

Stative verbs vs. nouns in Sateré-Mawé and the Tupian family

Sérgio Meira
Leiden University / KNAW
Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi

1 Introduction¹

Mawé (or Sateré-Mawé) is a Tupian language with approximately 5,000 speakers living mostly along the Marau and Andirá rivers in the states of Amazonas and Pará, in Brazil. Several studies have already sketched analyses of aspects of Mawé morphosyntax: Graham *et al.* (1984), Rodrigues & Dietrich (1997, based on data from Graham *et al.* 1984), and, more recently, Franceschini (1999, 2002).

The present study concentrates on the topic of the so-called **stative verbs** and their morphosyntactic properties. This topic has been discussed in the literature, though not in much detail. Graham *et al.* (1984: 188) mention

¹ There are different Mawé orthographies currently in use; the transcription used here basically adopts the most widespread orthographic features, with the exception of long vowels, usually either left unmarked or written as vowels with a macron (e.g., [su:] ‘blood’, written as *su* or *sū*), and here transcribed as sequences of identical vowels (*suu*). Symbols that deviate from IPA usage are *y* [i̠], *ḡ* [ŋ], *r* [r̠], *j* [j̠], and ‘[ʔ]’ (frequently realized as laryngealization of the surrounding vowels). Stress falls usually on the last syllable. The data in this paper were gathered in four field trips to the Mawé-speaking area in 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004, financed by the Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, the Netherlands, the Netherlands Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW), and the DoBeS (*Dokumentation bedrohter Sprachen*) program of the Volkswagen Foundation. Language names with final stress are written with acute accent: Mawé, Awetí, etc., following a convention normally used in Brazil. The abbreviations used in the glosses are: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, 3R = third person possessive or coreferential, A = agent of transitive verb, ARG = argumentative (case), AUX = auxiliary, CAU = causative, CL = class marker, COM = comitative, COP = copula, DECL = declarative, DEIC = deictic, DES = desiderative, ESS = essive, EX = existential, FOC = focus, FUT = future, IMPERF = imperfective, LOC = locative, N = noun, NEG = negative particle, NFUT = non-future, NP = noun phrase, NUC = nuclear (case), NOM = nominalizer, O = patient of transitive verb, OBL = oblique, PARTC = participle, PE = plural exclusive, PI = plural inclusive, PL = plural, POS = possessive, PROG = progressive, PRTCPL = participle, PST = (nominal) past, Q = question marker, REC = reciprocal, RED = reduplication, S = subject of intransitive verb, SG = singular, and TAM = tense-aspect-mood.

“verbos descritivos” (‘descriptive verbs’), and Franceschini discusses “verbes d’état” (1999: 96-106) or “verbos de estado” (2002), i.e., ‘state verbs’. Rodrigues & Dietrich, on the other hand, implicitly analyze the words in question as nouns (1997: 293, *passim*). The main goal of the present study is to discuss the properties of these “stative words” (a more neutral term) and compare their analyses as verbs and as nouns. A second goal is to compare the situation in Mawé to what has already been described for a number of other languages in the Tupí-Guaraní sub-branch of the Tupian family, in which a similar set of stative words have also been variously analyzed as verbs and as nouns. It will be seen that the phenomenon is exactly the same in Mawé. The same pattern is also found in Awetí, but not in other Tupian languages; this fact may lend support to Rodrigues’ hypothesis that Mawé, Awetí, and the Tupí-Guaraní languages form a genetic subgroup within the Tupian family (for which one might propose the name ‘Mawetí-Guaraní’).²

In §2, person marking on nouns and verbs is described in detail; stative words are initially presented as a subclass of verbs. The morphosyntactic similarities between stative words and nouns are the topic of §3. A review of the similar situation in Tupí-Guaraní languages and in Awetí is then given in §4, followed in §5 by a short comparison with some other Tupian languages. §6 contains a conclusion, with a short discussion of some consequences of stative words for the status of the verb-noun distinction in Tupian (or at least Mawetí-Guaraní) languages.

