

LIAMES 15(2): 313-337 - Campinas, Jul./Dez. - 2015

**Alain Fabre**

(Independent Researcher, Finland)

## **Predicative possession in nivacle**

**ABSTRACT:** In this paper, I identify and analyse fourteen predicative possession strategies employed by speakers of Nivacle, a Mataguayo language from the Paraguayan Chaco. It is intriguing that all of these strategies but three are in common use among the speakers. Because quantifiers and numbers surface as verbs in Nivacle, these can be used as possessive predicates, which appears to be another typological rarity. The paper also includes a brief overview of predicative possession in the other three languages of the Mataguayo family.

**KEYWORDS:** South American Languages; Nivacle; Linguistic Typology.

**RESUMEN:** En este trabajo, identifico y analizo catorce tipos de construcciones de posesión predicativa empleados por los hablantes del nivacle, una lengua chaqueña que pertenece a la familia mataguayo. Es interesante que de todas estas estrategias, once son de uso muy común entre los hablantes. Siendo los cuantificadores y números verbos en nivacle, éstos pueden ser utilizados como predicados posesivos, lo que parece otra rareza tipológica. El documento también incluye una breve comparación con la posesión predicativa en las otras tres lenguas de la familia mataguayo.

**PALABRAS CLAVES:** Lenguas de América del Sur; Nivacle; Tipología lingüística.

### **1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>**

For more than forty years, there has been a steady flow of typological surveys and case studies revolving around the topic of possession. Among some prominent studies devoting a substantial amount of space to predicative possession, one may mention Clark (1978), Ultan (1978), Clasen (1981), Seiler (1983), Heine (1997), Stassen (2009), and Aikhenvald (2012). There is a wide consensus in the literature that at least the following are pertinent parameters in studying predicative possession: indexing of possessor and possessee, location of possessee at/with possessor, existence, (in)transitivity. The existence of an entity X, of course, entails its location in a place, and the two may be difficult to distinguish. However, (pure) existence is a more basic concept than, for instance, that denoted by a position verb. As can be deduced from the extensive sample presented in Stassen (2009), (neutral) existence verbs are much more

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Pier Marco Bertinetto as well as an anonymous reviewer for insightful comments and suggestions on this paper.

frequent than position verbs in predicative possession constructions.<sup>2</sup> Some languages use a transitive verb, often historically derived from verbs like ‘to take’ or ‘to get’. These are called generically HAVE-verbs (examples under 7.1.). In order to keep this paper within manageable limits, I will focus on the following parameters: (a) type of predicate used in possessive constructions, (b) indexation of possessee, (c) indexation of possessor, and (d) morphology and locus of indexing: argument prefix and/or suffix, oblique (benefactive, instrumental, locative).

## 2. The Nivacle language

Nivacle is one of the languages spoken in the Gran Chaco region, in the very heart of South America. The Gran Chaco is home to five genetically independent (and still remarkably viable) linguistic families as well as two isolated languages: (1) Zamuco, with two languages, Ayoreo and Chamacoco, (2) Mataguayo, with four languages: (a) Wichí, with an rough estimate of 40 000 speakers in the Salta and Formosa provinces of Argentina, as well as a small group in the south east corner of the Tarija department, Bolivia (Vidal & Nercesian 2005), (b) Nivacle (also referred to as Chulupí and, in older sources, Ashlushlay) spoken by around 15 000 people in the centre of Paraguayan Chaco, and a further 400 in the western part of the Formosa province (Argentina). According to the Paraguayan census of 2002, the number of Nivacle older than five years was 12 000 in that year. The Nivacle population is reputed to have the highest rate of growth in the central Chaco, and the language was purported to be spoken by at least 83% of the Nivacle, including children, (c) Maká, exclusively spoken in Paraguay by around 1 300 people (Paraguay Census, 2002), and (d) Chorote, in the Salta province (Argentina) as well as in the Boquerón department (Paraguay), with 2600-2800 speakers (Carol, p.c. and 2014), (3) Enlhet-Enenlhet (traditionally known as ‘Lengua-Maskoy’) with six distinct but clearly related languages, (4) Guaykurú, with four languages: Kadiwéu, Qom (Toba), Pilagá, and Mocoví, (5) Tupí-Guaraní, with two varieties of Western Guaraní – not to be confounded with Paraguayan (Eastern) Guaraní, (6) Besiro, also known as Chiquitano, and (7) Vilela, now moribund. Recent investigations have shown that the Gran Chaco languages also form a linguistic area with a wide array of typologically uncommon features (Comrie, Golluscio, González & Vidal 2010, Fabre 2004, 2009/2010, 2012, 2014, Golluscio, González & Vidal 2010, Golluscio & Hirsch 2006, Golluscio & Vidal 2009/2010, Messineo 2001). All the Nivacle data have been gathered during three self-financed field trips I conducted in Filadelfia (Boquerón department, Paraguayan Chaco) with native speakers in June/July of 2007, 2009, and 2011. I am especially grateful to my main consultant Félix Ramírez.

---

<sup>2</sup> In Stassen’s sample, two languages from the Chaco, Mocoví and Pilagá (both from the Guaykurú family) are cited as examples of languages that employ a neutral existence verb. This is also true of Toba (Messineo 2002), as well as in the Mataguayo languages, where no position verb appears in such constructions. The locative verbs *weto’ot* ‘to be under smth and hidden’ and *weta’asop* ‘to be under smth but visible’, are also attested in toba (Messineo 2002), and the position verb ‘lay’ is well attested in the neighbouring languages of the Enlhet-Enenlhet family as well as the usual HAVE-construction (Hannes Kalisch, p.c.).

Before embarking on our discussion of predicative possession, a few words about the typology of Nivacle are in order. Nivacle being a radical head-marking language, any participant, be it core (S/A and/or O prefix, a cover term for P, T, and R, depending idiosyncratically on the verb root) or peripheral (any non-S/A suffixed participant, locative, benefactive or instrumental applicative), must be indexed on the predicate, because nouns have neither case markers nor adpositions. If a noun appears, it must be licensed by the corresponding index in the predicate word. Only a temporal expression may appear without concomitant index on the predicate. There are five conjugations, of which the first (Table 3 and Fabre 2014: 126-132), second (Fabre 2014: 133-139), third (Table 5 and Fabre 2014: 139-142) and fifth (Fabre 2014: 145-151), are relevant for possessive predicates.

The absence of a noun corresponding to an index within the verb establishes an anaphorical relation with the preceding portion of the text. Since the adjective category is absent in Nivacle, property words and quantifiers (including numbers) surface as verbs. The noun category fall in two classes, (obligatorily) possessed and non-possessed.<sup>3</sup> A possessed noun appears with an obligatory possessor prefix. In case the possessor is unknown or irrelevant, a special prefix is employed. Non-possessed nouns can never appear with a possessive prefix. A subclass of non-possessed nouns may be preceded by a possessive classifier which bears the corresponding index (Fabre 2004 and 2014: 90-96). All (non-predicatively used) nouns appear within a DP headed by a deictic determiner. In the singular, this bears the features masculine vs. feminine (grammatical gender), visual evidentiality (presently seen by speaker, seen before and still existing, seen before but no longer existing, never seen before).<sup>4</sup> In the plural, masculine vs. masculine gender is replaced by the opposition +human / -human, and visual evidentiality remains unchanged. Note the lack of a feature for (in)definiteness.

### 3. Predicative possession

Table 1 provides the general background against which I will compare Nivacle predicative constructions. It shows the four main types ('standard forms') of predicative possession constructions<sup>5</sup> Stassen (2009) extracted from his cross-linguistic typological study of predicative possession, which is based on a sample of 420 languages. The prominent parameters are, according to Stassen, the encoding of the two relevant NPs (possessor and possessee),<sup>6</sup> their grammatical function, and the choice of the verb (intransitive vs. transitive). Each construction of Table 1 is illustrated by one of the examples chosen by

<sup>3</sup> I believe the terms 'obligatorily possessed' and 'non-possessed' are more appropriate in Nivacle than 'inalienable' and 'alienable'. For more details on attributive possession in Nivacle see Fabre (2014: 79-96). If a noun cannot take possessive prefixes or be preceded by a possessive classifier (itself an obligatorily possessed subclass of noun), it cannot be used in a possessive construction. If pressed to give the equivalent of 'my tree', as in a typical elicitation context, the speaker will dodge the problem, answering, for instance 'the tree behind my house' or 'the tree I felled'.

<sup>4</sup> As verbs are not marked for tense/aspect, and temporal markers (particles) are optional, visual evidentiality can provide some (indirect) clue as to the possible temporal window of the event described.

<sup>5</sup> Additionally, Stassen (2009: 107) analyses a fifth type, adnominalization (genitive possessive), which does not exist in Nivacle.

<sup>6</sup> Although Stassen writes about NPs, it is clear, from the numerous examples he adduces, that it also includes free pronouns as well as affixes.

Stassen. Although Stassen’s ‘oblique/adverbial case form’ would not seem to apply to Nivacle, this language having neither nominal cases nor adpositions, I propose this criterion could easily be extended to cover applicative suffixes as well.

