ena’u
 ART.NH cat DEM.NH.DIST-EXI=IPFV there PREP 3NH-top_of
 pjue carpeta
 DEM.NH carpet
 ‘The cat, there it is, [...] there on the carpet.’ {stimLocal_L_40}

3.6 Temporality

Time expressions are not listed within minor types of nonverbal predication in the literature (Dryer 2007: 247). Mojeño Trinitario data offer examples of nonverbal predication with a temporal meaning. The predicate is either adverbial (*’chochu* ‘tomorrow, one future day’, *kope* ‘yesterday, one past day’), or nominal (*sache* ‘day’, *yoti* ‘night’, *kopere’i* ‘afternoon’, *ora* ‘hour’). In any case, the clause is of the nonverbal type. If an argument is present, it follows the temporal predicate, as do the nominalizations marked with a non-human article in (32) and (33). When the predicate is adverbial, the construction differs from locative predication in meaning only (32). When the predicate is nominal, the construction differs from equation/inclusion predicates in meaning (33) but also in that the predicate often stands alone, without an argument (34).¹⁰

9. The initial /o/ of *ou* is not realized when following an /a/.

10. *’ni’-im=po* is not a nominal phrase but a quantified existential (see Section 3.7.3) and constitutes a separate clause here.

- (32) **'chochu=wore** to v-yan-a=wore y-vejno to wkugi
 tomorrow=REP ART.NH 1PL-go-IRR=REP 1PL-get ART.NH wood
 'Tomorrow again we'll go and get wood one more time.' {text29.010}
- (33) takepo t-yon-om=pu=iji, **yoti=ji** to t-yon=ri'i.
 then 3-go-PL=PFV=RPT night=RPT ART.NH 3-go=IPFV
 '(It is told that) then they went, it was night-time when they went. (lit. their
 going was at night)' {text.19.145}
- (34) **yoti=ripo**, 'ñi'-im=po.
 night=PFV mosquito-QUANT.EXI=PFV
 'It was already night-time, there were plenty of mosquitos.' {text29.009}

The predication types described above all use the same general construction, i.e. the juxtaposition of a nominal phrase and a nonverbal predicate that also takes a person marker for a 1st, 2nd or 3rd plural argument. The argument follows the predicate when its head is a full noun phrase, and precedes it when it is a pronoun only. We refer to this construction as the 'nonverbal clause type'.

3.7 Existence

Existential constructions can be identified by "their ability to provide an alternative way to encode the prototypical figure-ground relationships also denoted by plain locational sentences." (Creissels 2013). Besides offering an alternative perspective on figure-ground relationships, existential predicates differ from locational predicates in that they "are not adequate answers to questions about the location of an entity, but can be used to identify an entity present at a certain location" (Creissels 2013). There is a basic construction for existential predication in Mojeño Trinitario, marked in different ways according to whether it also marks TAM and negation. There are also two minor types of existential predication with additional semantics (motion-presentational, and quantified existential). The primary function of all these constructions is to assert the existence of the referent, and they are often used to introduce a new participant in discourse. They differ from both verbal clauses and the non-copular nonverbal clauses seen in Sections 3.1 to 3.6: they constitute a third, and minor, clause type: the existential clause.

3.7.1 *The basic existential construction*

In the basic existential construction, the predicate is always clause-initial and contains a pronominal element. It can have three different forms.

- i. PRO-(o)jo(=ri'i)
- ii. PRO-TAM
- iii. PRO.INDET-*ina*

In absence of TAM or negation, the clause-initial predicate is made up of a pronoun suffixed with the copula *-(o)jo*. The clause-initial pronoun can either be an independent personal pronoun (including first or second person) (35) or a demonstrative pronoun (36), and agrees in humanness, number and gender with its argument.¹¹ The suffix *-(o)jo* (alternating with *-ja* due to vowel harmony)¹² is not used as a copula elsewhere. It is specific to this construction. It can be followed by other morphemes, and is almost always followed by the imperfective marker *=ri'i ~ =:i*. The single argument of the existential predicate follows it.

- (35) **em-ja=a'i=ji** ma 'chane t-k-ésa-ne [...],
 PRO.M-EXI=IPFV=REP ART.M person 3-VZ-garden-POSS
et-jo mógi-ji
 PRO.NH-EXI CORN-CLF:mass
 'People say that there was a man that has a garden, there was a corn field.'
{text6.034}

- (36) **makñ-ojo=o'i** kristianu, t-ejve-k=jicha
 DEM.M.NVIS-EXI=IPFV human 3-smell-ACT=well
 'There is a human being over there, it smells strong.'
{text19.079}

The existential meaning crucially builds on the dedicated existential marker *-(o)jo*. Without this copula, the construction would be interpreted as an equative predication made up of an independent pronoun (usually referring to a participant given in the context) and an NP, respectively the subject and predicate of a (non-copular) nonverbal clause. Example (35) without the two existential markers would in fact read as 'People say that he is a man that has a garden, it is a corn field.' The presence of the existential marker is therefore crucial for the existential meaning.

