On the typology of locative predication in Samoyedic languages[1]

Chris Lasse Däbritz

<chris.lasse.daebritz@uni-hamburg.de>

Abstract

Within the given paper, I investigate the patterns of the linguistic expression of locative predication (formalized as "X BE.AT Y") in the Samoyedic languages, taking into account the two major typological approaches of Stassen (1997) and Ameka & Levinson (2007). The following patterns are shown: The encoding of the theme (unmarked subject) and the location (spatial adverbial included in the predicate) does not differ across the Samoyedic languages, but the linking element: In affirmative locative clauses, most Samoyedic languages exhibit a copula verb, which appears in predicate nominals/adjectives as well. The major exception from this pattern is the Forest Enets locative copula verb *a-* 'to be at', which I discuss in more detail since its locative semantics appear to be a recent functionally motivated development. In negative locative clauses, in turn, negative existential verbs are used in all Samoyedic languages. Consequently, Samoyedic languages show a polarity split in the encoding of locative predication. Arguing that a locative interpretation of the successor forms of the Proto-Samoyedic copula verb is not felicitous from a synchronic point of view, I discuss the typological approaches of Stassen (1997) as well as Ameka & Levinson (2007). Finally, I present a first attempt at typological classification of locative predication, which is based on the analysis of the Samoyedic languages but might be validated by taking into account data from a much larger sample of languages.

1. Introduction

The paper at hand investigates the linguistic expression of both affirmative and negative locative predication in the Samoyedic languages. A typological perspective, starting from Stassen (1997) and Ameka & Levinson (2007), is considered for the different structures observed. As a disclaimer, it has to be stated that not all details of locative predication in the Samoyedic languages can be covered, given the space limits within a single paper. Therefore, it focuses on typologically "unexpected" structures rather than typologically common structures. To account for a uniform description,

the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, some necessary theoretical preliminaries are discussed, and Stassen's (1997) and Ameka & Levinson's (2007) typological approaches to locative predication are presented. Section 3 is devoted to the linguistic expression of locative predication in the Samoyedic languages, starting with some general patterns (3.1), dealing with each language separately (3.2 to 3.6) and pulling the strings together in Section 3.7. Given that the morphosyntactic patterns of locative predication in the Samoyedic languages are relatively well described (e.g. Wagner-Nagy 2011, Wagner-Nagy 2016, Budzisch 2017), I explicitly focus on their typological classification. From a methodological point of view, Section 3 is based on empirical language data, which come from varying sources, be they grammars, previously published research or language corpora; Table 1 summarizes the sources for primary data, i.e. text collections and corpora.

Language	Data
Nenets	- Tundra Nenets text collection of the project "Endangered Languages and Cultures of Siberia" (Nikolaeva et al. 2019)
Forest Enets	- Khanina & Shluinsky's *Digital Corpus of Enets*, parts of which is published within the project "Endangered Languages and Cultures of Siberia" (Nikolaeva et al. 2019)
Tundra Enets	
Nganasan	- *Nganasan Spoken Language Corpus* (Brykina et al. 2018)
Selkup	- *INEL Selkup Corpus* (Brykina et al. 2020) - *Selkup Language Corpus* (Budzisch et al. 2019)
Kamas	- *INEL Kamas Corpus* (Gusev et al. 2019)

Table 1: Primary language data

In either case, I indicate the relevant source and point eventually to possible caveats. Most often, I take over the transcription and glossing from the appropriate source; however, I slightly unified both for the sake of better comparability and readability of the data. Given the paper's focus on syntax, I only indicate it specifically if essential for the question under discussion.

Section 4, finally, draws some conclusions, and I try to evaluate to what extent the Samoyedic data can contribute to the general typological discussion.

2. Theoretical background

When approaching the linguistic expression of locative predication, it is essential to keep function and form apart. From a functional perspective, a locative predication expresses the position of an entity X (henceforth: *theme*; a.k.a. *figure, pivot*) at a place Y (henceforth: *location*; a.k.a. *coda, ground*) (Freeze 1992: 554; Payne 1997: 112), e.g. *the bear is in its den*. This definition entails two semantic-pragmatic patterns of locative predication: The *theme* tends to be definite and correlates to the information structural function *topic*; the *location*, in turn, may be either definite or indefinite and tends to relate to the information structural function *focus* (Bentley et al. 2015: 63–69; Däbritz 2021: 146–147). Given space limits, I do not go into more detail here but wish to emphasize the resulting functional prediction for the formal realization of locative

On the typology of locative predication in Samoyedic languages

predication. The theme is expected to be realized as the subject of a locative clause, whereas the location is expected to be included in the predicate. Indeed, many studies (e.g. Stassen 1997, Ameka & Levinson 2007) have shown that this assumption holds from a cross-linguistic perspective.