**Table 1.** Stassen’s four standard types of predicative possession constructions  
(VB = verb; PE = possessee; PR = possessor)

	LOCATIONAL POSSESSIVE	TOPIC POSSESSIVE	WITH-POSSESSIVE	HAVE-POSSESSIVE
VB	Locative/existential			Transitive
PE	Subject		Oblique/adverbial	Object
PR	Oblique/adverbial	Topic	Subject	Subject
	Latin <i>Est mihi liber</i> Is to-me book	Selknam <i>igwa iper pen</i> I meat stay	Mamvu <i>Uyá-náni la’</i> House-with he-is	Wolof <i>Am naa kër</i> Have I house

Stassen adds that all of the above mentioned four standard constructions have some non-standard variants. Three of them are relevant for Nivacle are (a) possessor indexing on possessee (possessive prefix), (b) clausal possessives (“exists X, his-Y”), and (c) topic-locational hybrid (possessor NP = sentence topic with oblique agreement affix on the verb).

In order to express positive predicative possession, speakers of Nivacle can choose between a total of fourteen constructions. Table 2 lists the schemes to be developed in the respective sections of this paper.<sup>7</sup>

**Table 2.** Nivacle predicative possession schemes  
(PR = possessor noun, pr = possessor affix, PE = possessee noun, pe = possessee affix)

SECTION	CONSTRUCTION SCHEME
3.1.1.	(PR) pe- <i>kâx</i> ‘exist’ + pr-PE [(X) it-exists + his-Y] non-standard topic possessive
3.1.1.	pe- <i>kâx</i> + PR + pr-PE [it-exists (X) + his-Y] thetical possessive
3.1.2.	pe- <i>kâx</i> -pr-BEN + pr-PE [it-exists-him-for + his-Y] topical-locational hybrid possessive
4.1.	pe- <i>am</i> -pr-BEN + pr-PE [it-is.inexistent-him-for + his-Y] topical-locational hybrid possessive
4.2.	pe- <i>am</i> -D + SUB <sub>2</sub> + pr-PE-IRR [there.is.no-such + which is his-Y] clausal possessive with subordination
5.1.	(PR) pe-QUANT + pr-PE [(X) they-are.many + his-Y] non-standard topic possessive

<sup>7</sup> Nivacle vowel phonemes are *i, u, e, o, a, v* (plain), *i̇, ù, ê, ô, â, v̇* (laryngealized). Consonant phonemes are *p, p̃, t, t̃, k, k̃, ʔ, f, s, f, x, ts, ts̃, yf, yf̃, l, k̄l, m, n, v, ʔv, j*. In the examples cited, the first line corresponds to the (more or less normalized but still debated) orthography used in the majority of Nivacle printed texts.

5.2.	(PR) pe-QUANT-pr-BEN + pr-PE [(X) they-are.many-him-for + his-Y] topic-locational hybrid possessive
5.3.1.	(PR) pe- <i>kâx</i> + pe-QUANT-pr-BEN + pr-PE [(X) it-exists + they-are.many-him-for + his-Y] non-standard topic-locational hybrid possessive
5.4.	(PR) + pe-QUANT-LOC + pr-PE [(X) be.many-at + his-Y] locational possessive
6.	(PR) + pr- <i>tsv'ax</i> -pe-INST + pr-PE [(X) X-owns-with + his-Y] with-possessive
7.1.	(PR) + pr-pe- <sup>2</sup> <i>van</i> + pr-PE [(X) X-Y-has + his-Y] have-possessive
7.2.	A-P- <sup>2</sup> <i>van</i> -pe-INST + pr/ <sub>A-P</sub> -PE [X sees Y with X's ~ Y's Z] ( <sub>A</sub> and <sub>p</sub> on PE can have opposite values) have-with hybrid possessive
8.	pr-PE-j + SUB [X-house-has + X] (-j = verbalizer suffix) denominal possessive
9.	pe- <i>am</i> -D + SUB <sub>2</sub> + pr-PE-IRR + SUB <sub>2</sub> + pr.pe.IRR- <sup>2</sup> <i>van</i> (IRR = irrealis mode) clausal possessive with subordination

**3.1. /kâx/.** As is shown in examples (1) and (2), this verb is used to express positive existence.<sup>8</sup> As such, it lends itself quite naturally to the expression of possessive construction discussed under 3.1.1. and 3.1.2.

(1)

apis	ti	caajyc'oya
apis	ti	Ø-kâx-ji-k'oya
already	SUB <sub>1</sub>	3S-exist-1-VENT.ANT
'It/he/she existed already before me'		

(2)

(yivaatsheelh)	ya'caajelh
(ji-vâjfa-et)	jaʔ-kâx-et
(1POS-self-PL.SAP)	1S-exist-PL.SAP
'We (excl.) are here'	

Along with many other verbs, quantifiers, numbers and predicatively used nouns, /kâx/ belongs to the first conjugation. It must be noted that in Nivacle, 'to be' (-i+LOC) is always locative and is not used in predicative constructions. Table 3 shows the inflection of five verbs pertaining to the first conjugation.

<sup>8</sup> Morphologically, conjugation classes are distinguished by their particular personal prefixes. The numbers 1, 2 and 3 are shorthand for 1SG/1PL.EXCL, 2SG/2PL, and 3SG/3PL, respectively. Plural of Speech Act Participant (SAP) is marked with the suffix /-et/, whereas third person plural subject is mostly optional.

**Table 3.** Personal prefixes for first conjugation: ‘exist’, ‘be inexistant’, quantifiers and predicative nouns.

	-kâx ‘exist’	-am ‘not.exist’	-manla ‘live’	-aklox ‘be many’	-veʔla ‘be one	-taɔklax ‘be a child’
1	jaʔ-kâx	jaʔ-am	jaʔ-manla	jaʔ-aklox	jaʔ-veʔla	jaʔ-taɔklax
2	aʔ-kâx	aʔ-am	aʔ-manla	aʔ-aklox	aʔ-veʔla	aʔ-taɔklax
3	Ø-kâx	Ø-am	Ø-manla	Ø-aklox	Ø-veʔla	Ø-taɔklax
1INC	kas-kâx	kas-am	kas-manla	kas-aklox	kas-veʔla	kas-taɔkla-s

**3.1.1. /-kâx/ in simplex possessive constructions.** When /-kâx/ ‘to exist’ is used to express predicative possession, it can appear in two different constructions. In the simplest case, shown in (3) and (4), /kâx/ directly links the possessor with the possessee. Scheme: (PR) *pe-kâx* + *pr-PE* [(X) exists + his-Y]. The DP whose head noun refer to the possessee consists of either (a) deictic classifier + possessed noun (3) (4), and (5), the latter with two coordinated possesseees, or (b) deictic noun classifier + possessive classifier + noun (4). The first subtype is used with obligatorily possessed nouns, and the second with nouns that cannot take possessive prefixes but admit possessive classifiers. Possessive classifiers are morphologically undistinguishable from obligatorily possessed nouns. The zero-marking on the predicate refers to the possessee and the possessor index is prefixed to the possessee noun. The construction corresponds to what Stassen (2009) calls non-standard topic possessive. What makes it ‘non-standard’, according to this author, is that the possessor is indexed on the possessee, independently of the presence or absence of a DP corresponding to the possessor. Since all Nivacle possessive predicative constructions but one (7.1.) are ‘non-standard’ in this sense, this indication is redundant, and I will often omit it for simplicity’s sake.

As word order is rather free in Nivacle, it is widely used to express pragmatic differences. For instance, the women in (3) are presented as already known information, from which some new data are predicted, namely that they used to have their own songs. The same can be said about the omitted topic of (4), of which it is said that he (topic) had a wife and children (theme/new information).<sup>9</sup>

(3)

papi	ôcjeclôi	caaj	pa	t’aclaach
pa-pi	ɔkxeklɔ-j	Ø-kâx	pa	t’a-klâʃ
D-PL.HUM	woman-PL	3S-exist	M.D	3POS-song

‘The women had their song’

(4)

caaj	lhja	lhch’acfa	shi’	ja	lhaôs
Ø-kâx	l-xa	l-ʃ’akfa	ʃiʔ	xa	l-aps
3S-exist	F-D	3POS-spouse	and	M.D	3POS-son

‘He has a wife and a son’

<sup>9</sup> Although the segment /l-ʃ’akfa/ ‘his/her spouse’ is ambiguous in the sense that ‘spouse’ can refer to a man or a woman, and the possessive prefix is nor marked for gender in Nivacle, there can be no ambiguity in this language for two reasons in this example: (a) it refers back to an already known person, and (b) the obligatory deictic classifier is indexed for the gender of the N ‘spouse’, where /xa/ shows the features ‘singular; masculine; known to speaker but not presently in sight’ and /l-xa/ ‘singular; feminine; known to the speaker but no presently in sight’.