When TAM other than the imperfective or the speculative is specified in the existential predication, the clause-initial predicate almost always lacks the suffix *-(o)jo*. The TAM markers attach directly to the clause-initial independent pronoun, that agrees in humanness, number and gender with the nominal phrase, as in the examples below.¹³ The construction looks very much like an equative predication, but it presents an existential function and a different placement of the TAM markers.

11. In this construction, personal pronouns of the form (...)V.CV- lose their final vowel at the morphological boundary with the *-(o)jo* suffix (like *ema* PRO.3M and *eto* PRO.3NH in (35)), while demonstratives are reduced to a personal index and a spatio-epistemic suffix (whereas they additionally take an initial *p-* when used as pronouns or modifiers within a noun phrase).

12. Due to a regular vowel deletion process (Rose 2011a, 2014b), the /a/ triggering vowel harmony is never visible after *-jo* is suffixed.

13. In only one example is the pronoun a demonstrative rather than an independent personal pronoun, and it shows the initial *p-* that is absent in existential predicates with a copula (see note 11).

The TAM markers attach to the pronoun in the existential predication without a copula, while they attach to the nominal predicate in the nonverbal clause type used for equative predication, as Section 4.1 will show.

- (37) ante **ema=rich'o** ma yru'eru.
 before PRO.M=still ART.NH bajón_player
 'Before, there still was a bajón¹⁴ player.' {text25.112}
- (38) ene **esu=po** su na-chineno-o'i.
 and PRO.F=PFV ART.F 3PL-daughter_in_law-IPFV
 'And there was their daughter-in-law (imagining the success of a virtual farmer, whose children would grow and find partners).' {text21.094}
- (39) **eto=pripo** eto t-k-ijare kavildo.
 PRO3NH=PROG.GRAD PRO3NH 3-VZ-name cabildo
 'There was already what is called cabildo (an indigenous local government).' {text24.129}

The Mojeño Trinitario basic existential construction offers an obvious counterexample to three general claims about nonverbal predication. First, the claim that existence is rarely expressed in verbless clauses (Dixon 2010b: 161). Second, the claim that “verbless clauses do not – save exceptional cases – mark tense” (Dixon 2010b: 161). Third, the claim that non-present tenses are cross-linguistically a common grammatical condition for the presence of a copula (Payne 1997: 118–119, Dryer 2007: 236–237, Dixon 2010b: 180–181). Surprisingly, the Mojeño Trinitario copula is generally absent when TAM is marked. Dixon (2010b) writes that “a common explanation offered for the omissibility of a Copula verb is that it is, effectively, a ‘dummy’ element needed just to carry bound morphemes providing information about TAM, person/number of Copula Subject, etc.” This explanation does not hold for Mojeño Trinitario, because the copula is precisely absent when TAM is specified. But remember that, in the absence of TAM specification, the juxtaposition of a pronoun and a nominal phrase is interpreted as an equative predication (asserting identity between the two, as in (16)). An explanation for the presence of the copula in the absence of TAM specification is that it is crucial to identify the construction as different from the nonverbal clause type, and render an existential meaning, while in the presence of TAM specification, their placement on the pronoun is sufficient to identify the construction as existential.

Finally, the third form of the existential predicate is a negative existential copula, made of an indeterminate pronoun with the nominal irrealis *-ina*.¹⁵ This clause-initial negative existential predicate carries the TAM markers and agrees in

14. A Bolivian musical instrument that is a huge panpipe.

15. Marbán (1702) provides historical evidence for this.

The *-(o)po* marker takes part in the associated motion system. Markers of associated motion encode, on a lexical verb, a motion event in a temporal relation with the event expressed by the lexical verb. They convey in one morpheme what is most often expressed via subordination (“before I go”) or coordination (“do and go”) in the languages of the world. Mojeño Trinitario has five verbal markers of associated motion (Rose 2015a), such as *-num(o)* in (44). The *-(o)po* morpheme presented above is unique in the very sparse and recent literature on associated motion in that it does not attach to a verb, but to a pronoun, as a copula used for nominal predication (see Rose 2015a for more details).

- (44) p-ni-k-num-a
 2SG-eat-ACT-SUBS.MOT-IRR
 ‘Eat before you go.’ {elicited}

Payne (1997: 113) states that “locomotion clauses are those in which someone or something changes place” and are “not very likely to lack a semantically rich verb, but still may”. For instance, in Hopi, motion predicates lack a verb and structurally belong to nonverbal predicates (Payne 1996: 226–228). Mojeño Trinitario, like Hopi, can express motion without a verb, yielding an additional semantic type of nonverbal predication. Additionally, this type of predicate asserts the existence of the referent of the noun phrase and introduces it as a new participant. It is therefore very similar to the basic existential construction, both formally and semantically: it also instantiates the existential clause type.