Coming to the formal encoding of locative predication, primarily, the locative predicate itself is prone to cross-linguistic variation. Stassen (1997: Ch. 2 & 3) distinguishes a verbal strategy, a nominal strategy and a locational strategy for encoding: The verbal strategy uses bound person-number-gender markers attached directly to the locative predicate (example (1a) from Erzya), the nominal strategy either juxtaposes subject and predicate or uses a copula element (example (1b) from Finnish)[2], and the locational strategy uses a copula element expressing location or existence (example (1c) from Tundra Nenets).

(1a)　　　　*Mon*　　　　　　*vel'e-s-**an**.*
　　　　　　　　1SG.PRO　　　　village-INE-**1SG**
　　　　　　　　'I am in the village.'
　　　　　　　　(Erzya; personal knowledge)

(1b)　　　　*Minä*　　　　**ole-n**　　　　*kylä-ssä.*
　　　　　　　　1SG.PRO　　**be-1SG**　　　village-INE
　　　　　　　　'I am in the village.'
　　　　　　　　(Finnish; personal knowledge)

(1c)　　　　*Wen'ako*　　　*m a-k na*　　　　***me.***
　　　　　　　　dog　　　　　　tent-LOC　　　**be.at.3SG**
　　　　　　　　'The dog is in the tent.'
　　　　　　　　(Tundra Nenets; Nikolaeva 2014: 263)

Stassen (1997)	**Ameka & Levinson (2007)**
verbal strategy	type 0 (no verb in locative pre-dication)
nominal strategy – covert copula	
nominal strategy – overt copula	type Ia (1 copula verb in locative pre-dication)
locational strategy	type Ib (1 locative verb in locative pre-dication)
	type II (2–7 locative verbs in locative predication)
	type III (> 7 locative verbs in locative predication)

Table 2: Typological approaches to locative predication

---

[2]　Note already here that Stassen (1997: 119) limits the class of copula elements used in the nominal strategy to zero copulas, pronominal copulas and particle copulas (which may eventually be verbalized). Consequently, he classifies copula elements like the successor forms of PFU **wole-* (e.g. Finnish *ol-* 'to be') as locative verbs and classifies, e.g. Finnish as applying the locational strategy (Stassen 1997: 145, 680). I will come back to this issue in Section 3.7 and present arguments, why I disagree with this opinion.

Chris Lasse Däbritz

Ameka & Levinson (2007) start from the same understanding of locative predication but classify languages according to the number of locative verbs they exhibit (such as items like TN *me-*). Moreover, they explicitly include posture verbs like *stand, sit, lie* in the typology if they occur in relevant contexts, e.g. German *das Buch liegt auf dem Tisch* 'the book is [lit. is lying] on the table'. The table above compares Stassen's (1997) and Ameka & Levinson's (2007) typologies. I will refer to either of them in the upcoming sections on locative predication in the Samoyedic languages.

3. Locative predication in Samoyedic languages

3.1. General patterns

Before describing the linguistic expression of locative predication in the single Samoyedic languages, some general patterns shall be mentioned to avoid iterations in the upcoming sections. Adhering to nominative-accusative alignment, the theme of locative predication is realized as the unmarked subject of the clause in all Samoyedic languages. It may also be realized covertly in the case of a pronominal theme/subject. The location, in turn, is encoded as a case-marked noun phrase, an adverb phrase or an adpositional phrase. In either case, the relevant expression is included in the predicate of the clause. Given these patterns, it is, on the one hand, the morphosyntactic linking of theme and location, and on the other hand, issues such as word order and information structural configuration, which are prone to variation. Thereby, I will focus on the former issue in the following sections, though not entirely disregarding the latter.

3.2. Nenets

In Tundra Nenets locative clauses, the theme and the location are linked by a copula element, depending on the clause's polarity and the theme's animacy. In affirmative locative clauses, animate themes call for the copula *me-* (example (2a)), whereas inanimate themes call for the copula *æ-* (example (2b)). Neither copula can be omitted from the clause, nor can locative predicates be inflected with person-number suffixes, which is a clear divergence from predicate nominals/adjectives (Nikolaeva 2014: 263). The order of constituents is *theme – location – copula*, adhering to the basic SOV word order of Tundra Nenets.

(2a) *Mǝnø* *tol-* *ilna* **me -dm.**
      1SG.PRO   table-GEN   under   **be.at-1SG**
      'I am under the table.'
      (Nikolaeva 2014: 263)

(2b) *Jekar* *mʼa -mi* *xǝnøana* **æ-bta?**
      unknown   tent-POSS.1SG   where   **be.at-COND.3SG**
      'I don't know where my tent is.'
      (Nikolaeva et al. 2019;
      http://www.siberianlanguages.surrey.ac.uk/audio/two-men//?q=be, 0:33)

On the typology of locative predication in Samoyedic languages

In negative locative clauses, the negative existential verb *ja gu-* is used as a copula element, regardless of the theme's animacy (Wagner-Nagy 2011: 280).