By contrast, the presence of the existential verb at the beginning of the utterance in (5) shows that the whole statement is presented as new information. Scheme: *pe-kâx* + (*PR*) + *pr-PE* [exists (X) + his-Y]. In contradistinction to (3) and (4), (5) is a thetical utterance, i.e. it cannot be interpreted like a typical topic – predicate construction. Being rather marginal in (written) languages, thetical utterances are more typical of spoken language, hence expected to be more frequent in traditional oral languages (Cornish 2010, Sasse 1996).

(5)

caaj	pa	nivacle	lhpa	lhclô'	ch'ech'e
Ø-kâx	pa	nivacle	l-pa	l-klb	ʃ'ej'e
3S-exist	M.D	man	F-D	3POS-POS.CL.pet	parrot
'A man had a parrot'					

Both types appears to be derived from a canonical existential construction such as (6), which has been dubbed 'nuclear existence' by Heine (1997: 58), and cannot be used to express possessive predication.

(6)

caaj	nava	pejaya
Ø-kâx	na-va	pexaja
3S-exist	D-PL.NON.HUM	sweet.potato(es)
'There are sweet-potatoes'		

**3.1.2. /-kâx/ + benefactive.** /-kâx/ can also take personal suffixes, which encode the possessor, the possessee being encoded like in the simplex construction above (3.1.1.) as a third person (zero) prefix. The possessor suffix is then followed by the benefactive applicative suffix /-m/. Scheme: *pe-kâx-pr-BEN* + *pr-PE* [exists-him-for + his-Y]. Table 4 shows the benefactive inflection of /-kâx/ with third person possessee prefix.

**Table 4.** Benefactive inflection of /-kâx/ in predicative constructions.

1	Ø-kâx-ja-m
2	Ø-kâx-ʔa-m
3	Ø-kâx-e-m
1INC	Ø-kâx-xô-m

Like in 3.1.1. above, the DP consists of (a) deictic noun classifier + possessed noun, or (b) deictic noun classifier + possessive classifier + noun. Examples (7), (8), and (9) illustrate what Stassen calls topic locational hybrid. In such a construction, the presence of an oblique/adverbial possessor marker (Nivacle benefactive), would define it as 'locational', were it not for the fact that the possessor is, I assume, the topic. In (10), we can see an extended DP, where the number (quantifier) verb appears in a relative construction in order to determine the head noun. In comparison to the simplex construction in 3.1.1., the presence of the benefactive suffix makes it unnecessary for the hearer to have to refer back to any already known topic so that it can be used either to present a whole chunk of new information (7, 8, 9) or just as a topic reminder (10).

(7)

caajyam	lhja	yibicicleta
Ø-kâx-ja-m	l-xa	ji-bisicleta
3S-exist-1-BEN	F-D	1POS-bike

‘I have a bike’

(8)

jayeetajesh	ca	nicaajelh’am
xaj-ê-tax-e-f	ka	ni-kâx-el-ʔa-m
1S-want-NCMP-3-INST	SUB <sub>2</sub>	IRR-3S.exist-PL.SAP-2-BEN
pava		vatcufaijates
pa-va		vat-kufaj-xat-es
D-PL.NON.HUM		INDEF.POS-give-NMLZ-PL

‘I would like you (pl.) to have presents’

(9)

ca	nicaajtaj’am	lhpa	a’jaya
ka	ni-kâx-tax-ʔa-m	l-pa	aʔ-xaja
SUB <sub>2</sub>	IRR-3S.exist-CON-2-BEN	F-D	2POS-spouse

‘If you have/had a wife’

(10)

caajem	java	napu’yama	lhac’uc
Ø-kâx-e-m	xa-va	Ø-napujama	la-k <sup>2</sup> u-k
3S-exist-3-BEN	D-PL.NON.HUM	3S-be.seven	3POS-weapon-PL

‘They had seven horns’ (Sociedad Bíblica del Paraguay 1994, Apocalipsis 5: 6)

#### 4. The verb /-am/

In predicative possession constructions, the verb /-am/ ‘to lack, be absent’, expresses negative possessive predication.<sup>10</sup> It can be employed in two different constructions, where it always precedes the nous representing the lacking entity.<sup>11</sup>

**4.1. /-am/ + benefactive.** Scheme: *pe-am-pr-BEN* + *pr-PE*. This construction is the negative counterpart of the topic locational hybrid construction /-kâx/, followed by a personal suffix and the applicative benefactive suffix (compare examples under 3.1.2. with 11 and 12).

<sup>10</sup> It is probable that the verb /-am/ is related to the particle /ama ~ ame/, which is used as a negative reply to a yes/no question. /-am/ inflects like /-kâx/ in Table 4.

<sup>11</sup> The same observation about word order can be made about other constructions whenever it means ‘to lack’: /am-k<sup>2</sup>oja xa ve<sup>2</sup>la vat-k<sup>2</sup>ovât/ (lack-EXPECTED D be.one IND.POS-chair) ‘There is one chair lacking/ We need one chair’, /am-la-pa peso-a/ (lack-F-D money-IRR) ‘There is no money’. Because of its benefactive suffix, the following example could be analysed as a negative possessive predicative construction as well: /am-el-k<sup>2</sup>oja-ʔa-m pa a-twi-ʃeyaf-el/ (lack-EXPECTED-2-BEN D 2POS-know-NMLZ-PL.PAH) ‘You (pl.) have no judgement/wit’.



(11)

am'am	lhpa	abicycleta
Ø-am-ʔa-m	ɫ-pa	aʔ-bisykleta
3S-not.exist-2-BEN	F-D	2POS-bike

'You (sg.) don't have a bike' ("it-is-inexistent-for-you your-bike")

(12)

ca	amtaja'am	lhpa	nivacche
ka	Ø-am-tax-ʔa-m	ɫ-pa	nivak-ʔe
SUB <sub>2</sub>	3S-not.exist-CON-2-BEN	F-D	person-F

'If you (sg.) have no wife' (if it-is-inexistent-for-you a/the woman')

A nuance of indefiniteness can be achieved by conjugating the noun in its predicative form (13). Any Nivacle noun can be made predicative by stripping it from its otherwise obligatory deictic classifier (the/a jug → it is the/a jug). In a subordinate construction, the irrealis predicate is preceded by the subordinator /ka/ (it is a/the jug → that it be the/a jug). The resulting construction may then return its original noun status (that it be the/a jug → the [thing] that would be a jug). Conversely, any completely inflected verb can be made referential by adding a deictic classifier before it (I teach him → my I-teach- him).

(13)

amyam	lhpa	ca	tnôjquea
Ø-am-ja-m	ɫ-pa	ka	tn-ɔxke-a
3S-not.exist-1-BEN	F-D	SUB <sub>2</sub>	INDEF.POS-jug-IRR

'I don't have a/any jug / I don't even have (what could be called) a jug'

**4.2. /am+D/.** Scheme: *pe-am-D.pe* + *SUB<sub>2</sub>* + *pr-PE-IRR* [there.is.no-such + which is his-Y]. The second type of construction involves the enclisis of the deictic /-pa/ onto the negative existence verb /am/. In all other cases, the deictic classifier appears first in the sentence. I guess the fact that the deictics are written separately in Nivacle only reflects Spanish orthography, since they are seen as near-equivalents of articles. However, deictics are never stressed, and they differ from other particles in that they always appear immediately before their host, the second word of the sentence. The presence of /pa/ after the negative existence verb /am/ is unique in Nivacle for two reasons: its position (enclitic) and its being hosted by a verb.<sup>12</sup> There are two subtypes of this construction: (a) /am+D/ + possessed noun with negative/irrealis suffix (14) and (15), and (b) (16) /am+D/ + irrealis subordination + possessed noun in predicative use with negative/irrealis suffix. The absence of deictic article before the possessed noun in (14) and (15) shows that the construction is a series of two predicates.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Indeed, /-am/ is the only verb, and /-pa/ is the only determiner that can be used in this way. In this constellation, the feminine marker /ʔa/ can appear between /-am/ and /-pa/ in the singular, which contrasts two grammatical genders, masculine (unmarked, 14 and 15) and feminine (16). In the plural, masculine vs. feminine gender is replaced by the opposition human vs. non-human (17), which is suffixed to the determiner.

<sup>13</sup> Similar structures with two predicates, one consisting of a verb and the other of a (predicative) noun, are frequent in neighbouring Enlhet-Enenlhet languages (genetically unrelated to Nivacle) (Kalisch 2009/2010, Unruh and Kalisch 2002).

(14)	ampa Ø-am-pa 3S-not.exist-D ‘They/He/She had no food’ (“it-was-inexistent + it-was-their-food”)	lhôcla l-ɔ̃kl-a 3POS-food-IRR	(15)	ampa Ø-am-pa 3S-not.exist-D ‘They/He/She had no son’ (“he-was-inexistent + he-was-their-son”)	lhôsa l-ɔ̃s-a 3POS-son-IRR
------	---	-------------------------------------	------	---	----------------------------------

The subordinated construction (16), like (13), introduces a nuance of indefiniteness, although the possessed noun is predicative. In (16), we have two predicates, but in (13), the second (denominal) predicate has retaken its status as a noun, as shown by the deictic classifier.