3.7.3 *Quantified existential*

A very rare construction seems to express both an existential predication and quantification. It differs in two respects from the nonverbal clause types. First, it consists of a nominal predicate without any noun phrase or pronoun juxtaposed to it. Second, the nominal predicate is marked with an *-ini* copular suffix, as found on *’ñi’i* ‘mosquito’ in (45), and *kujpa* ‘yuca’ in (46). This construction predicates both the existence of the referent of the noun and its large quantity. My textual corpus offers only two examples of this construction, given in (45) and (46), but a similar suffix (segmented *-ni*)¹⁶ with the same function has been identified in the neighboring dialect Mojeño Ignaciano (Olza Zubiri et al. 2002: 369–372). It is said to occur only on Ignaciano nouns that do not combine with a possessive prefix, which is actually also the case in the two Trinitario examples.

16. The segmentation *-ini* is confirmed by elicited data (*’ñi’-ini* mosquito-EXL.QUANT ‘They are a lot of mosquitos’). The surface forms in (45) and (46) result from phonological and prosodic rules; in (45), vowel deletion suppresses the final *i* of the suffix and the *n* of the suffix assimilates the labial place of articulation of contiguous *p*; in (46), the sequence of morpheme final *a* and a morpheme-initial *-i* is realized *ue* [we].

- (45) *yoti=ripo, 'ñi'-im=po*
 night=PFV mosquito-QUANT.EXI=PFV
 'It was already night-time, there were plenty of mosquitos.' {text29.009}
- (46) *kujpu-em=po*
 yuca-QUANT.EXI=PFV
 'There is a lot of yuca.' {text21.073}

3.8 Possession

Cross-linguistically, possessive predicates have been classified into eight types, depending on the construction they are based on (Heine 1997). Most possessive predicates are based on nonverbal predication (locative or existential sentence for example), while one type only is clearly characterized as transitive with the possessor as the agent and the possessee as the patient (Action Schema in Heine 1997: 47). Mojeño Trinitario offers four possibilities for expressing possessive predication (Table 2). The two most common constructions use a denominal verbal predicate, a possibility that is not accounted for in the typology of possessive predication. This paper will not give many details on these constructions, since they are verbal.

The first type of possessive predication is a denominal verb made up with the so-called “attributive” verbalizer *ko-* typical of Arawak languages and a noun referring to the possessee. The *ko-* verbalizer can combine with any noun that can take a possessive prefix, and this usually results in a possessive predicate meaning ‘have N’. Remarkably, this construction does not conform to the typological characteristics of verbal possessive predicates. The construction is in fact intransitive, since the possessee is part of the denominal verb stem ((47), see also (35)). A third person subject is regularly indexed with *ty-* as on intransitive verbs.¹⁷

- (47) *p-woo'o=po p-a-k-ima?*
 2SG-want=PFV 2SG-IRR-VZ-husband
 'Do you want to have a husband?' {text26.049}

In the second type of possessive predication, the *ko-* verbalizer also attaches to a noun, but the result is a transitive verb. The noun used in this denominal verb form is the generic possessive noun *ye'e* that was introduced in Section 2 (see Example (13)), and the resulting verbal stem is *koy'e* and means ‘to have’. This

17. A few *ko-* denominal verbal forms have lexicalized into a non-possessive (usually active) meaning, and the resulting construction is either intransitive or transitive. For example, *ko-metsi* vz-pot means ‘to cook (intransitive)’ and *ko-chane* vz-person means ‘to be accompanied by (transitive)’. These cases fall beyond the scope of this paper.

construction is generally used when the possessee is a noun that does not combine with possessive prefixes. These possessive predicates are transitive: the possessor and possessee are constructed as the subject and object respectively, as in (48) and (49). Also, they can take a semantically specified third person prefix like *na-* in (49), though *ty-* is generally preferred, depending on information structure (see Rose 2011b for further details). Even though it involves a transitive predicate, this construction does not conform to the Action Schema of Heine's (1997) typology, because the meaning of the verb is simply possessive and not active (note that the denominal verbs do not take the active suffix).

- (48) ene p-ko-y'e to awariente?
 and 2SG-VZ-GPN ART.NH alcohol
 'And do you have alcohol?' {text30.078}
- (49) t-ko-y'-om=po to waka. t-wachri-ko-m=po smoru,
 3-VBZ-GPN-PL=PFV ART.NH cow 3-buy-ACT-PL=PFV pig
 chiwa [...]. eto na-ko-y'e.
 goat PRO.NH 3PL-VZ-GPN
 'They had cows. They bought pigs, goats... these they had.' {text21.065}

The third type of possessive predicates in Mojeño Trinitario is nonverbal. In this construction, a possessed noun is the argument of an existential predicate. Nominal possession is encoded by either a personal possessive prefix as in (50) or through the intermediary of the possessive noun *ye'e* as in (51). This type illustrates Heine's (1997) Genitive Event Schema: 'X's Y exists'. Its negative counterpart uses the negative existential word-form as in (52).