(3)   *N'a-wa*   *t'ukona*   ***ja gu.***
          friend-POSS.1PL   here   NEG.EX.3SG
          'Our friend is not here.'
          (Wagner-Nagy 2011: 280)

Since Forest Nenets locative clauses do not appear to differ systematically from Tundra Nenets locative clauses (Wagner-Nagy 2011: 198–199), the conclusions drawn for Tundra Nenets can cautiously be transferred to Forest Nenets, too.

3.3. Enets
In the Enets languages, the theme and the location are obligatorily combined by a copula element, and the former cannot be inflected with person-number suffixes. Again, this is a diagnostic difference from predicate nominals/adjectives (Siegl 2013: 334). The order of the elements in locative clauses is generally *theme – location – copula* but can vary due to information structural processes.

    In affirmative clauses, the two Enets languages differ in the choice of the copula: Whereas in Tundra Enets, *a-* is generally used (example (4)), Forest Enets exhibits both *a-* and -. Thereby, *a-* appears in the present tense and the past tense formed with *-š* (example (5a)), and - appears in all other tenses and moods (example (5b)) (Wagner-Nagy 2016: 226). Like in Nenets, the copula cannot be omitted in locative clauses, a diagnostic difference from predicate nominals/adjectives (Siegl 2013: 335–336). In the case of Forest Enets, this is essential since locative clauses exhibit *a-* precisely in those contexts where a copula is absent in predicate nominals/adjectives. From a diachronic perspective, *a-* and - are suppletive stems of the same copula verb, which have parallels in Nganasan as well (Beáta Wagner-Nagy, p.c.). I will come back to this issue in Section 3.7 since it provides valuable evidence for the typological classification of the data.

(4)   *L'i e-da*   *sud'e-n*   ***a-ða***
          cradle-POSS.3SG   inside-LOC.SG   **be-FUT.3SG**
          'He will be in the cradle.'
          (Tundra Enets; Khanina & Shluinsky in prep.;
          En_T_BeMD_20090826_KinderInDerTundra_nar.002)[3]

(5a)   […]   *peratsija-xan*   ***a-zu***   *an'.*
                        surgery-LOC.SG   **be.at[4]-1SG.PST**   and
          '[Well, in summer, I say,] I have been to a surgery.'
          (Forest Enets; Khanina & Shluinsky in prep.;
          En_W_LyND_19970718_Leben_nar.286)

---

[4] The original gloss 'exist' has been changed to 'be at'.

(5b) | *Šiðe* | *n* | *nœ-xu-nø ,* | *ko-n* | ***-ða-xi*** | *teða.* |

two woman child-DU-POSS.1SG here-LOC.SG **be-FUT-3DU** now
'My two daughters, they will be here now.'
(Forest Enets; Khanina & Shluinsky in prep.;
En_W_LyND_19970718_Leben_nar.164)

When it comes to negative locative clauses, there are concurring opinions in the literature on the Forest Enets pattern. Wagner-Nagy (2011: 202) states that the negative existential verb *d'agu-* is used as a copula element, but Siegl (2015: 55) accounts for the structure "negative auxiliary *nøi-* + connegative form of the affirmative copula *a-*". According to the material analyzed here, the former strategy is slightly more frequent; thus, both structures (examples (6a) and (6b)) have to be accounted for.

(6a) | *I* | *s u* | *d'eri* | *p tabu-xon* | ***d'a o-š.*** |

and seven day Potapovo-LOC.SG **NEG.EX[5]**
3SG.PST

'And she was absent in Potapovo for seven days.'
(Forest Enets; Khanina & Shluinsky in prep.;
En_W_RoSA_20080824_ImSumpfVersunken_nar.008)

(6b) | *Nixu-r* | *d'u-xon* | ***nøi*** | ***a- .*** |

force-POSS.2SG fat-LOC.SG **NEG.AUX.3SG** **be.at-CNG**
'The force is not in the fat.'
(Forest Enets; Khanina & Shluinsky in prep.;
En_W_GlES_20100702_MärchenSchwiegersöhne_flk.058)

Like in Forest Enets, both the existential verb *d'i u-* (example (7a)) and the combination of the negative auxiliary *nœ-* and the affirmative copula *a-* (example (7b)) do occur in negative locative clauses in Tundra Enets. Here, the latter strategy is slightly more frequent in the analyzed material.