2 Person marking.

Mawé, like most Tupí languages, distinguishes first person (1), second person (2), third person (3), first person plural inclusive (1PI), first person plural exclusive (1PE), second person plural (2PL), and third person plural (3PL). For each distinction, there is at least one pronoun (there are several for the third person, with various demonstrative or anaphoric values) and two person markers, forming two distinct sets. Table 1 gives an overview of all pronouns and person markers. On possessed nouns, there is an additional coreferential (or ‘reflexive possessive’) prefix *to-*, *tuw-* ‘3R’, which indicates that the (third-person) possessor is the subject of the clause (‘s/he...his/her own N’; cf. Latin *suus*, Swedish *sin*, Esperanto *sia*).

² This name first came up in a conversation between Sebastian Drude and me, during a Comparative Tupí Meeting in Belém (Brazil).

Table 1. Mawé person markers: pronouns and prefixes.

	PRONOUNS	SET I	SET II
1	<i>uito</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>u-</i>
2	<i>en</i>	<i>e-</i>	<i>e-</i>
3	<i>mi'i, ...</i>	∅-	∅-
1PI	<i>aito</i>	<i>waa-</i>	<i>a-</i>
2PL	<i>eipe</i>	<i>ewe-</i>	<i>e-</i>
1PE	<i>uruto</i>	<i>uru-</i>	<i>uru-</i>
3PL	<i>mi'i-ria, ...</i>	(several)	<i>i'atu</i>

Set II markers (plus *to-* '3R') are used on nouns to refer to their possessor. There are at least three noun classes, defined by an intermediate element between the prefix and the stem: the *i-*, *h-*, and *he-* classes, exemplified in (1) below. In the case of the *h-* class, the intermediate element may be analyzed as a part of the stem; notice that *et* 'name' never occurs without this element, even in the unpossessed form *s-et* 'name', while *kyse* 'knife' does often occur without (*h*)*e-*. Similar elements in Tupí-Guaraní languages have been called relational prefixes (cf. e.g., Jensen 1998); in the Mawé case, an analysis involving stem-initial alternations (*het* ~ *set*) seems preferable.³ With respect to semantics, the *he-* class tends to contain alienable nouns (e.g., instruments and artifacts), while the other two classes contain mostly inalienable nouns (e.g., body parts and kinship terms). There are, however, significant exceptions: e.g., *u-i-pory'a* 'my arrow', in the *i-* class, or *u-he-hary'i* 'my wife', in the *he-* class. There are several irregularities: most *i-* class nasal-initial nouns denasalize their initial consonant when possessed (*mu'aap* 'path', *u-i-pu'aap* 'my path'; *ǵo* 'field, garden', *u-i-ko* 'my field, garden'); *h-* class nouns with a nasal vowel alternate *h* with *j* ([j] in this context) instead of *s* (*u-h-ãi* 'my tooth', *e-j-ãi* [eɲãj] 'your tooth'). There are also some cases of suppletion (*ǵetap* 'house', *u-i-'yaat* 'my house').

³ Denny Moore (p.c.) suggests that the Tupí-Guaraní relational prefixes may be the reflex of this kind of stem-initial alternations (in case they are reconstructible to Proto-Tupí), with one of the alternants having lost its initial consonant. This hypothesis is currently being examined.