- (50) eno 'jiro-no, en-jo=o'i no na-yeno-m=po'o'i
 PRO.PL man-PL PRO.PL-EXI=IPFV ART.PL 3PL-wife-PL=each
 'The men, they each had a wife (lit. there was their wife of each of them).'
- {text19.002}
- (51) et-jo=o'i to ma-ye'e libro májiko, eto ma-ko-y'e
 PRO.NH-EXI=IPFV ART.NH 3M-GPN magic_book PRO.NH 3M-VZ-GPN
 ema JSN
 PRO.M JSN
 'He has his magic book (lit. there was his magic book), José Santos Noko had this.'
- {text22.037}
- (52) taj-(i)na=pka na-ye'e-(i)na puera,...
 PRO.INDET-IRR=SPEC 3PL-GPN-IRR pan
 'If they don't have a pan (lit. if there are not their pans), [they are going to get clay (to make a pan)].'
- {text21.075}

Finally, a fourth and less frequent type of possessive predicate consists in the use of a denominal adjective as the nonverbal predicate of an NP (53). This adjectival form is made of a noun with the privative prefix *ma-* (also realized *m-* or *mu-*; for more information on this privative prefix, see Rose 2014a). It does not take person prefixes, just like non-derived adjectives, but takes person suffixes, like other nonverbal predicates (54). There are too few textual examples (only two) to posit any basic constituent order. This denominal adjectival construction is not accounted for in the typological literature on possessive predication.

- (53) ñi Ramo **mu-emptone**
 ART.M Ramón PRIV-work
 ‘Ramón doesn’t have work. (lit. Ramón is work-less)’ {text37.066}
- (54) m-chicha-re-nu
 PRIV-child-N.POS-1SG
 ‘I don’t have children’ {elicited}

Section 2 has presented the ten different types of nonverbal predication listed in Table 2, including the six major types discussed in the literature (predication of equation, inclusion, attribution, location, existence and possession), as well as two minor types little described in the literature (predication of quantification and temporality) and two types absent from the literature (presentational with motion, quantified existence). Two of these types in Mojeño Trinitario are typologically remarkable. The existential construction is exceptional in leaving off the copula when TAM markers are present, a condition for copula omissibility opposite to that commonly described in the literature. The possessive construction, a denominal verb whose root can refer to the possessee, is not discussed in the typological literature. Existence and possession aside, all other predication types are expressed in Mojeño Trinitario via the same nonverbal clause type. The properties specific to this clause type are discussed in the next section.

4. The nonverbal clause type of Mojeño Trinitario

This section focuses on the morphosyntactic properties of the most multi-functional construction used for the expression of nonverbal predication, i.e. the (non-copular) nonverbal clause type. It leaves aside the existential clause type (with or without a copula), and the different types of possessive clauses (with denominal verbs, or based on the existential construction). This section therefore covers nonverbal predication of the following type: equation, inclusion, attribution, quantification, location, and temporality. It involves nominal, adjectival (including quantifier),

numeral, adverbial and prepositional phrase predicates. It does not concern the constructions in which the predicate is based on a pronoun (personal or demonstrative): these are of the existential clause type.

The preceding section has already shown that the non-copular nonverbal predicates share some basic properties, and can therefore be said to embody a single clause type. Here are the basic properties of nonverbal clauses:

- i. a nominal phrase and a nonverbal predicate are juxtaposed
- ii. the nominal phrase is optional
- iii. the nominal phrase follows the nonverbal predicate when its head is a noun or a nominalized element, and precedes it when it is a pronoun
- iv. the nonverbal predicate obligatorily takes a person marker when the single argument is 1st, 2nd or 3rd plural.

The remainder of this section further specifies the properties of nonverbal clauses, demonstrating that the nonverbal clause type is clearly distinct from the verbal clause type, regardless of the part-of-speech of the nonverbal predicate. Section 4.1 describes the properties that verbal and nonverbal clauses have in common, and Section 4.2 the properties that distinguish them. These similarities and differences between nonverbal clauses and verbal clauses are summarized at the end of the section in Table 3.

4.1 Properties shared with the verbal clause type

Nonverbal predicates take to a certain extent the same inflectional morphology as verbal predicates. This section will show that the morphology of negation, plural and TAM is the same for nonverbal and verbal predicates.

The first series of examples shows how negation is comparable on both nominal (55), adjectival (56), numeral (57), adverbial demonstrative (58), and prepositional phrase (59) predicates on the one hand, and on verbal predicates (60) on the other hand. There is no example of standard negation on an adverbial predicate in my corpus. Standard negation is always marked with a clause-initial negative word *wo* that is immediately followed by the predicate (see Rose 2014a about negation in Mojeño Trinitario).¹⁸ The single argument follows, whether pronominal (55) or nominal (57).

18. Example (59) is taken from a written text. The unexpected placement of the subject before the negative word *wo* could be explained either by topicalization, or by a calque from Spanish in the process of translation.