(16)	amlhapa Ø-am-la-pa 3S-not.exist-F-D ‘I don’t have a/any radio’	ca ka SUB <sub>2</sub>	yitishjana yi-tiʃ-xan-a 1POS-sing-NMLZ-IRR
------	---	------------------------------	--

Notes that the same structure is also used in non-possessive cases (plain existentials):

(17)	ampava Ø-am-pa-va 3S-not.exist-D-PL.NON.HUM ‘There are no alligators’ (“they-were-inexistent which are alligators”)	ca ka SUB <sub>2</sub>	alhutasa aʎu-ta-s-a iguana-SIM-PL-IRR
------	--	------------------------------	---

It appears that (14) and (15), on the one hand, and (16) and (17), on the other, consist of two clauses, each with its own predicate; albeit the second predicate is a predicative noun. Stassen (2009: 94-95) devotes a few lines to what he calls ‘clausal possessives’, which he considers to be “A most curious and puzzling a non-standard variant of possession encoding”. As I have mentioned about the second type of simplex possessive constructions with /-kâx/ (3.1.1.), both of Stassen’s examples appear to be thetical. Interestingly, they represent two types, simple coordination for Ixtlan Zapotec, and subordination for Sino-Tibetan Daflā.<sup>14</sup> Stassen’s terminological choice ‘clausal possessive’ is quite fitting and I will retain it here, all the more since it distinguishes two subcases, coordination and subordination, which equally apply in Nivacle. As we shall see later, example (39) can also be described as a case of clausal possessive with subordination.

## 5. Quantifiers as existential predicates

Both quantifiers and numbers inflect like /-kâx/ (and predicate nouns) and can be used in predicative possession constructions (see last two columns of table 1). Two subtypes are attested: (a) quantifier/number + possessed noun (5.1.), and (b) quantifier/number + BEN + possessed noun (5.2.).

<sup>14</sup> In this case subordination via converb.

**5.1. Quantifier + possessed DP.** Scheme: (PR) *pe-QUANT + pr-PE* [(X) be.many + his-Y]. This construction, a non-standard topic possessive, is the most basic. Compared to the simplex construction (section 3.1.1.), the only difference is that the quantifier appears instead of /-kâx/ as the existential predicate. Again, the possessed noun is preceded by its obligatory deictic classifier. Like in the case of /am/ in 4.1. and 4.2., the quantifier verb precedes the possessed.

(18)

napu'	papi	lhcles
Ø-napũ	xa-pi	l-kles
3S-be.two	D-PL.HUM	3POS-children
'S/he has two children'		

(19)

ve'lha	lhpa	lhclô'	tashinshtaiche
Ø-veʔla	l-pa	l-klô	taʃɪŋʃ-ta-iʃe
3S-be.one/alone	F-D	3POS-POS.CL.pet	deer-SIM-F
'S/he had a goat'			

(20)

acloj	java	lhcles
Ø-aklox	xa-va	l-kles
3S-be.many	D-PL.HUM	3POS-children
'S/he has many children'		

**5.2. Quantifier + BEN + possessed DP.** Scheme: (PR) *pe-QUANT-pr-BEN + pr-PE* [(X) be.many-him-for + his-Y]. This construction, illustrated in (21), is again similar to examples like (7), (8), (9), and (10), were it not for the fact that the quantifier has taken over the predicate function. Again, the quantifier verb precedes the possessed noun. This scheme is a topic-locational hybrid.

(21)

aclojelh'am	japi	vatclônjanjas
Ø-aklox-et-ʔa-m	xa-pi	vat-klôn-xanxa-s
3S-be.many-PL.SAP-2-BEN	D-PL.HUM	IND.POS-war-NMLZ-PL
'You (pl.) have many warriors' (Sociedad Bíblica del Paraguay 1994, Oseas 10: 13)		

### 5.3. Mixed types involving quantifiers

**5.3.1. /-kâx/ + quantifier + possessed DP.** Scheme: (PR) *kâx + QUANT-pr-BEN + pr-PE*. This is an extension of the simplex possessive construction, with the possessor indexed on the possessee. The benefactive is suffixed to the quantifier or number which determines the possessed noun. Compare (10) and (22). This complex construction combines a non-standard topic possessive with a topic-locational hybrid. It will call it 'non-standard topic-locational hybrid'.

(22)

caaj	lhpa	ve'lheem	lhôse
Ø-kâx	l-pa	Ø-veʔla-e-m	l-ɔs-e
3S-exist	F-D	3S-be.one/only-3-BEN	3POS-child-F

‘S/he had one/an only daughter’

**5.4. Locative indexing in quantifier predicate.** Scheme: (PR) + *pe-QUANT-LOC* + *pr-PE* [(X) be.many-at + his-Y]. In (23), the quantifier exhibits a locative applicative suffix (“they are two in/on it”). Extending Stassen’s definition of ‘locative predicate’ – where ‘locative’ is obviously a semantic feature of the root verb – to cases where the locative feature belongs to the applicative suffix rather than the root, I would suggest that this structure is a locational possessive.<sup>15</sup>

(23)

ja'lhech	yaquisit	napu'e'	java	lhac'uc
xa-leʃ	yakistit	Ø-napū-eʔ	xa-va	la-k'ʉ-k
M.D-DEM	animal	3S-be.two-PROX	D-PL.NON.HUM	3POS-horn-PL

‘This animal has two horns’

## 6. The verb /-tsɔtʔax/

Scheme: (PR) + *pr-tsɔtʔax-pe-INST* + *pr-PE* [(X) X-owns-with + his-Y]. In its basic (not possessive) use, /-tsɔtʔax/ means ‘to be straight’ (24). The prefix slot is monovalent, i.e. this verb is intransitive.

(24)

nava	lhnôyishai	napi	samto
na-va	l-nôyif-aj	na-pi	samto
D-PL.NON.HUM	3POS-path-PL	D-PL.HUM	white.people

yitsôt'as'in  
 yi-tsɔtʔa-s-ʔin  
 3S-be.straight-PL-INT  
 ‘The white men’s paths are straight’ (whereas the traditional Nivacle’s paths are not)

The verb /-tsɔtʔax/ can also be used in possessive constructions whenever there is a need to stress someone’s right to be the owner of some entity. In such cases, the possessor is in focus. The personal S prefix of the verb /-tsɔtʔax-/, which indexes the owner, exhibits inactive alignment: it is identical with the object (P/T/R) inverse prefixes of transitive verbs (Table 5). Adding a personal suffix (usually third person) and the applicative instrumental introduces the possessee. /-tsɔtʔax-e-ʃ/ can be translated as ‘X is entitled to Y’, ‘X has a right to claim Y’, ‘Y is X’s’, ‘Y belongs to X’ or ‘X owns Y’.

<sup>15</sup> Stassen himself (2009: 51) seems to analyse Haspelmath’s Lezgian example (glossed be.at) as a ‘locative’ verb, albeit “with a rough meaning of ‘to be’”.

**Table 5.** Inflection of an inactive verb (/tsɔtʰax/) vs. inflection of an inverse/ hierarchical alignment verb (/ʰvan/ 'to see/meet').

Inactive alignment verb	Inverse alignment verb
tsi-tɔtʰax-e-f 'It belongs to me/It is mine'	tsi-ʰvan 's/he sees me'
na-tɔtʰax-e-f 'It belongs to you/It is yours'	na-ʰvan 's/he sees you'
ji-tɔtʰax-e-f 'It belongs to him/her'	ji-ʰvan 'S/he sees him/her/it'

(25)

shtantsɔtʰajesh                      nôque                      lhtsitenjayish  
 fʃan-tɔtʰax-e-f                      nɔ-ke                      ʃ-tɔtʰax-ɛ-ʃ  
 1INC-own-3-INST                      M.D-DEM                      3POS-dwell-NMLZ  
 capi                      casnôvot  
 ka-pi                      kas-nɔvot  
 D-PL.HUM                      1POS.INC-ancestors  
 'The territory of our ancestors belongs/has been endowed to us'

(26)

lha    moto            tsitsɔtʰajesh  
 ʃa    moto            tsi-tɔtʰax-e-f  
 F.D motorbike            1S-own-3-INST  
 'This motorbike is mine'

The predicative possession construction with /tsɔtʰax-/ can be compared to Stassen's with-possessive type. According to this author (Stassen 2009: 54), such a construction, paraphrased as *PR exists with a PE*, (a) employs a locative/existential predicate with the rough meaning of 'to be', (b) the possessor is the grammatical subject, and (c) the possessee is constructed in some oblique, adverbial case form. However, the Nivacle construction with the verb /tsɔtʰax-/ differs in two substantial ways from Stassen's type: (a) instead of being locative/existential, it is a two-place verb (recall that in its basic meaning 'to be straight', the verb is intransitive, but in order to use it in a possessive structure, its valency must be increased by one), (b) the possessor, albeit grammatical subject, is indexed on the verb as an inactive prefix. The prefix-marking can be compared with the German dative possessor in: *Dieses Motorrad gehört mir*, although a more literal (and awkward) translation of the Nivacle construction would rather be something like *Mir ist gefügt mit diesem Motorrad*. For the alignments types of Nivacle see Fabre (2009/2010, 2012 and 2014). The possessee shows up as a suffixed index followed by the applicative instrumental on the verb (rather than on the possessee). The applicative instrumental<sup>16</sup> is one of the most common valency increasing processes in Nivacle. Stassen (2009: 137-207) mentions two subvariants of the with-possessive type, each one differing in substantial