(1) Examples of person markers on nouns.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. <u>ty</u> ‘mother’ (<i>i</i> -class) | b. <u>et</u> ‘name’ (<i>h</i> -class) |
| <i>u-i-</i> ty ‘my mother’ | <i>u- h- et</i> ‘my name’ |
| <i>e-</i> ty ‘your mother’ | <i>e- s- et</i> ‘your name’ |
| <i>i-</i> ty ‘his/her mother’ | <i>h- et</i> ‘his/her name’ |
| <i>a-i-</i> ty ‘our (PI) mother’ | <i>a- h- et</i> ‘our (PI) name’ |
| <i>e-i-</i> ty ‘your (P) mother’ | <i>e- h- et</i> ‘your (P) name’ |
| <i>uru-</i> ty ‘our (PE) mother’ | <i>uru- s- et</i> ‘our (PE) name’ |
| <i>i’atu-</i> ty ‘their mother’ | <i>i’atu- s- et</i> ‘their name’ |
| <i>Maria</i> ty ‘Maria’s mother’ | <i>Maria</i> s- et ‘Maria’s name’ |
| <i>to-</i> ty ‘his/her own mother’ | <i>to- s- et</i> ‘his/her own name’ |
- c. kyse ‘knife’ (*he*-class)
- | |
|--|
| <i>u- he-</i> kyse ‘my knife’ |
| <i>e- e-</i> kyse ‘your knife’ |
| <i>he-</i> kyse ‘his/her knife’ |
| <i>a- he-</i> kyse ‘our (PI) knife’ |
| <i>e- he-</i> kyse ‘your (P) knife’ |
| <i>uru- e-</i> kyse ‘our (PE) knife’ |
| <i>i’atu- e-</i> kyse ‘their knife’ |
| <i>Maria</i> e- kyse ‘Maria’s knife’ |
| <i>tuw- e-</i> kyse ‘his/her own knife’ ⁴ |

Postpositions, like nouns, also take Set II markers (e.g., the *he*-class *u-he-pe* ‘to/for me’, or the *i*-class *u-i-tote* ‘on top of me’). Notice that the 1PE and 3PL markers *uru* and *i’atu* parallel free NP possessors like *Maria*; they were probably independent words at some point in the past.

Transitive verbs have two participant arguments, here termed A and O (following Dixon 1994). The two person-marking sets are used to identify these participants. Instead of co-occurring, the sets form two distinct paradigms: the A-conjugation, in which Set I markers indicate the A participant and the O participant is a third person (‘I → him/her/it’, ‘you → him/her/it’, etc.), and the O-conjugation, in which Set II markers indicate the O participant and the A participant is a third person (‘s/he/it → me’, ‘s/he/it → you’, etc.). There is a special prefix *mor(o)-* ‘1A2O’ for the ‘I → you’ situation (its reverse, ‘you → me’, has no specific prefix; it is expressed with the 1O form preceded by the second-person pronoun *en* ‘you’). When both partici-

⁴ The form *t-ee-kyse* ‘his/her own knife’ is apparently in free variation with *tuw-e-kyse*.

pants are third persons, there are special forms to indicate whether the preceding nominal refers to the A or to the O participant (and also a *to-* ‘3A’ form, in which the prefix plays the role of an explicit third-person A participant, so that only O nominals co-occur with it; the pronoun ‘s/he’ in the gloss is meant to indicate that).

(2) Examples of person markers on transitive verbs.

a. *muu’e* ‘teach O’ (*ti*-class)

<u>A-conjugation</u>	<u>O-conjugation</u>
<i>a- ti- muu’e</i> ‘I teach O’	<i>u- i- muu’e</i> ‘A teaches me’
<i>e- ti- muu’e</i> ‘you teach O’	<i>e- muu’e</i> ‘A teaches you’
<i>waa- ti- muu’e</i> ‘we.PI teach O’	<i>a- i- muu’e</i> ‘A teaches us.PI’
<i>ewe- i- muu’e</i> ‘you.PL teach O’	<i>e- i- muu’e</i> ‘A teaches you.PL’
<i>uru- i- muu’e</i> ‘we.PE teach O’	<i>uru- muu’e</i> ‘A teaches us.PE’
<i>ta’atu- muu’e</i> ‘they teach O’	<i>i’atu- muu’e</i> ‘A teaches them’
<i>Maria ti- muu’e</i> ‘Maria teaches O’	<i>Maria muu’e</i> ‘A teaches Maria’
<i>to- i- muu’e</i> ‘s/he teaches O’	
<i>moro- muu’e</i>	‘I teach you’
<i>en u-i- muu’e</i>	‘you teach me’

b. *enoi* ‘tell about O’ (*h*-class)