(7a) | *A* | *tea-* | ***d'i ua-*** | *me-k n.* |

and reindeer-PL **NEG.EX[6]-3PL** house-LOC.SG
'And the reindeers are not at home.'
(Tundra Enets; Khanina & Shluinsky in prep.;
En_T_SiSD_20080808_RentiereEinfangen_nar.032)

---

[5] The original gloss 'there is no' has been changed to 'NEG.EX'.
[6] The original gloss 'there is no' has been changed to 'NEG.EX'.

On the typology of locative predication in Samoyedic languages

(7b) *Kudaxaa*   *bal nøis-x n*   ***nøe-ð***   ***a-abi- .***
for.a.long.time hospital-LOC.SG **NEG.AUX-1SG** **be-HAB-CNG**
    'I did not use to stay in the hospital before.'
    (Tundra Enets; Khanina & Shluinsky in prep.;
    En_T_TuSU_20090816_Leben_nar.104)

3.4. Nganasan

In Nganasan, the theme and the location are connected by a copula element in most cases; see below for an exception from this pattern. In affirmative clauses, most frequently, the copula *i-* is used, which is the same item occurring in predicate nominals/adjectives in non-present tense contexts (Wagner-Nagy 2019: 347, 357) (example (8a)). Additionally, the existential verb *t i-* can be used, but much less frequently and only in clauses without an overt location (Wagner-Nagy 2019: 357) (example (8b)). The lack of an overtly expressed location may be explained because the existential verb *t i-* is lexicalized from the pronominal stem *t -* and the copula *i-*. Consequently, the pre-verbal position can be assumed to be blocked for other elements (see Wagner-Nagy (2011: 188–189) for a diachronic discussion). Finally, person-number endings can directly be attached to the locative predicate if the latter is formed by an adverb or an interrogative (Wagner-Nagy 2019: 358) (example (8c)).

(8a) *M n*   *aba- a-n*   *kad a-n*   ***i-n'antu-g -tu-m.***
1SG.PRO mother-AUG-   near-LOC.ADV **be-VOL-ITER-AOR-1SG**
        POSS.1SG.GEN
    'I wanted to stay at my mother's.'
    (Brykina et al. 2018; ChND_041213_Reminiscence_nar.072)

(8b) *T*   *n em -g i-t i*   *t bt*   ***t i-t ü-g j.***
well mother-DU POSS.3SG also **exist-AOR-3DU**
    'Well, her parents are also [there].'
    (Brykina et al. 2018; JSM_090809_Life_nar.398)

(8c) *M n*   *tamnu-**m.***
1SG.PRO there-**1SG**
    'I am there.'
    (Wagner-Nagy 2019: 358)

Although the given examples exhibit SOV structures, it must be said that the word order in locative clauses in Nganasan is more flexible than in Nenets and Enets (Wagner-Nagy 2011: 190–192).

In negative locative clauses, either the negative existential particle *d'a ku* or the negative existential verb *d'a guj-* appear, the latter being a lexicalization from *d'a ku* and the copula verb *i-* (Wagner-Nagy 2011: 192). The particle *d'a ku* is the most frequent pattern in the present tense, whereby it can agree only in number with the subject (example (9a)). The verb *d'a guj-*, in turn, is used in other tenses and moods and is regularly inflected for person and number (example (9b)) (Wagner-Nagy 2011:

Chris Lasse Däbritz

194–195; Wagner-Nagy 2019: 416). Very seldom, also the combination of the negative auxiliary *nø̆-* and the connegative form of the existential verb *t i-* is used (Wagner-Nagy 2019: 416–417) (example (9c)).

(9a)　　　*Manu*　　　*ana san- -*　　　*turku*　　　*b r -n*　　　***d'a gu- .***
old　　　man-EP-PL　　　lake.GEN　　　shore-LOC.ADV　　　**NEG.EX-PL**
'The old men are not on the river shore.'
(Wagner-Nagy 2011: 194)

(9b)　　　*M n*　　　*t -m n*　　　***d'a guj-s ü -m.***
1SG.PRO　　　summer-PROL　　　**NEG.EX-PST-1SG**
'I wasn't there all summer.'
(Brykina et al. 2018; KES-SEN_031114_Dialog_conv.137)

(9c)　　　***N'i-s d' -r***　　　*ndiai*　　　***t ib -***　　　*d'ebt ða-bü -m .*
NEG.AUX-PPF-2PL　　　probably　　　**exist-CNG**　　　tell-ACT-POSS.1SG
'Probably you were not [here] when I said that.'
(Brykina et al. 2018; KVB_97_Djuhode_nar.006)

3.5. Selkup

First of all, it has to be acknowledged that Selkup exhibits much dialectal variation at all levels of the language system. However, since Budzisch (2017) has shown that locative predication is realized similarly in all varieties of Selkup, they are discussed together here. Generally, theme and location are most often connected by a copula element, which is the copula verb - (with phonetic variants) in affirmative locative clauses (example (10a)). Very rarely, a zero copula can be observed, but only in third-person singular contexts (example (10b)) (Budzisch 2017: 51–54).