- (55) **wo** pakrara-ena jmaro-no negation on nominal predicate
 NEG peccary-IRR DEM.NH.MED-PL
 ‘These are not peccaries.’ {text19.014}
- (56) **wo** winaraji-na. negation on adjectival predicate
 NEG bad-IRR
 He is not bad. {text22.049}
- (57) **wo** mophon-ena ñi-tupara’o negation on numeral predicate
 NEG three-IRR 3M-function
 ‘His functions are not three.’ {elicited}
- (58) **wo** oni-(i)na negation on demonstrative predicate
 NEG here-IRR
 ‘It is not here.’ {text25.136}
- (59) to n-tupara’o **wo** taye’e-(i)na pjoka pog’e
 ART.NH 1SG-kingdom NEG PREP-IRR DEM.NH.PROX earth
 negation on PP predicate
 ‘My kingdom is not on this earth.’ {John18:36, transcription modified}
- (60) **wo** n-ech-a negation on verbal predicate
 NEG 1SG-know-IRR
 ‘I don’t know.’ {text10.015}

The second series of examples shows that the encoding of plural is comparable on both nominal (61), adjectival (here quantifier) (62), and numeral (63) predicates on the one hand, and on verbal predicates (64) on the other hand. The marker *-ono* indicates the plurality of the subject. It is not attested on adverbs, the adverbial demonstratives or the preposition in my corpus.

- (61) ’muii-muri trinran-**ono** eno tparaa-k-ono plural on nominal predicate
 all-CLF:group Trinitario-PL 3PL charge-N.POS-PL
 ‘The persons in charge were all Trinitarios.’ {text24.002}
- (62) movera-**m=po** to sap-gira-no plural on adjectival predicate
 numerous-PL=PFV ART.NH toad-DIM-PL
 ‘The small toads were numerous.’ {text11.038}
- (63) dies-na-**no** no sontar-ono plural on numeral predicate
 ten-CLF:hum-PL ART.PL soldier-PL
 ‘The soldiers were ten.’ {text22.009}
- (64) ty-ero-**no** v-eesa. plural on verbal predicate
 3-drink-PL 1PL-chicha
 ‘They drink our *chicha* (traditional beverage).’ {text25.133}

The third series of examples shows that the encoding of TAM is comparable on non-verbal and verbal predicates. Here this is exemplified with the perfective aspect =*po* on various predicates: a noun (65), an adjective (66), a numeral (67), a prepositional phrase (68) – it then attaches to the preposition – and a verb (69). An example of TAM (repetitive) on an adverbial predicate was given in (32) above.

- (65) *sache=po=pka* TAM on nominal predicate
day=PFV=SPEC
 ‘Maybe it was already day-time.’ {text18.010}
- (66) *juiti ’chosi-nu=po* TAM on adjectival predicate
now old-1SG=PFV
 ‘I am old now.’ {text15.004}
- (67) *te kuaru=pu=iji to ñi-añu-ra,* TAM on numeral predicate
when four=PFV=RPT ART.NH 3M-year-POSS
 ‘when he was four years old,...’ {text19.128}
- (68) *psukro Pransiska te’=po s-owsa* TAM on PP predicate
DEM.F.POT.LOC Francisca PREP=PFV 3F-town
 ‘Francisca is already in her town.’ {elicited}
- (69) *takepo t-im-ko=po* TAM on verbal predicate
after 3-sleep-ACT=PFV
 ‘After that, he slept.’ {text11.005}

These three series of examples show that a great part of the inflectional morphology of verbs is also found on nonverbal predicates, notwithstanding their part-of-speech classification. This morphology can therefore be considered to be predicate morphology.

4.2 Properties specific to the nonverbal clause type

The nonverbal clause type nevertheless differs from the verbal clause type in at least three major respects: constituent order, person indexing, and the form of the irrealis.

The first distinction between nonverbal and verbal clauses lies in constituent order. Section 2 showed that the basic constituent order in intransitive verbal clauses is VS. This is the case with both active and stative intransitive verbs whether the subject is expressed by a full noun phrase, as in (10) and (11), or by an independent pronoun, as in (70) and (71). Section 3 showed that there are two basic constituent orders in nonverbal clauses, depending on whether the argument is a full noun phrase or an independent pronoun. The two orders are: PRED NP, and PRO PRED. The PRED NP order of nonverbal clauses aligns with the VS order of verbal clauses,

but the PRO PRED does not. The constituent order of nonverbal and verbal clauses is therefore clearly distinct when their single argument is a pronoun. This contradicts the claim that “When there is a fixed or preferred order for the constituents within a transitive or intransitive clause, a requirement for fixed order generally carries over into copula and verbless clauses” (Dixon 2010b: 164).