<u>A-conjugation</u>	<u>O-conjugation</u>
<i>a- h- enoi</i> ‘I tell about O’	<i>u- h- enoi</i> ‘A tells about me’
<i>e- h- enoi</i> ‘you tell about O’	<i>e- enoi</i> ‘A tells about you’
<i>waa- h- enoi</i> ‘we.PI tell about O’	<i>a- h- enoi</i> ‘A tells about us.PI’
<i>ewe- h- enoi</i> ‘you.PL tell about O’	<i>e- h- enoi</i> ‘A tells about you.PL’
<i>uru- h- enoi</i> ‘we.PE tell about O’	<i>uru- enoi</i> ‘A tells about us.PE’
<i>ta’atu- h- enoi</i> ‘they tell about O’	<i>i’atu- enoi</i> ‘A tells about them’
<i>Maria h- enoi</i> ‘Maria tells about O’	<i>Maria enoi</i> ‘A tells about Maria’
<i>to- h- enoi</i> ‘s/he tells about O’	
<i>mor- enoi</i>	‘I tell about you’
<i>en u-h- enoi</i>	‘you tell about me’

As was the case with nouns, there are different stem classes identified by an element that occurs between the person markers and the stem. In the *ti*-class (2a above), this element is *ti-* ~ *i-* in the A-conjugation and *i-* ~ \emptyset - in the O-conjugation.⁵ These elements can be seen as markers of third-person O and

⁵ Graham *et al.* (1984: 178) report that *ti-* occurs also in the 2PL, 1PE and 3 forms (*ewe-ti-*, *uru-ti-*, *to-ti-*) in the speech of older people and in conservative discourse

A participants, respectively. In the *h*-class (2b above), the intermediate element is *h*- in both conjugations, with some gaps in the O-conjugation. Interestingly, the *h*- disappears when there is a preceding O nominal, as if the nominal had occupied its structural position. This suggests that there is still some connection between this intermediate element and the marking of a third-person O participant. Given, however, the *h*-’s in most O-conjugation forms, this connection is synchronically far from obvious, which makes it difficult to analyze this element as a 3O marker.

Intransitive verbs appear to fall into two major classes: the ‘active’ or *re*-class (termed “middle” in Franceschini 1999: 94, 145-158), and the ‘stative’ class (“descriptive” in Graham *et al.* 1984: 188). These classes are identified (a) by an intermediate element, *re* for active verbs, and *i*, *h* or *he* for stative verbs (i.e., there are three stative subclasses), and (b) by the person markers: Set I occurs on active verbs, and Set II on stative verbs. Note that there are many irregularities in the active class: the intermediate element is *re* for the first and second person, but *to* ~ *tu* in the third person and in the 1PI and 1PE forms, *ro* in the 3PL form, and *i* in the 2PL form. Most active verbs are synchronically or historically reflexives, which is indicated by the reflexive morpheme *we*-; compare *muu’e* ‘teach O’, from (2) above, with *we-muu’e* ‘study’, an active verb which follows the paradigm of *put* ‘run’ in (3b).⁶

Given the distribution of person-marking sets (Set I marks A on transitive verbs and the subject (S) on active intransitive verbs, while Set II marks O on transitive verbs and S on stative intransitive verbs), it is easy to come to the conclusion that Mawé has a typical ‘active-stative’ system (Mithun 1991). Set I and Set II could then be renamed ‘active’ and ‘stative’ person markers. For the subjects of verbs of the two intransitive classes, the labels *S_A* and *S_O* (from Dixon 1994) could also be used. A semantic basis for the system also seems to exist: Mawé stative verbs usually denote states (*kahu* ‘be pretty’, *wato* ‘be big’, *hup* ‘be red’, etc.). In fact, most traditional adjectival meanings correspond to stative verbs in Mawé.

genres. In the data used for this paper, this phenomenon was occasionally observed with *uru*-, and, more frequently and more unexpectedly, with a preceding A nominal: *Sérgio ti-wenka* ~ *Sérgio i-wenka* ‘Sérgio invited him/her’. This *ti*- ~ *i*- variation suggests ongoing change.