<sup>16</sup> Note that the applicative instrumental must be preceded by a personal suffix. Although all examples above show the third person /-e/ indexed with the possessed noun, nothing prevents using another one, if the need arises. The following example is extracted from the Bible: /tsi-tɔtʰax-e-ʃa-f/ (1S<sub>p</sub>-own-PL-2-INST) 'I am your (pl.) master' (Jeremiah 3:14), in which Nivacle says more directly 'I own you (pl.)', with second person suffix /-ʃa/.

ways from /-tsɔtʰax-/. In the inflectional variant, the possessee-phrase appears itself as an intransitive verb stem. In South America, the inflectional variant is attested, among others, in Aymara and many Arawak languages. The construction can be paraphrased as “(I) + house-with-am”. The second subtype can be paraphrased as “I + house-with + am”. The inflectional variant comes nearest to the Nivacle construction, but cannot be equated to it, as both possessor and possessee are marked on the verb, the first as an inactive prefix and the second as an instrumental index. The possessee appears as a non-possessed noun (26).<sup>17</sup> Because of the presence on the verb of the applicative instrumental indexed with the possessee, the Nivacle construction can be regarded as a with-possessive, although not strictly in the sense Stassen intended.

Another frequent use of /-tsɔtʰax-/ is as a possessive classifier for general ownership, especially with a noun that cannot be used with a possessive prefix (27a). Note than (27b) is ungrammatical.

(27a)			(27b)
lha	tsitsótʰajesh	ofoche	*yofoché
ła	tsi-tsɔtʰax-e-ʃ	ofo-ʃe	j-ofo-ʃe
F.D	1S-own-3-INST	dove-F	1POS-dove-F
	‘My dove’		‘My dove’

## 7. The verb /-ʔvan/ ‘HAVE’; ‘TO SEE’

This transitive verb has two closely connected meanings ‘to see’ or ‘to find’, and the semantic extension ‘to have’. Correspondingly, there is a main constructions with the meaning ‘to find’ (7.1.) and a marginal one, where the basic meaning ‘to see’ is retained (7.2.). In the three sister languages of Nivacle, Maká, Chorote and Wichí, the respective cognates are -wen ‘to see/find’ (unattested as ‘to have’), -ʔwen ‘to see/find’ (usually), ‘to have’ (attested but rare), and -weʔn ‘to have’ (mostly), to see/find’ (sometimes).

**7.1. /-ʔvan/ ‘to have’.** Scheme: (PR) + *pr-pe-ʔvan* + *pr-PE* [(X) X-Y-has + his-Y]. The literature on the subject often mentions that HAVE-verbs frequently arise from TAKE/SEIZE-verbs. SEE has to my knowledge never been cited as a possible grammaticalization path, but is more readily understandable as the first member of the chain SEE > FIND > HAVE, where FIND shares a few semantic features with TAKE/SEIZE, as well as identical valency. Heine (1997: 48) mentions the path FIND > HAVE, and Heine & Kuteva (2002: 148) GET/RECEIVE /OBTAIN > HAVE. For Creissels (1996), FIND represents one of the three main diachronic sources of a verb HAVE in the languages of the world. The use of /-ʔvan/ is significantly less frequent than /kâx/. In Nivacle, the basic (root) valency of a verb is displayed in its prefix slot. If this slot is filled by two arguments (the maximal possible – it concerns all verbs pertaining to the fifth conjugation), the prefix exhibits direct/inverse (hierarchical) alignment, but only the highest participant (A, P/T

<sup>17</sup> The possessed noun at the end of the first line of (25) forms part of the adnominal possessive NP (‘the territory of our ancestors’).

or R) actually surfaces, there being no need of any direct/inverse marker.<sup>18</sup> The person hierarchy is 1>2>3. In order to make the reading of the glosses more straightforward, I show the ousted argument inside parenthesis. Only such verbs will be called ‘transitive’. All other verbs will be called (basically) ‘intransitive’ (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> conjugations), insofar as their prefix excludes the existence of a P/T/R argument. Valency increasing of intransitive verbs can be achieved by two different strategies: (a) causativisation, which yields a ‘genuine’ transitive verb in the sense that the prefix slot obligatory involves two arguments (A+P/T/R), the alignment being direct/inverse (hierarchical), just like any basically transitive verb, and (b) transitivisation, where the new argument (P/T/R) is added as a suffix to the root verb, whereas the prefix slot only licenses A (Fabre 2012). Valency increasing of basic transitive (bivalent) verbs can only be achieved by way of suffixes. The verb /-<sup>2</sup>van/ appears before the possessed noun.

(28)

ni	yi’van	lhpa	nivacche
ni	ji- <sup>2</sup> van	ɫ-pa	nivak-ɬje
NEG	1A(>3P)-have	F-D	person-F

‘I have/had no wife’ (second reading: ‘I don’t/didn’t see any woman’)

(29)

saselhjo’p’am	ca	a’vanelh
Ø-sas-el-xop-ʔa-m	ka	a- <sup>2</sup> van-el
3S-be.bad-PL.SAP-BESIDE-2-BEN	SUB <sub>2</sub>	2A(>3P)-have-PL.SAP
pa	ve’lha	taôclaj
pa	Ø-ve’lha	taoklax
M.D	3S-be.one	child

‘You (pl.) cannot (“it is impossible that you”) have a child’ (second reading: ‘You cannot see any child’)

**7.2. /-<sup>2</sup>van/ ‘to see’ + instrumental in possessive constructions.** Although a rather marginal construction, it may be of interest to observe that /-<sup>2</sup>van/, in its original meaning of ‘to see’, can be employed with the applicative instrumental to indicate that the entity seen possesses a physical and temporary (rather than inalienable) characteristic. This looks like a kind of external possession or possessor dative (Spanish: *le pisó los zapatos* ‘he tread on his [somebody else’s] shoes’, French: *je lui ai pris la main* ‘I took her/his hand’), except that it is not used with inalienably possessed parts. The construction falls short of Heine’s (1997) ‘companion schema’, unless we unnecessarily complicate it (X is with Y’s Z). A still more compelling argument not to consider this as a HAVE-verb is that /-<sup>2</sup>van/ always keeps its sense of ‘to see’, and the instrumental applicative suffix alone indicates possession. This construction as a kind of (embedded) with-possessive, in which the verb is used in its most usual sense of ‘to see’, but indicated that the patient possesses a temporary characteristic. I will call it ‘have-with hybrid possessive’.

<sup>18</sup> Actually, both arguments do appear in one specific constellation: second person A + first person P/T/R: *ɫ-tsi-<sup>2</sup>van* (2A-1P-see) ‘you (sg) see me’.

The proposed scheme is A-P-<sup>2</sup>*van-pe-INST* + *pr*/<sub>A-P</sub>-PE. Note that (a) the prefix slot on the verb includes two participants, A and P, (b) the notation *pr*/<sub>A-P</sub>-PE indicates that the possessor may but need not be coreferenced with A or P.<sup>19</sup> Comparing (30a) and (30b), the latter asserts that A only sees *paint*, nothing else. By contrast, (30a), the object is (salient) paint on somebody’s face.

(30a) *yi’vanesh*                      *pa*      *lhninjat*  
*ji-<sup>3</sup>van-e-f*                      *pa*      *l-nin-xat*  
 3A(>3P)-see-3-INST      D      3POS-paint-NMLZ  
 ‘S/he saw his paint / S/he saw him/her with his/her paint on’

(30b) *yi’van*                      *pa*      *lhninjat*  
*ji-<sup>3</sup>van*                      *pa*      *l-nin-xat*  
 3A(>3P)-see      D      3POS-paint-NMLZ  
 ‘S/he saw his/her paint’

Since the instrumental applicative, apart from its canonical use of referring to an instrument, is one of the strategies used in Nivacle to introduce a dependent clause (31 and 32) and/or a patient argument (Fabre 1009/2010), it is logical to consider that /A-P-<sup>2</sup>*van/* ‘to see’ + instrumental in (30a) can be paraphrased as ‘Agent saw Patient together with his/her attribute Z’.