- (70) ene t(y)-echmu-k=po eto t(y)-vénopo te pog'e
 and 3-go_loose-ACT=PFV PRO.NH 3-fall PREP ground
 ‘It (a bee hive hanging in a tree) went loose and fell on the ground’ {18.027}
- (71) t(y)-ijye=e'i jmakni¹⁹
 3-smell.good=IPFV DEM.M.NVIS
 ‘he smells good’ {text19.079}

The second distinction between nonverbal and verbal clauses lies in the indexing of a single argument. Section 2 introduced the fact that all Mojeño Trinitario intransitive verbs take a person prefix (72) while nominal predicates take a person suffix (73). The two sets were presented in Table 1. Section 3 additionally showed that other types of nonverbal predicates behave like nominal predicates: demonstratives (26), adjectives (74), adverbs derived from demonstratives (75),²⁰ and numerals (76) also take a suffix for 1st person, 2nd person or 3rd person plural (remember there is no third person singular suffix). Nonverbal and verbal predicates thus differ in the position and the set of the index that they take for their single argument.

- (72) n-uuna
 1SG-be.good
 ‘I am good’.
- (73) ’jiro-nu=po
 man-1SG=PFV
 ‘I was a man then’.
- (74) juiti ’chosi-nu=po
 now old-1SG=PFV
 ‘Now I am old’.

19. The initial *j* is the result of dissimilation of /p/ before /m/ (Rose 2015c: 68).

20. The adverbs *ongira* ‘little’ and *ommuri* ‘few’, used either in adverbial or predicative function in the corpus, are derived from the adverbial demonstrative *oni* (see Section 2) with the diminutive *-gira* or the classifier *-muri* ‘group’ (sometimes realized *-muu*). Underived adverbs have not been found with a person suffix: having essentially temporal meanings, they are not expected to have a non-third person argument.

- (75) om-muu-wokovi
 few-CLF:group-1PL
 ‘We are few’ {elicited}
- (76) mopo-na-wokow(i)=ri’i=(i)ni.
 three-CLF:hum-1PL=IPFV=PST
 ‘We were three.’ {text19.088}

The distinction is even more striking when comparing nonverbal and verbal clauses with two participants. If the noun of a nominal predicate is possessed, the possessor is encoded by a possessive prefix on the predicate noun and can be developed in a genitive noun phrase following the predicate noun (77), as for the genitive phrase in (30). The indexing on the nominal predicate in (77) is structurally reversed in contrast with the predicative transitive verb in (78). In (77), the prefix on the nominal predicate agrees with the possessor noun phrase following the predicate, while the suffix agrees with the pre-predicate subject. In (78), the prefix on the verbal predicate agrees with the pre-verbal subject, while the suffix agrees with the post-verbal object.

- (77) y-mutu ma-chicha-nove-wokovi ma Viya
 1PL-all 3M-SON-PL.KIN-1PL ART.M God
 ‘We all are the sons of God.’ {text24.036}
- (78) pñi ’chane ñ-etavi-k-woko pno ’seno-no [...].
 DEM.M person 3M-pass-act-3PL DEM.PL woman-PL
 ‘The man is passing by the women...’ {stimPath_C_33}

To summarize, the single argument of nonverbal clauses clearly shows different properties from the single argument of intransitive verbal clauses, both in terms of constituent order and person indexing. In fact, as far as alignment is concerned, Arawak languages are known for displaying split-intransitivity (Aikhenvald 1999: 86), as defined by Merlan (1985). Durand (2016) distinguishes the following types within the family: split-intransitivity based on the lexical class of verbs or predicates (active/stative), on parts-of speech (verbs/non-verbs), on grammatical factors (TAM, constituent order, or main/subordinate distinction), or on semantic and pragmatic factors (agent/patient). Split-intransitivity based on parts-of-speech (verbs/non-verbs) has been noted in at least six Arawak languages (Durand 2016),²¹ including Mojeño and Baure, a close relative (Danielsen and Granadillo 2008).²² In these languages, the single argument of all intransitive verbal predicates aligns

21. Bahuana, Resigaro (?), Wauja, Mehinaku, Baure, Mojeño and Yine.

22. Baure however radically differs from Mojeño in that nouns and adjectives must take a copula *-wo* to be used as predicates.

- (83) wo ene-(i)na n-ut-s-i'-a.
 NEG here-IRR 1SG-be.born-ACT-APPL-IRR
 'It is not here that I was born.' {text15.002}

The similarities and differences between nonverbal clauses and verbal clauses highlighted in Section 4 are summarized in Table 3. Information was easier to find for nominal, adjectival and numeral predicates, because they are more frequent and easier to elicit than adverbial, demonstrative and prepositional phrase predicates. Section 4.1 showed that nonverbal and verbal clauses share some properties, which leads us to consider these to constitute the morphology and syntax of predicates in general. Nevertheless, Section 4.2 showed that nonverbal and verbal clauses differ in several other respects. We therefore consider them to be two distinct major clause types in Mojeño Trinitario. We have noted that constituent order played a role in this distinction, and that this was not typologically expected. Underlying this nonverbal /verbal clause distinction is a robust distinction among lexical classes between verbs on one hand, and all other lexical classes on the other hand. This lexical distinction is based on the fact that the *-ina* irrealis found in nonverbal clauses – but not in verbal clauses – is also found on nonverbal non-predicative elements, most typically on nominals in argument position. All this reinforces the analysis of some property words as belonging to a lexical class of adjectives (rather than verbs) in Mojeño Trinitario, a classification that varies among Arawak languages (Durand 2016: 161–168).