(10a)　　　*Ä w -t*　　　***ä -qu-s***　　　*ma t-q n.*
mother-POSS.3SG　　　**be-HAB-PST.3SG**　　　house-LOC
'Her mother was at home.'
(Ket Selkup; Brykina et al. 2020;
KMS_1963_BearAteTwoWomen_nar.009)

(10b)　　　*Teb- -n*　　　*pid -t*　　　*t'u -n*　　　*pu o- n.*
3SG.PRO-EP-GEN　　　nest-POSS.3SG　　　earth-GEN　　　inside-LOC
'His nest is in the ground.'
(Ket Selkup; Budzisch et al. 2019; KMS_1966_MouseGray_flk.005)

As shown in example (10a), the word order differs from the basic word order SOV. Indeed, the analyzed material exhibits a variation of SVO and SOV patterns. However, since this variation does not affect the morphosyntactic encoding of the participants in locative clauses, it is not discussed further here. In negative locative

On the typology of locative predication in Samoyedic languages

clauses, the negative existential verb *ä ki-* (Northern varieties) and *a gu- ~ t'a gu-* (Non-Northern varieties) is used as a copula element (Wagner-Nagy 2011: 214).

(11) […] *kaj-gan-naj* ***a g-wa.***
what-LOC-EMPH **NEG.EX-CO.3SG**
'[I ran to the river, I ran to the hill] – she is nowhere.'
(Central Selkup; Brykina et al. 2020, KFN_1967_Lifestory_nar.019)

Finally, posture verbs like *mta-* 'to sit' appear to function as a copula element in locative clauses. Apparently, relevant instances are often hard to discriminate against a full lexical reading of the given verb. Nevertheless, example (12) shows a locative clause formed with the posture verb *mta-* 'to sit', in which the lexical reading is not likely since the corresponding referent is a tent. Given that these structures are not fully understood yet, nor described, they are not discussed further here but definitely call for further research.

(12) […] *n ar -t* *p läš-ša* ***mta.***
tundra-GEN side-COR **sit.3SG**
'[Then he sees a tent, a large tent,] it is (standing?) in the middle of the tundra.'
(Northern Selkup; Budzisch et al. 2019; AAI_1973_Okyle_flk.054)

3.6. Kamas
The linguistic expression of locative predication in Kamas is straightforward. The theme and the location are obligatorily combined by a copula element. The order of the components is *theme – location – copula*, adhering to the basic SOV word order of Kamas. In affirmative locative clauses, the copula verb *i-* is used, which is the same item as in predicate nominals/adjectives (Wagner-Nagy 2011: 289).

(13) *Ši* *d ije-g n* ***i-bi-le .***
2PL.PRO forest-LOC **be-PST-2PL**
'You were in the taiga.'
(Gusev et al. 2019; PKZ_196X_SU0203.PKZ.071)

In negative locative clauses, the negative existential verb *naga-* appears as a copula element (Wagner-Nagy 2011: 186–187, 290).

(14) *Da* *t n* *gijend* *i* ***nago-bi-al.***
and 2SG.PRO where and **NEG.EX-PST-2SG**
'But you haven't been anywhere.'
(Gusev et al. 2019; PKZ_196X_AngryLady_flk.044)

Chris Lasse Däbritz

3.7. Typological classification

As was stated in the introduction, one of the main goals of this paper is to relate the Samoyedic patterns of expressing locative predication to given typological approaches. As described in Section 2, Stassen (1997) distinguishes a nominal, a verbal and a locational strategy to express intransitive predication, under which locative predication is subsumed. Whereas the verbal strategy (appearance of person-number-gender markers at the predicate itself) is straightforward, the differentiation of the nominal and locational strategies calls for further comments. Stassen (1997: 55) characterizes the locational strategy as showing "[…] the presence of a supportive lexical item which has the morphosyntactic categories of a verb", calling the latter "locative verb". The nominal strategy, in turn, may exhibit a zero copula, non-verbal copula elements or copula verbs, which have grammaticalized from the latter (Stassen 1997: 121). For the aims of this paper, it is crucial that Stassen (1997: 97–99, 145) argues that many copula verbs (e.g. successor forms of PIE *sta-*, e.g. Spanish *estar* 'to be (located)', as well as PFU *wole-*, e.g. Finnish *olla* 'to be') trace back to posture or other locative verbs. Be this diachronically the case or not, I think that the synchronic distribution of copula elements in a language should instead be the decisive criterion for their classification, as will become apparent especially when discussing the Enets data. Synchronically, Forest Enets exhibits - in certain tense and mood forms in both predicate nominals/adjectives and locative clauses. Forest Enets *a-*, in turn, appears in affirmative locative clauses in those tense and mood forms, in which a copula is absent in predicate nominals/adjectives (see Section 3.3 above). Being particular about Stassen's (1997) approach, one cannot account for this functional division since both forms trace back to the same Proto-Samoyedic copula verb (Janhunen 1977: 16–17), be it diachronically a locative verb or not. Consequently, I propose to account for FE - as a semantically empty copula verb. In contrast, FE *a-* is indeed a locative copula verb in the given domains from a synchronic point of view. Since semantically empty copula verbs prototypically relate to predicate nominals/adjectives, I subsume them under the nominal strategy here.