⁶ The occasional occurrence of long-vowel variants of the first- and second-person forms (*a-re-put* ~ *a-ree-put*, *e-re-put* ~ *e-ree-put*) suggests the earlier presence of the *we*- prefix (**a-re-we-put* > *a-ree-put* ~ *a-re-put*). An alternation between the *we*- prefix and a long vowel occurs in the other persons: *tuwe-put* ~ *tee-put*, *wa-tuwe-put* ~ *wa-tee-put*, *uru-tuwe-put* ~ *uru-tee-put*, *te’e-ruwe-put* ~ *te’e-ree-put*; notice also the alternation *ewe-iwe-put* ~ *eiwe-put* (also *ewe-he-put*).

(3) Examples of person markers on intransitive verbs

a.	<u>ket</u> ‘sleep’ (re-class)	b.	<u>put</u> ‘run’ (re-class)
	<i>a-</i> <i>re-</i> <i>ket</i> ‘I sleep’		<i>a-</i> <i>re(e)-</i> <i>put</i> ‘I run’
	<i>e-</i> <i>re-</i> <i>ket</i> ‘you sleep’		<i>e-</i> <i>re(e)-</i> <i>put</i> ‘you run’
	<i>to-</i> <i>ket</i> ‘s/he sleeps’		<i>tuwe-</i> <i>put</i> ‘s/he runs’
	<i>waa-</i> <i>to-</i> <i>ket</i> ‘we.PI sleep’		<i>waa-</i> <i>tuwe-</i> <i>put</i> ‘we.PI run’
	<i>uru-</i> <i>to-</i> <i>ket</i> ‘we.PE sleep’		<i>uru-</i> <i>tuwe-</i> <i>put</i> ‘we.PE run’
	<i>ewe-</i> <i>i-</i> <i>ket</i> ‘you.PL sleep’		<i>ewe-</i> <i>iwe-</i> <i>put</i> ‘you.PL run’ ⁷
	<i>te’e-</i> <i>ro-</i> <i>ket</i> ‘they sleep’		<i>te’e-</i> <i>ruwe-</i> <i>put</i> ‘they run’
	<i>Maria</i> <i>to-</i> <i>ket</i> ‘Maria sleeps’		<i>Maria</i> <i>tuwe-</i> <i>put</i> ‘Maria runs’
c.	<u>to</u> ‘go’ (re-class)	d.	<u>kahu</u> ‘be pretty’ (i-class) ⁸
	<i>a-</i> <i>re-</i> <i>to</i> ‘I go’		<i>u-</i> <i>i-</i> <i>kahu</i> ‘I am pretty’
	<i>e-</i> <i>re-</i> <i>to</i> ‘you go’		<i>e-</i> <i>kahu</i> ‘you are pretty’
	<i>to-</i> <i>to</i> ‘s/he goes’		<i>i-</i> <i>kahu</i> ‘s/he is pretty’
	<i>waa-</i> <i>tu-</i> <i>wat</i> ‘we.PI go’ ⁹		<i>a-</i> <i>i-</i> <i>kahu</i> ‘we.PI are pretty’
	<i>uru-</i> <i>tu-</i> <i>wat</i> ‘we.PE go’		<i>e-</i> <i>i-</i> <i>kahu</i> ‘you.PL are pretty’
	<i>ewe-</i> <i>i-</i> <i>wat</i> ‘you.PL go’		<i>uru-</i> <i>kahu</i> ‘we.PE are pretty’
	<i>tu-</i> <i>wat</i> ‘they go’		<i>ia’atu-</i> <i>kahu</i> ‘they are pretty’
	<i>Maria</i> <i>to-</i> <i>to</i> ‘Maria goes’		<i>Maria</i> <i>i-</i> <i>kahu</i> ‘Maria is pretty’

⁷ A variant form *ewe-he(e)-put* is also attested; one speaker preferred it to *ewe-iwe-put*.