Table 3. Properties of various types of nonverbal predicates compared to verbal predicates (=identical property, ≠ different property, 0 no example)

	N	ADJ	NUM	ADV	ADV.DEM	PREP / PP
Standard negation	=	=	=	0	=	=
Plural in <i>-ono</i>	=	=	=	≠	≠	≠
TAM	=	=	=	=	0	=
Pronominal single argument follows the predicate (≠ : precedes)	≠	≠	≠	0	0*	0
Person indexing via prefixes (≠ : suffixes)	≠	≠	≠	≠	≠	0
Irrealis in <i>-a</i> (≠ : <i>-ina</i>)	≠	≠	≠	0	≠	0

* There is no example of a pronominal single argument followed by an adverbial demonstrative. Existential constructions such as (31) are used instead.

5. Conclusion

This paper has first followed an onomasiological approach to nonverbal predication by reviewing how Mojeño Trinitario encodes ten functions of nonverbal predication. The various constructions can be organized in three clause types: verbal, nonverbal (also non-copular), and existential clauses. The nonverbal clause type is particularly widespread: it is used for almost all types of nonverbal predication (equation, inclusion, attribution, location, quantification, temporality and negative possession), with the exception of existence and possession. This clause type is defined as consisting of a non-copular and nonverbal predicate, and is characterized by the juxtaposition of a nominal phrase and a nonverbal predicate, that takes a person marker for a 1st, 2nd or 3rd plural argument.

This paper has then focused on further morphosyntactic properties of the nonverbal clause type. The properties shared with verbal clauses were analyzed as predicative morphosyntax. Among the properties distinguishing nonverbal and verbal clauses, the nonverbal morphology not only covers nonverbal predicates but also non-predicative elements. This underlines the neat behavioral split among Mojeño Trinitario lexical classes between verbs on the one hand, and all other classes on the other hand: nouns, adjectives, numerals, adverbs and pronouns. This is of high interest because of the debated classification of adjectival terms as adjectives, nouns or verbs in the Arawak family.

This paper has also brought to light constructions that do not fit with the existing typology of nonverbal predication. First, it includes little-described types of nonverbal predication (numeral or quantifier predication), types not commonly considered within this domain (temporal predication), as well as typologically unattested types (motion-presentational, quantified existence). Second, it offers original data for the typology of existential and possessive predication. The existential construction is remarkable in showing TAM distinctions, and even more in the fact that the copula is absent precisely when TAM is overt, a situation opposite to that commonly found crosslinguistically. The major possessive construction is based on a predicate derived from a nominal root referring to the possessee. While this derivation is found throughout the Arawak family (Durand 2016: 303), it is not accounted for in the typology of possessive predication. Third, the paper shows that constituent order may actually plainly differ between verbal and nonverbal clauses, contrary to expectations.

Finally, this paper also offers data for a rather neglected type of alignment: split-intransitivity based on a part-of-speech distinction. In Mojeño, the single argument of nonverbal predicates aligns with the P of transitive clauses, while the single argument of both active and stative intransitive verbs aligns with the A of transitive clauses. This is a split-intransitivity system, but it cannot be described

as having a semantic basis: the definition of nonverbal predication as an utterance “that presents the expression of a property and of an entity that can a priori satisfy the property or not” (Creissels 2006: 343) is satisfied not only for the nonverbal clause type, but also for the existential and possessive predicates, as well as for the stative intransitive verbs. Stative intransitive verbs and nonverbal predicates cannot therefore be distinguished on a semantic basis, but they can be on the basis of their morphosyntactic behavior. Consequently, the split-intransitivity system of Mojeño Trinitario rests upon a morphosyntactic rather than a semantic basis. This goes back to the primacy of the lexical class distinction between verbs and non-verbs in Mojeño Trinitario.

Abbreviations

ACN.NZ	action nominalizer	NVIS	non-visible
ACT	active	N.POS	non-posessed
APPL	applicative	PFV	perfective
ART	article	PL	plural
CLF	classifier	PL.KIN	plural for kinship terms
D	discourse marker	PLURACT	pluractional
DEM	demonstrative	POSS	possessed form of the N
DIM	diminutive	POT.LOC	potential location
DIST	distal	PREP	preposition
EXI	existential	PRIV	privative
F	feminine (singular)	PRO	pronoun
FUT	future	PROG.GRAD	progressive gradual
GPN	generic possessive noun	PROX	proximal
HAB.PAT.NZ	habitual patient nominalizer	PST	past
INDET	indeterminate	QUANT.EXI	quantified existential
IPFV	imperfective	REP	repetitive
IRR	irrealis	RPT	reportative
M	masculine (singular)	SG	singular
MED	medial	SPEC	speculative
MID	middle	SP.PAT.NZ	specific patient nominalizer
MOT.PRES	motion presentational	SUBS.MOT	subsequent motion
NEG	negation	TAM	tense-aspect-mood
NH	nonhuman	VZ	verbalizer