Given this argumentation, the nominal strategy with an overt, semantically bleached copula verb is fairly widely distributed in affirmative locative clauses in the Samoyedic languages, being represented by Kamas *i-*, Selkup -, Forest Enets -, Tundra Enets *a-*, Tundra Nenets *æ-* and Nganasan *i-*. Tundra Nenets is included in this group since the copula *æ-* also appears regularly in predicate nominals/adjectives, which do not show present or past (*-c'*) tense morphology. Additionally, Selkup allows for a zero copula in present-tense, third-person singular contexts, though not regularly. In negative locative clauses, the nominal strategy is applied only in the Enets languages (negative auxiliary + connegative form of the copula verbs *a-* and *a-*, respectively) and in Nganasan (negative existential particle *d'a ku*). In either case, it concurs with the locational strategy with a negative existential verb.

The verbal strategy is applied only in a tiny domain in Nganasan, namely in affirmative present-tense contexts, the location being encoded as an adverb or an interrogative pronoun. This is surprising inasmuch as the verbal strategy is frequently applied in all three Northern Samoyedic languages in predicate nominals/adjectives. Finally, the locational strategy is regularly applied in affirmative clauses in Nenets (locative copula *me-* used for animate themes) and in Forest Enets (locative copula *a-*). Thereby, the Nenets copula *me-* is a separate item, which can possibly be related

On the typology of locative predication in Samoyedic languages

to PS *me-* 'to do; to make' (Janhunen 1977: 91)[7]. On the contrary, the Forest Enets locative copula *a-* is an outcome of a functional division between suppletive stems of the same copula verb. If the Selkup posture verbs turn out to be regularly used in locative predication, they adhere to the locational strategy as well. In negative clauses, the locational strategy is by far the most common in the Samoyedic languages, applied by the negative existential verbs Tundra Nenets *ja gu-*, Forest Enets *d'agu-*, Tundra Enets *d igu-*, Nganasan *d'a guj-*, Selkup *ä ki-* (Northern varieties) and *a gu- ~ t'a gu-* (Non-Northern varieties) and Kamas *naga-*. Since these verbs appear to be taken over from existential predication, I assume they still carry the lexical meaning 'to not exist' ~ 'to not be (located)', which contrasts with most copula verbs used in affirmative locative clauses named above. Additionally, it can be stated that these negative existential verbs usually do not appear in predicate nominals or predicate adjectives.

Thus, the Samoyedic languages tend to apply the nominal strategy in affirmative locative clauses but the locational strategy in negative affirmative clauses when using Stassen's (1997) typology.

When it comes to the typology and classification of Ameka & Levinson (2007), it is essential to note that the authors focus on the cognitive-semantic side of the copula elements used in locative predication. Therefore, they distinguish languages, where the conceptual properties and semantics of the theme (e.g. lying vs upright objects) play no role in encoding locative predication (type 0 and I), from languages, where this is the case (type II and III). The morphosyntactically conditioned usage of more than one copula element is subsumed under type I as long as the conceptual properties and semantics of the theme do not play a role (Ameka & Levinson 2007: 852, 855). Given this, all Samoyedic languages but Nenets fall into the former group of languages. More precisely, they are type I languages since using an overt copula element is by far the most frequent pattern (see above for exceptions in Nganasan and Selkup). The Nenets languages are more difficult to classify. On the one hand, they do not involve any posture or positional verbs in the expression of locative predication. On the other hand, the choice of the copula element (TN *æ-* vs *me-*) in affirmative locative clauses is definitely semantically conditioned, namely by the animacy of the theme. Therefore, I tend to label Nenets as type II language(s), although not being entirely sure whether the animacy of the theme is a decisive factor within the given typology. A severe classification problem arises when deciding between type Ia (single copula verb) and type Ib (single locative verb) since most Samoyedic languages adhere to type Ia in affirmative locative clauses but to type Ib in negative locative clauses. Based on the existing descriptions of the typology, there is no solution but to acknowledge this split for Samoyedic languages. Finally, Selkup could possibly be classified as a type II language according to Ameka & Levinson (2007) if further research underlines that posture verbs like *mta-* 'to sit' are indeed regularly used as copula elements in locative clauses.