(31) *c’ayaesh*                      *ti*              *lhnam*  
*k<sup>2</sup>aja-e-f*                      *ti*              *l-n-am*  
 1A(>2P)-hear-3-INST      SUB<sub>1</sub>      2S-CIS-go  
 ‘I heard [about you] that you (sg) were coming’ (not \*I heard you coming’)

(32) *jalheclôjesh*                      *ti*              *c’ui*              *jayu*  
*xa-leklôx-e-f*                      *ti*              *Ø-k<sup>2</sup>uy*              *xaju*  
 1A(>3P)-believe-3-INST      SUB1      3S-be.cold      PROSP  
 ‘I think it (the weather) will be getting cold’

Examples (33), (34) and (35) illustrate further combinations with first and second person participants, whose correct interpretation depends on the indexation of the personal suffix preceding the applicative instrumental. In (33), the personal suffix on the verb shows that the glasses belong to the subject of the clause, i.e. A and the owner of the glasses are coreferential, and the instrumental canonically expresses instrument. In (34) coreference is established between P and the owner of the glasses, which are not the instrument through which A perceives B. (35) represents a case of disjoint reference between A and P, the owner of the glasses,<sup>20</sup> which are the instrument through which A sees P.

<sup>19</sup> Assuming A to be first person and P second person, there are four logical possibilities: (a) I see you & you have your glasses on (ex. 34), (b) I see you & I have my glasses on (ex. 33), (c) I see you and I have your glasses on (ex. 35), (d) I see you & you have my glasses on (not exemplified).

<sup>20</sup> There is an interesting parallel in the Nivacle adnominal possession, where the presence or absence of the prefix /ka- ~ k- ~ k<sup>2</sup>a- ~ k<sup>2</sup>-/ signals genuine vs. ‘indirect/proxy’ possession in cases like: *l-afinuk* ‘its (the horse’s) bit’ vs. *l-k-afinuk* ‘his (the horse owner’s) bit, or *y-afi* ‘my mouth’ vs. *yi-k-afi* ‘my door = my (house’s) mouth’.



(33)

c <sup>3</sup> a <sup>3</sup> vanesh	nava	yitôsjeshiyis
k <sup>2</sup> a <sup>2</sup> van-e-f	na-va	yi-tôsx-e-ſij-is
1A(>2P)-see-3-INST	D-PL.NON.HUM	1POS-eye-NMLZ-PL
'I see you with/through my (own) glasses'		

(34)

c <sup>3</sup> a <sup>3</sup> vanesh	nava	atôsjeshiyis
k <sup>2</sup> a <sup>2</sup> van-e-f	na-va	a-tôsx-e-ſij-is
1A(>2P)-see-3-INST	D-PL.NON.HUM	2POS-eye-NMLZ-PL
'I see you with (but not through) your glasses' (you have your glasses on)		

(35)

c <sup>3</sup> a <sup>3</sup> van'ash	nava	atôsjeshiyis
k <sup>2</sup> a <sup>2</sup> van-ʔa-f	na-va	a-tôsx-e-ſij-is
1A(>2P)-see-2-INST	D-PL.NON.HUM	2POS-eye-NMLZ-PL
'I see you with/through your glasses' (I have your glasses on)		

## 8. Denominal verbs as possession verbs. Scheme: *pr-N-j (PR) [X-house-has + X]*.

I would like to mention a lexicalized minor possessive type, slightly reminiscent of a well attested construction in some Tupí-Guaraní languages (Dietrich 2001, Meira 2006, Rose 2002, Velázquez Castillo 1996), whereby a possessee noun is directly constructed as a predicative word. The resulting structure is called 'non-verbal predicative construction' by Velázquez Castillo (1996), which notes that in Paraguayan Guaraní, it is primarily used with inalienable nouns. There are substantial differences between the Tupí-Guaraní and Nivacle examples, among which I list the following: (a) the Nivacle construction is a denominal verb, (b) the construction exemplifies different kinds of possession, (c) the construction is mostly lexicalized, insofar as it cannot be employed with any noun, and (d) the construction yields verbs that may have unexpected, basically non-possessive meanings. (36) shows some regular instances of predicative constructions derived from a noun, and (37) gives a few unpredictable meanings, which cannot be considered possessive predicates. The predicativization possessive type in Nivacle is certainly not very productive, even if some of its members show up quite frequently. In this construction, the verb belongs to the second conjugation, and exhibits the derivation suffix /-j/. Be that as it may, it cannot be said for certain that the list of such verbs is closed. New examples crop up from time to time, further investigation being needed in this respect. Similar examples are attested in the sister languages Chorote (Carol 2014 y p.c.) y Maká (Gerzenstein 1999).

- (36) -kʔü 'weapon' → -k<sup>2</sup>u-j 'to have a weapon'; -ſjä 'shooting scar' → -ſja-j 'to have a shooting scar'; yitsux 'male' → -ktsɔ-j 'to have descendants'; -lku 'load' → -lku-j 'to carry a load'; -ts<sup>2</sup>a 'mate, friend' → -ts<sup>2</sup>a-j 'to have mates'; -vô 'worm' → -vô-j 'to have worms'; -kɔfa 'enemy' → -kɔfa-j 'to have enemies'; -ſʔakfa 'spouse with whom one has children' → -ſʔakfa-j 'to be married with children'; -tsamät 'dream' → -tsamat-aj 'to dream/ have a dream'; -axte 'breast(s)' → -axte-j 'to have breasts'; -uxä 'honey' → -uxä-j 'to have plenty of honey'; -piö 'debt' → -piö-j 'to have debts'

- (37) -xpɔyijf ‘house’ → -xpɔyif-ej ‘to build a house’ (not \*to have a house); fɔtɔx ‘mushroom’ → -fɔtɔ-tɔ-j ‘to have leprosy’ (not \*to have mushrooms); -aklɔ ‘back, shoulder’ → -aklɔ-j ‘to fall on one’s back’ (not \*to have shoulders); -afk’ut ‘gall, bile’ → -afk’ut-i-vaj ‘to be green’ (-vaj is a further derivation suffix); -uyxatfi ‘shirt, cloth’ → -uyxatfi-j ‘to put on one’s clothes’; -sxān ‘meat’ → -sxan-i ‘to be stout, well-build’ (not \*to have meat), -xpekl ‘shade’ → -xpekl-ej ‘to stay in the shade’ (not \*to have shade/be shady – the suffix is a locative applicative).<sup>21</sup>

**9. A further type: combining /-am/ and /-<sup>2</sup>van/. Scheme: *pe-am-D.pe* + *SUB*<sub>2</sub> + *pr-PE-IRR* + *SUB*<sub>2</sub> + *pr.pe.IRR-<sup>2</sup>van*.**

Yet another way to express negative predicative possession consists in combining the verbs /-am/ and /-<sup>2</sup>van/, in which case the deictic article cliticizes to the first, and /-<sup>2</sup>van/ appears in the irrealis mode if there is no noun:

- (38) (Seelwische 1995: 128)
- |                  |                  |                     |
|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| ampa             | ca               | a’van               |
| Ø-am-pa          | ka               | a- <sup>2</sup> van |
| 3S-not.exist-M.D | SUB <sub>2</sub> | 2A.IRR(>3P)-have    |
- ‘You (sg.) don’t have anything’

If there is a possessed noun, like in (39), this is used predicatively. The main verb is followed by a sequence of two subordinated predicates. In this example, the combination of the first and third predicate alone matches the structure in (38), but here a second predicate, dependant on the third, appears sandwiched between the two. It must be added that although the verb /-<sup>2</sup>van/ cannot be used in a main negative clause with the meaning ‘to have’,<sup>22</sup> there is no such restriction when it appears in a subordinated clause like (39). Building on Stassen’s typology, I will classify this particular structure as a case of clausal possessive with subordination (see 4.2.).

- (39)
- |                  |                  |              |                          |                  |
|------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| ampa             | ca               | samto        | t’acfiya                 | ca               |
| Ø-am-pa          | ka               | samto        | t’ <sup>2</sup> a-kfij-a | ka               |
| 3S-not.exist-M.D | SUB <sub>2</sub> | white.people | 3POS-shoe-IRR            | SUB <sub>2</sub> |
- n’van  
n-<sup>2</sup>van  
3A.IRR(>3P)-have  
‘They had nothing like white men’s shoe(s)’ (Seelwische 1995: 174)  
 (“they-were-inexistent which were-white men’s-shoes which they-had-them”)

<sup>21</sup> One can actually say ‘to have a good/bad shade’ by using a productive derivation with the suffix -(V) mat-sex ‘to have a good/adequate X’, in turn derived from the basic, negative, counterpart -(V)mat ‘to have a bad/defective/inadequate X’: /-xpekl-emat/ ‘to lack shade’ /-xpekl-emat-sex/ ‘to be conveniently shady’. I do not consider such derivations as proper have-constructions. Even more marginal, Nivacle can derive inactive verbs from some body-part nouns, meaning ‘to have/ be distinguished by a sizeable/remarkably large X’. The derivation suffix is /-val/, but this construction shows up only occasionally in my data, and does not seem to be productive. I registered only three examples: -nāf → -nāf-val ‘to have a big nose’, -vts<sup>2</sup>ē ‘belly’ → -vts<sup>2</sup>e-val ‘to have a big belly’, and -pɔse ‘beard’ → -pɔse-val ‘to have a big beard’.

<sup>22</sup> This means that /ni-n-<sup>2</sup>van/ (NEG-3A(>3P).IRR-see) can only mean ‘s/he does not see it/him/her/ them’, never \*s/he does not have it/him/her/ them’.