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 1999. The Arawak language family. In *The Amazonian Languages*, Robert M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds), 65–106. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bowerman, Melissa & Pederson, Eric. 1992. *Topological Relations Picture Series*. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.
- Creissels, Denis. 2006. *Syntaxe générale: Une introduction typologique, Vol. 1: Langues et syntaxe*. Paris: Lavoisier.
- Creissels, Denis. 2013. Existential predication in typological perspective. Paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Split.
- Danielsen, Swintha & Granadillo, Tania. 2008. Agreement in two Arawak languages: Baure and Kurripako. In *The Typology of Semantic Alignment*, Mark Donohue & Søren Wichmann (eds), 396–411. Oxford: OUP. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199238385.003.0016
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2010a. *Basic Linguistic Theory*, Vol. 1. Oxford: OUP.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2010b. *Basic Linguistic Theory*, Vol. 2. Oxford: OUP.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2007. Clause types. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. 1: Clause Structure*, 2nd edn, Timothy Shopen (ed.), 224–275. Cambridge: CUP. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511619427.004
- Durand, Tom. 2016. L'intransitivité scindée dans les langues arawak, PhD dissertation, INALCO, Paris.
- Frachtenberg, Leo J. 1922. Coos. In *Handbook of America Indian Languages*, Vol. II, Franz Boas (ed.). Washington DC: Government Printing Office.
- Gast, Volker & Haas, Florian. 2011. On the distribution of subject properties in formulaic presentationals of Germanic and Romance. In *Impersonal Constructions: A Cross-linguistic Perspective* [Studies in Language Companion Series 124], Andrej Malchukov & Anna Siewierska (eds), 127–166. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/slcs.124.05gas
- Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511581908
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1996. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Marbán, Pedro. 1702. *Arte de la lengua Moxa, con su Vocabulario, y Cathecismo*, Lima: Imprenta Real de Joseph de Contreras.
- Merlan, Francesca. 1985. Split intransitivity: Functional oppositions in intransitive inflection. In *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause*, Johanna Nichols & Anthony Woodbury (eds), 324–262. Cambridge: CUP.
- New Tribes Mission. 2002. *Eto 'chojriicovo mue 'ma viya* (The New Testament). Sanford: New Tribes Mission.
- Olza Zubiri, Jesús, Nuni de Chapi, Conchita & Tube, Juan. 2002. *Gramática Moja Ignaciana*, Caracas: Universidad Católica Andres Bello.
- Payne, Thomas. 1996. Estatividad y movimiento. In *Estudios lingüísticos de textos de la Amazonia peruana*, Mary Ruth Wise (ed.), 221–268. Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, Perú.
- Payne, Thomas. 1997. *Describing Morpho-syntax. A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rose, Françoise. 2011a. Morphological and prosodic structure of the Trinitario verb. Paper presented at the Americanist Meeting: Word-formation in South American Languages, University of Leipzig, 24 June.

- Rose, Françoise. 2011b. Who is the third person ? Fluid transitivity in Mojeño Trinitario. In special issue *Argument-encoding Systems in Bolivian Amazonian Languages*. Antoine Guillaume & Françoise Rose (eds). *International Journal of American Linguistics* 77(4): 469–494.
- Rose, Françoise. 2014a. Irrealis and negation in Mojeño Trinitario. In *Negation in Arawak Languages*, Lev Michael & Tania Granadillo (eds), 216–240. Leiden: Brill. doi:10.1163/9789004257023_011
- Rose, Françoise. 2014b. When vowel deletion blurs reduplication in Mojeño Trinitario. In *Reduplication in South-American Languages*, Gale Goodwin Gómez & Hein van der Voort (eds), 375–399. Leiden: Brill. doi:10.1163/9789004272415_015
- Rose, Françoise. 2015a. Associated motion in Mojeño Trinitario: Some typological considerations. *Folia Linguistica* 49(1): 117–158. doi:10.1515/flin-2015-0004
- Rose, Françoise. 2015b. Innovative complexity in the pronominal paradigm of Mojeño. A result of contact? In *Borrowed Morphology*, Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze (eds), 241–267. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Rose, Françoise. 2015c. Mojeño Trinitario. In *Lenguas de Bolivia, Vol 3: Oriente*, Mily Crevels & Peter Muysken (eds), 59–97. La Paz: Plural Editores.
- Rose, Françoise. 2016. On finitization. In *Finiteness and Nominalization* [Typological Studies in Language 113], Claudine Chamoreau & Zarina Estrada Fernández (eds), 347–372. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