---

[7] The grammaticalization of dynamic verbs such as ‑to do, ‑to make or ‑to build to copula verbs is well attested cross-linguistically (Stassen 1997: 92‑93); from a Samoyedic point of view, the Kamas verb *m -* (Joki 1944: 40) may be a case point, too. Since the latter item does not occur in locative predications, it is not discussed further here.

Table 3 summarizes the typological classification of locative predication in the Samoyedic languages. For the sake of comprehensiveness, only the most frequent and salient patterns are included, leaving aside, e.g. the marginal zero copula in Selkup.

Language	Stassen (1997)	Ameka & Levinson (2007)
Nenets	affirmative: nominal & locational negative: locational	affirmative: type II negative: type Ib
Forest Enets	affirmative: nominal & locational negative: nominal & locational	affirmative: type Ia ~ Ib negative: type Ia ~ Ib
Tundra Enets	affirmative: nominal negative: nominal & locational	affirmative: type Ia negative: type Ia ~ Ib
Nganasan	affirmative: nominal (& locational & verbal) negative: nominal & locational	affirmative: type Ia (~ Ib ~ 0) negative: type Ia ~ Ib
Selkup	affirmative: nominal (locational (?)) negative: locational	affirmative: type Ia (type II (?)) negative: type Ib
Kamas	affirmative: nominal negative: locational	affirmative: type Ia negative: type Ib

Table 3: Typological classification of locative predication in the Samoyedic languages

4. Conclusion and further outlook

The paper at hand investigated the linguistic expression of locative predication in the Samoyedic languages and tried to evaluate the emerging patterns against a typo-logically informed background. As was already described before, the prototypical split in the expression of locative predication in Samoyedic languages is in the polarity of the corresponding locative clause. A copula verb is used in affirmative clauses, where-as negative clauses exhibit a negative existential verb (or particle). Since most of the copula verbs used in affirmative clauses (except for TN *me-* and Nganasan *tˈi-*) can be traced back to the same Proto-Samoyedic item, whose successor forms are used in predicate nominals/adjectives as well, this pattern can best be classified as adhering to the nominal strategy according to Stassen (1997) and representing type Ia according to Ameka & Levinson (2007). The functional division of two suppletive stem variants (*ŋ-* and *a-*) in Forest Enets deserves special attention since it may challenge Stassen's (1997) underlying assumption that the locative interpretation of a verbal copula is primary against semantically empty counterparts. When contrasting Forest Enets *a-* to the items in other Samoyedic languages, it appears more plausible to assume its locative semantics to be a relatively recent, functionally motivated innovation than an archaism. Additionally, the apparent polarity split within the encoding of locative clauses in all Samoyedic languages may be of value for further typological research since polarity – in contrast to person, number and tense – has not been included yet as a relevant parameter in the discussed typological approaches.

On the typology of locative predication in Samoyedic languages

As a proposal and an outlook for further similar research, I would like to propose another typological classification for locative predications, which solely relies on the formal encoding of the linking element between location and theme and refrains from taking into account the (diachronic) semantics of an overt copula element.

Type	Properties	Example
I	verbal endings directly attached to the predicate expressing the location	Erzya *vel'e-s-an* 'village-INE-1SG'
II	zero copula	Russian *On v Moskve.* 'He [is] in Moscow.'
IIIa	overt non-verbal copula	Nganasan *d'a ku* 'there is not'
IIIb	overt verbal, semantically empty copula	Kamas *i-* 'to be'
IIIc	overt verbal, semantically filled copula, including posture verbs	TN *me-* 'to be at' (of animates)

Table 4: A proposed typology of locative predication

It is evident that only a few languages can be classified into one type of this classification, but this is apparently the rule rather than the exception in syntactic typology. As long as morphosyntactic parameters (e.g. person and number of the theme; tense or mood of the predicate; polarity of the clause) can be detected as driving factors for an eventual split, this does not pose a problem for the typology itself. However, I have to admit that this attempt based on the Samoyedic languages indeed has to be validated, taking into account a representative sample of languages and the respective encoding of locative predications. Nevertheless, I think that a strictly synchronic approach to the typology of locative predication is most felicitous since it does not have to cope with the diachronically oriented discussion of the origin of copula elements. Such discussions are valuable and essential in general but not crucial for the encoding pattern itself. Whether or not, e.g. Kamas *i-* can be traced back to a locative copula verb does not change its synchronic behaviour in any way. Consequently, it should not be included in a typological classification from my point of view.

To sum up, I think — not only in the domain of locative predication — that the Samoyedic languages may provide valuable material for developing or refining typological classifications and generalizing conclusions drawn from them. Coming back to the occasion of this paper, it should be emphasized that the jubilarian's extensive work on the description and understanding of the Samoyedic languages contributed to a great extent to the possibility of conducting studies like the present one and certainly will be of great value for upcoming generations of researchers as well.