## 10. Comparative observations on predicative possession in the other Mataguayo languages.

The Maká verb /-al/ corresponds to Nivacle /-kâx/ and can be used in the third person in similar simplex existential constructions. Compare (40) with (3).

- (40) (Gerzenstein 1995)  
 n-al          n-e'          y-itsi'  
 3S-exist    D-F          1POS-house  
 'I have a house'

Just like its correspondent in Nivacle, Maká /-al/ can appear with the benefactive suffix, yielding a topic-locative hybrid (41). Compare with (7).

- (41) (Gerzenstein 1999)  
 n-a'    y-as                  n-al-i-m                  n-a'    nunax  
 D-M    1POS-son          3S-exist-3-AP.BEN    D-M    dog  
 'My son has a dog'

Maká appears also to have a negative construction /nite' lef/, where the second element, translated by Gerzenstein (1999) as 'sin algún atributo', could be cognate to the Chorote and Wichí negative /lax/. Unfortunately, Gerzenstein (1999) provides only one example, a potential with-possession type:<sup>23</sup>

- (42) Maká (Gerzenstein 1999)  
 n-a'          leqeŋ'i          nite'          lef  
 D-M          milk          NEG          without.smth  
 'The milk has no sugar (in it)'  
 ('The milk is lacking a certain quality')

Wichí has a topic-locative hybrid possessive. It consists of the predicate /-i/ 'to be', normally followed by a locative applicative suffix. The majority of nouns – perhaps all – appear to be inalienable (43, 44, and 45). No equivalent structure exists in Nivacle.

- (43) Wichí (Terraça 2009)  
 ŋɪ-ey          Ø-i-hi  
 1POS-name    3S-be-LOC  
 'I have a/my noun'

- (44) Wichí (Lunt 1999)  
 oɬ-as          Ø-i-hi  
 1POS-son      3S-be-LOC  
 'I have a child'

<sup>23</sup> Apart from that, it is also possible that Maká can make use of numbers and quantifiers as existential predicates. I found only one example in Gerzenstein's works (1995): pan uxaX pe e-li-ts (WH indef.quantity D 2POS-child-PL) 'How many children do you have?'.  


---

The verb /i-(hi)/ 'to be' can also be employed, in conjunction with the negated possessed noun, with the correlative negative suffix on the verb:

- (45) Wichí (Vidal & Nercesian 2005)  
 ha-n'-ey                      Ø-i-hi-hi  
 NEG<sub>1</sub>-1POS-name          3S-be-LOC-NEG<sub>2</sub>  
 'I have no name'

- (46) Wichí (Terraza 2009)  
 la-k<sup>ə</sup>emet                    Ø-i-hi-hit<sup>ə</sup>e  
 3POS-work                  3S-be-LOC-NEG  
 'He has/they have no work'

Maká /-atsat<sup>a</sup>aX-/ 'to own/ belong to' has the same derivation and inflection as its Nivacle cognate. It is derived from /-atsathen/ 'to be straight'. /-atsat<sup>a</sup>aX/ takes inactive prefixes, i.e. the subject is marked like a patient of transitive. It is used with the suffix /-i-x/, which corresponds exactly to Nivacle third person + applicative instrumental /-e-f/. This construction can thus be subsumed under the with-possessive type (compare with examples under 6).

- (47) Maká (Gerzenstein 1999, 2000)  
 ts-atsat<sup>a</sup>aX-ix              n-e<sup>ə</sup>      fo<sup>ə</sup>              wit-itsi  
 1Sp-own-INST          D-F      be.white      INDEF.POS-house  
 'This/The house belongs to me'

- (48) Maká (Gerzenstein 1999, 2000)  
 n-a<sup>ə</sup>      tiptip              y-atsataX-ix              n-a<sup>ə</sup>      leqisil  
 D-M      horse              3S-own-INST              D-M      chief  
 'This/The horse belong to the chief'

The verb 'to see/find' has cognates in all Mataguayo languages and has grammaticalized into a possession verb in all but Maká. In Chorote, this verb is seldom used to express ownership (Carol, p.c.). The widest range use in the sense 'to have' is to be found in Wichí (compare with examples under 7.1.).

- (49) Wichí (Vidal & Nercesian 2005)  
 n'-w'en                      n'-kuset  
 1S-have                      1POS-trousers  
 'I have (my) trousers'

- (50) Wichí (Vidal & Nercesian 2005)  
 ha-n>-w'en-hi                      husan  
 NEG<sub>1</sub>-1S-have-NEG<sub>2</sub>              ax  
 'I don't have an ax'

- (51) Chorote (Carol 2014)  
 syupapo kijil-as je i-'win-t'i-pi  
 D elder-PL NEG 3A-have/see-CONJ-DISTANT.PAST  
 'The elders had nothing (no clothes) to put on'

The use of a pair 'exist/not exist' with the benefactive applicative suffix is only attested in Maká and Nivacle. Wichí can use the benefactive applicative /-(h)u/ after the root /i-/ 'to be', but the construction does not have possessive reading. Chorote has a devoted benefactive suffix /-k'yoye/ as well as a dative/general locative /-xam/, where the /m/ is undoubtedly cognate with the Nivacle and Maká benefactive, but neither of these is reported to be used in combination with an existential verb to express predicative possession construction (see examples under 3.1.2. and 4.1.).

- (52) Maká (Gerzenstein 1995)  
 n-al-ye-m n-a' nunax  
 3S-exist-1-AP.BEN D-M dog  
 'I have a dog'

- (53) Maká (Gerzenstein 1995)  
 Ø-ham-ye-m  
 3S-not.exist-1-AP.BEN  
 'I have nothing'

**Table 6.** Comparative view of options available to express predicative possession in the Mataguayo languages (+ = positive form; - = negative form). For Nivacle, only those schemes for which I have been able to find a correspondence are given.

	SIMPLEX EXISTENTIAL	TOPIC- LOCATIVE HYBRID POSSESSIVE	WITH-POSSESSIVE	HAVE-POSSESSIVE
MAKÁ	<b>n-al</b> (+) ----- <b>ham</b> (-)	<b>n-al+BEN</b> (+) ----- <b>ham+BEN</b> (-)	<b>-atsat?ax-i-x</b> (+) ----- nite? lef (-) uncertain	(-wen 'see/find', but unattested as 'have')
NIVACLE	<b>kãx</b> (+) <b>QUANT</b> (+) ----- am (-) unattested	<b>kãx+BEN</b> (+) <b>QUANT+BEN</b> (+) ----- <b>am+D + ka + N-IRR</b> (-)	<b>-tsnt?ax-e-f</b> (+)	<b>-?van</b> 'have' (but mostly 'see/find') less frequent than -ka?x
CHOROTE	<b>po</b> (+) ----- <b>lax</b> (-)	<b>lax-k'i+D</b> (-) (without following N)		<b>-wen</b> 'have' (but mostly 'see/find') rare but attested
WICHÍ	<b>lax</b> (-)	<b>i-(+/-LOC)</b> (+/-) with inalienable nouns		<b>-we'n</b> 'have' (also 'see/find') most preferred option

## 11. Concluding remarks.

Among the many typological rarities of Nivacle, predicative possession is particularly striking. A total of fourteen different morphosyntactical schemes distributed between nine general types: (1) non-standard topic possessive (ex. 3, 4, 18, 19, and 20), thetical possessive (ex. 5), (3) topic-locational hybrid (ex. 7-10, 14, 15, 21 and 22), (4) clausal possessive with subordination (ex. 16, 17, and 39), (5) locational possessive (ex. 23), (6) with-possessive (ex. 26 and 26), (7) have-possessive (ex. 28 and 29), (8) have-with hybrid possessive (ex. 30a, 31-35), and denominal possessive (ex. 36).

All schemes but one (§ 8.) include an obligatorily possessed noun (*pr-PE*) or a non-possessed noun preceded by a possessive classifier. Only the verb /-tsɔtʔax-/ (§6.) can be followed by a non-possessed noun, but such a construction is infrequent. In fact, as most occurrences are to be found in the Bible, it is quite possible that this option has been acquired through translation. According to Stassen (2009: pp. 71, 75, 77), the indexing of the possessor on the possessee noun represents a non-standard variant, which turns out to be especially popular in topic possessive constructions and, on a lesser degree, in locational possessive constructions. However, *pr-PE* is remarkably rare in with-possessive and have-possessive structures.

The possessee index appears prefixed to the verb, except in ex. 25, 26, and 36, where the prefix refers to the possessor. In ex. 28 and 29, both possessor and possessee appear as prefixes on the verb. However, since the hierarchy rule will always specify that the possessor is higher than the possessee, only the former surfaces. Concerning the suffix indexes on the verb, the possessor appears in ex. 7-10, 11-13, 21, and 22.

As for the applicatives, /-kãx/, /-am/ and quantifier verbs can take the benefactive /-m/, /-tsɔtʔax-/ (as well as, marginally, /-ʔvan/) the instrumental /-f ~ -x/, and the quantifiers, the proximal /-ʔe/.