⁸ Franceschini (1999: 106) mentions an additional third-person *to*-form (e.g., *to-kahu* ‘s/he is pretty’). In the data used for this paper, this form did not occur as an independent main clause predicate, but only in subordinate contexts (e.g., *to-kahu hap* ‘something for his/her beauty, for making him/her beautiful’, ‘cosmetics’).

⁹ Also *waa-to* ‘we (dual) go’ = ‘the two of us go’, ‘you and I go’. This suggests that the 1PI category is actually dual (‘you.SG and I’), but this can only be seen with verbs that have suppletive plural stems. This topic needs further research.

e.	<u>eera</u> ‘be tired’ (<i>h</i> -class) ¹⁰	f.	<u>hay</u> ‘talk’ (<i>he</i> -class) ¹¹
	<i>u-</i> <i>h-</i> <i>eera</i> ‘I am tired’		<i>u-</i> <i>he-</i> <i>hay</i> ‘I talk’
	<i>e-</i> <i>s-</i> <i>eera</i> ‘you are tired’		<i>e-</i> <i>e-</i> <i>hay</i> ‘you talk’
	<i>h-</i> <i>eera</i> ‘s/he is tired’		<i>i-</i> <i>hay</i> ‘s/he talks’
	<i>a-</i> <i>h-</i> <i>eera</i> ‘we.PI are tired’		<i>a-</i> <i>he-</i> <i>hay</i> ‘we.PI talk’
	<i>e-</i> <i>h-</i> <i>eera</i> ‘you.PL are tired’		<i>e-</i> <i>he-</i> <i>hay</i> ‘you.PL talk’
	<i>uru-</i> <i>s-</i> <i>eera</i> ‘we.PE are tired’		<i>uru-</i> <i>e-</i> <i>hay</i> ‘we.PE talk’
	<i>ia’atu-</i> <i>s-</i> <i>eera</i> ‘they are tired’		<i>ia’atu</i> <i>e-</i> <i>hay</i> ‘they talk’
	<i>Maria</i> <i>h-</i> <i>eera</i> ‘Maria is tired’		<i>Maria</i> <i>he-</i> <i>hay</i> ‘Maria talks’

3 Stative verbs and nouns: a closer look.

One striking fact about Mawé stative verbs is their morphological similarity to (possessed) nouns. The three subclasses of both groups are virtually identical, as can be seen by comparing (3d-f) and (1). Even irregularities such as the *m* ~ *p* alternation between possessed and non-possessed forms of certain *i*-class nouns can also be found among stative verbs (e.g., *motpaap* ‘work’, *u-i-potpaap* ‘I work’). So far, the only apparent difference is the occurrence of a third-person form after a subject nominal with stative verbs (*Maria i-kahu* ‘Maria is pretty’), while possessed nouns with an explicit nominal possessor occur in a prefixless form (*Maria ty* ‘Maria’s mother’). Consider, however, the examples in (4):

- (4) Comparing examples of stative verbs (a-b, e-f, i-j) and nouns (c-d, g-h, k-l)
- | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| a. | <i>Maria</i> <i>potpaap</i>
Maria work
‘Maria’s work’ | b. | <i>Maria</i> <i>i-potpaap</i>
Maria 3:CL-work
‘Maria works.’ |
| c. | <i>Maria</i> <i>pohaḡ</i>
Maria medicine
‘Maria’s medicine.’ | d. | <i>Maria</i> <i>i-pohaḡ</i>
Maria 3:CL-medicine
‘Maria has medicine.’ |
| e. | <i>Maria</i> <i>s-eera</i>
Maria CL-be.tired
‘Maria’s tiredness.’ | f. | <i>Maria</i> <i>h-eera</i>
Maria 3:CL-be.tired
‘Maria is tired.’ |

¹⁰ There is variation in the last vowel of this stem: *eera* ~ *eero*. Graham *et al.* (1984: 188) has *ero*.