ABBREVIATIONS

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ACT	action noun
ADV	adverb
AOR	aorist
AUG	augmentative
AUX	auxiliary
CNG	connegative
CO	co-affix
COND	conditional
COR	coordinative
DU	dual
EMPH	emphasis
EP	epenthesis
FE	Forest Enets
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
HAB	habitual
INE	inessive
ITER	iterative
LOC	locative
NEG	negative
NEG.EX	negative existential
SG	singular
PFU	Proto-Finno-Ugric
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
PL	plural
POSS	possessive suffix
PPF	past perfect
PRO	pronoun
PROL	prolative
PS	Proto-Samoyedic
PST	past
TN	Tundra Nenets
VOL	volitive

On the typology of locative predication in Samoyedic languages

REFERENCES

Ameka, Felix K. & Levinson, Stephen C. 2007: *Introduction: The typology and semantics of locative predicates: posturals, positionals, and other beasts. – Linguistics* 45(5/6). 847–871.

Bentley, Delia & Ciconte, Francesco Maria & Cruschina, Silvio 2015: *Existentials and locatives in Romance dialects of Italy.* Oxford: Oxford Scholarship Online. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198745266.001.0001>

Brykina, Maria & Gusev, Valentin & Szeverényi, Sándor & Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2018: *Nganasan Spoken Language Corpus (NSLC).* Version 0.2. <http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-C6F2-8>

Brykina, Maria & Orlova, Svetlana & Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2020: *INEL Selkup Corpus.* Version 1.0. <http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-E1D5-A>. – Wagner-Nagy, Beáta & Arkhipov, Alexandre & Ferger, Anne & Jettka, Daniel & Lehmberg, Timm (eds.): *The INEL corpora of indigenous Northern Eurasian languages.*

Budzisch, Josefina 2017: *Locative, existential and possessive sentences in Selkup dialects. – Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 41. 45–61.

Budzisch, Josefina & Harder, Anja Harder & Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2019: *Selkup Language Corpus (SLC).* Version 1.0.0. <http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-D009-4>

Creissels, Denis 2014: *Existential predication in typological perspective.* Unpublished working Paper. <http://www.deniscreissels.fr/public/Creissels-Exist.Pred.pdf 03.01.2021>

Däbritz, Chris Lasse 2021: *Topik, Fokus und Informationsstatus: Modellierung am Material nordwestsibirischer Sprachen.* Language, Context and Cognition 17. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.

Freeze, Ray 1992: *Existentials and other locatives. – Language* 68(3). 553–595.

Gusev, Valentin & Klooster, Tiina & Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2019: *INEL Kamas Corpus.* Version 1.0. <http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-DA6E-9> – Wagner-Nagy, Beáta & Arkhipov, Alexandre & Ferger, Anne & Jettka, Daniel & Lehmberg, Timm (eds.): *The INEL corpora of indigenous Northern Eurasian languages.*

Janhunen, Juha 1977: *Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemeinsamojedische Etymologien.* Castreni-anumin toimitteita 17. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Joki, Aulis 1944: *Kai Donners Kamassisches Wörterbuch nebst Sprachproben und Hauptzügen der Grammatik.* Edited by Aulis Joki. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae VIII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Lyons, John 1967: *A note on possessive, existential and locative sentences. – Foundations of language* 3(4). 390–396.

Khanina, Olesya & Shluinsky, Andrey (in preparation): *Digital corpus of Enets.* Unpublished corpus.

Nikolaeva, Irina 2014: *A grammar of Tundra Nenets.* Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.

Nikolaeva, Irina & Garrett, Edward & Bond, Oliver 2019: *Endangered Languages and Cultures of Siberia.* <www.siberianlanguages.surrey.ac.uk 06.05.2021>

Payne, Thomas E. 1997: *Describing morphosyntax. A guide for field linguists.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siegl, Florian 2013: *Materials on Forest Enets. An indigenous language of Northern Siberia.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 267.

Siegl, Florian 2015: Negation in Forest Enets. – Miestamo, Matti & Tamm, Anne & Wagner-Nagy, Beáta (eds.): *Negation in Uralic languages. Typological Studies in Language* 108. 45–73. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stassen, Leon 1997: *Intransitive predication.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chris Lasse Däbritz

Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2011: *On the typology of negation in Ob-Ugric and Samoyedic languages.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 262.

Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2016: *Existentials, Possessives and Definiteness in Samoyedic Languages.* – Fischer, Susann & Kupisch, Tanja & Rinke, Esther (eds.): *Definiteness Effects: Bilingual, Typological and Diachronic Variation.* 213–243. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2019: *A grammar of Nganasan.* Leiden: Brill.