Six kinds of words (plus various combinations thereof) can function as possessive predicates in Nivacle: (1) /-kãx/ ‘exist’ (only positive); (2) /-am/ ‘not.exist’ (only negative); (3) quantifier (including numbers) predicates; (4) /-tsɔtʔax-e-f/ ‘be the owner of it’; (5) /-ʔvan/ ‘have’ in both positive and negative constructions; (6) denominal possessive predicates.

As mentioned in §3, my study of predicative possession in Nivacle has built on Stassen’s insightful typology. However, in order to fully describe the Nivacle data, it has turned out impossible to employ Stassen’s terminology without some modifications. First, Stassen’s verb dichotomy locative/existential (“with a rough meaning of ‘to be’”) vs. transitive has to be extended to cover quantifiers as well. Second, I have divided and modified the analysis of Stassen’s ‘clausal possessives’, distinguishing between (a) thetical possessive and (b) clausal possessive with subordination.

## References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2012). Possession and ownership: A cross linguistic perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald; R.M.W. Dixon (eds.). *Possession and ownership: a cross-linguistic typology*, pp. 1-64. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carol, Javier (2014). *Lengua chorote (mataguayo). Estudio fonológico y morfosintáctico*. Munich: LINCOM EUROPA.

- Clark, Eve V. (1978). Locational: Existential, locative and possessive constructions. In Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.). *Universals of Human Language*, vol. 4: *Syntax*, pp. 85-126. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Clasen, Bernd (1981). *Inhärenz und Etablierung*. Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien Projekts 41. Cologne: University of Cologne.
- Comrie, Bernard; Golluscio, Lucía; González, Hebe; Vidal, Alejandra (2010). El Chaco como área lingüística. In Zarina Estrada Fernández; Ramón Arzápalo Marín (eds.). *Estudios de lenguas amerindias 2: Contribuciones al estudio de las lenguas originarias de América*, pp. 85-130. Hermosillo: Ed. Unison.
- Cornish, Francis (2010). L'absence de prédication, le topique et le focus: le cas des phrases «thétiques». *Faits de Langues* 30/31: 121-131.
- Creissels, Denis (1996). Remarques sur l'émergence de verbes avoir au cours de l'histoire des langues. *Faits de Langues* 7: 149-158.
- Dietrich, Wolf (2001). Categorias lexicais nas línguas tupi-guarani (visão comparativa). In Francesc Queixalós (ed.). *Des noms et des verbes en tupi-guarani: État de la question*, pp. 21-66. Munich: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Fabre, Alain (2004). Morfosintaxis de los clasificadores posesivos en las lenguas del Gran Chaco (Argentina, Bolivia y Paraguay). *UniverSOS. Revista de Lenguas Indígenas y Universos Culturales* 4: 67-85.
- Fabre, Alain (2009/2010). El sufijo -sh del nivacle (familia mataco-mataguayo) como instrumental, incremento de valencia y subordinador. In Lucía Golluscio; Alejandra Vidal (eds.). *Las lenguas del Chaco. Amerindia* 33/34: 43-72.
- Fabre, Alain (2012). Interacción entre alineamiento inverso (jerárquico) y orientación verbal hacia P/T o R en los verbos transitivos del Nivacle (Chaco paraguayo). *LIAMES - Línguas Indígenas Americanas* 12: 87-101.
- Fabre, Alain (2014). *Estudio gramatical de la lengua Nivacle*. Available at: [www.etnolingüística.org/biblio:fabre-2014-estudio](http://www.etnolingüística.org/biblio:fabre-2014-estudio).
- Gerzenstein, Ana (1995). *Lengua maká. Estudio descriptivo*. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Gerzenstein, Ana (1999). *Diccionario etnolingüístico maká-español*. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Gerzenstein, Ana (2000). La posesión en maká, una lengua aborígen del Chaco paraguayo. In B. Staib (ed.). *Linguística romanica et Indiana. Festschrift für WolfDietrich zum 60. Geburtstag*, pp. 501-519. Tübingen.
- Golluscio, Lucía; Hirsch, Silvia (2006). Introducción: Historias fragmentadas, identidades y lenguas: los pueblos indígenas del Chaco argentino. *Indiana* 23: 99-102.
- Golluscio, Lucía; Vidal, Alejandra (2009/2010). Recorrido sobre las lenguas del Chaco y los aportes a la investigación lingüística. In Lucía Golluscio; Alejandra Vidal (eds.). *Las lenguas del Chaco. Amerindia* 33/34: 3-40.
- Heine, Bernd (1997). *Possession. Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd; Kuteva, Tania (2002). *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kalisch, Hannes (2009/2010). Los constituyentes de la cláusula enlhet (enlhet-enenlhet). Esbozo de una cláusula omnipredicativa. In Lucía Golluscio; Alejandra Vidal (eds.). *Las lenguas del Chaco. Amerindia* 33/34: 109-150.

- Lunt, Robert M. (1999). *Wichi lhãntes. Una gramática del idioma wichi con ejercicios*. Tartagal (Salta): ASOCIANA.
- Meira, Sérgio (2006). Stative verbs vs. nouns in Sateré-Mawé and the Tupian family. In G.J. Rowicka; E.B. Carlin (eds.). *What's in a verb? Studies in the verbal morphology of the languages of the Americas*, pp. 189-214. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
- Messineo, Cristina (2001). Aproximación tipológica a las lenguas indígenas del Gran Chaco. Rasgos compartidos entre toba (familia guaicurú) y maká (familia mataguayo). *Indiana* 28: 183-225.
- Messineo, Cristina (2002). El contraste alienable/inalienable en las construcciones posesivas del toba (guaicurú). In Ana Fernández Garay; Lucía Golluscio (eds.). *Temas de lingüística aborigen II*: 53-81. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Lingüística, Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Messineo, Cristina; Gerzenstein, Ana (2007). La posesión en dos lenguas indígenas del Gran Chaco: toba (guaicurú) y maká (mataguayo). *LIAMES - Línguas Indígenas Americanas* 7: 61-79.
- Rose, Françoise (2002). My hammock = I have a hammock. Possessed nouns constituting possessive clauses in Eméillon (Tupi-Guarani). In Ana Suelly Arruda Cabral; Aryon Dall'Igna Rodrigues (eds.). *Atas do I Encontro Internacional do Grupo de Trabalho sobre Línguas Indígenas da ANPOLL*, t. 1: 392-400. Belém.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen (1996). *Theticity. Arbeitspapier Nr. 27 (Neue Folge)*. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität zu Köln.
- Seelwische, José (1995). *Sui papi catsinóvot p'alhaa ti yisclansha'ne na lhocsjaat. Lecturas para el 5º grado*. Mariscal Estigarribia: Vicariato Apostólico del Pilcomayo.
- Seiler, Hansjakob (1983). *Possession as an operational dimension of language*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Sociedad Bíblica del Paraguay (1994). *Pa Dios tasinóyoom nôqueesh. Nava Dios lhasinóc na Nivacle lhcliish*. Asunción.
- Stassen, Leon (2009). *Predicative possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Terraza, Jimena (2009). *Grammaire du wichi: Phonologie et morphosyntaxe*. Université du Québec à Montréal (Ph.D. dissertation)
- Ultan, Russell (1978). Towards a typology of substantival possession. In Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.). *Universals of human language, vol. 4: Syntax*, pp. 11-50. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Unruh, Ernesto; Kalisch, Hannes (2002). *Die Sprachidee des Enlhet. Abriss der funktionalen Grund-konzeption des Enlhet*. Ya'alve-Saanga: Nengvaanem-quescama Nempayvaam Enlhet (ms.).
- Velázquez Castillo, Maura (1996). *The grammar of possession. Inalienability, incorporation and possessor ascension in Guaraní*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vidal, Alejandra; Nercesian, Verónica (2005). Sustantivos y verbos en wichi: hacia una taxonomía de clases de palabras. *LIAMES – Línguas Indígenas Americanas* 5: 7-24.



**Abbreviations**

A	agent,
BEN	benefactive
CIS	cislocative
CON	conative
CONJ	conjunctural
D	deictic classifier
DEM	demonstrative
DP	determiner phrase
F	feminine
HUM	human
INDEF.POS	indefinite possessor
INST	instrumental
INT	intensive
IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative
M	masculine
N	noun
NEG	negative
NLMZ	nominalizer
NON.HUM	non-human
P	patient of monotransitive
pe	possessee affix
PE	possessee noun
PL	plural
PL. SAP	plural of speech act participant
POS	possessor
POS. CL	possessive classifier
pr	possessor affix
PR	possessor noun
PROSP	prospective
QUANT	quantifier
R	recipient
S	intransitive subject
SIM	similar
SUB1	realis subordinator
SUB2	irrealis subordinator
T	theme (patient of ditransitive)
VBLZ	verbalizer
VENT.ANT	anticipated ventive
IINC	first person inclusive.

Recebido: 7//11/2014

Versão revista e corrigida: 8/3/2015

Aceito: 28/6/2015