¹¹ The form *i-hay* occurred in the data on which this paper is based. Franceschini (1999: 104) reports an additional more regular third-person *he*-form (in this case, *he-hay*), apparently in free variation with the *i*-form. In the data on which this paper is based, *he-hay* occurred only with a preceding subject NP. Further research is clearly necessary here.

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| g. | <i>Maria s-et</i>
Maria CL-name
'Maria's name.' | h. | <i>Maria h-et</i>
Maria 3:CL-name
'Maria has a name.' |
| i. | <i>Maria e-hay</i>
Maria CL-talk
'Maria's talk.' | j. | <i>Maria he-hay</i>
Maria 3:CL-talk
'Maria talks.' |
| k. | <i>Maria e-kyse</i>
Maria CL-knife
'Maria's knife.' | l. | <i>Maria he-kyse</i>
Maria 3:CL-knife
'Maria has a knife.' |

The above examples show a remarkable parallelism between nouns and stative verbs: members of both groups can occur in a prefixless 'possessed' form with a preceding 'possessor', and in a third-person prefixed form as a predicate. These two situations are distinct only for the third person: the other person-marked forms in (1) are ambiguous between simple possessive phrases ('my mother', 'your name', 'our knife') and possessive predicates ('I have a mother', 'you have a name', 'we have a knife / knives').¹² With stative verbs, along with the possessive translation ('Maria's tiredness'), there is a more common translation as a modifier ('tired Maria'); cf. (5) below, which can be compared to the examples in (4).

(5) Examples of stative verbs as modifiers.

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| a. | <i>aware wato</i>
dog be.big
'the big dog' | b. | <i>aware i-wato</i>
dog 3:CL-be.big
'The dog is big.' |
| c. | <i>waipaka hup</i>
chicken be.red
'the red chicken' | d. | <i>waipaka i-hup</i>
chicken 3:CL-be.red
'The chicken is red.' |

The above parallelism between nouns and stative verbs becomes even more striking when the causative prefix *mo-* is taken into consideration. It occurs on verbs, and also on possessed nouns (6).

¹² There is, in addition to the simple forms in (1), another possessive predicate construction, involving an existential verb *toĩ*: e.g., *toĩ suu* 'there is blood (on something)', from *suu* 'blood', and *Maria toĩ i-pohaḡ* 'Maria has medicine'. The latter is, as far as could be ascertained, equivalent to, though less frequent than, the simpler *Maria i-pohaḡ* 'Maria has medicine'.

(6) The causative suffix *mo-* on verbs (a-d) and nouns (e-f: *i*-class; g-h: *he*-class).

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|
| a. | <i>a-re-ket</i>
1-CL-sleep
'I sleep.' | b. | <i>a-ti-mo-ket</i>
1A-CL-CAU-sleep
'I make him/her sleep.' |
| c. | <i>u-i-'ahuu</i>
1-CL-be.ill
'I am ill.' | d. | <i>a-ti-mo-'ahuu</i>
1A-CL-CAU-be.ill
'I made him/her be ill.' |
| e. | <i>u-i-pory'a</i>
1-CL-arrow
'My arrow.'; 'I have an arrow.' | f. | <i>a-ti-mo-pory'a</i> <i>hirokat</i>
1A-CL-CAU-arrow child
'I make the child have an arrow.' |
| g. | <i>Maria e-sokpe</i>
Maria CL-clothes
'Maria's clothes.' | h. | <i>uru-i-mo-e-sokpe</i>
1PE.A-CL-CAU-CL-clothes
'We (PE) make him/her have clothes.' |

Notice also the parallel behavior in negative clauses. Given that negation is often marked with two elements around the predicate, the negative examples also suggest that a possessed nominal and its possessor form a single phrase, while a possessive clause or stative verb clause actually contain two constituents: a noun phrase playing the role of the subject, and a verb phrase functioning as the predicate (7a-d). The other verbal examples (7g-j) illustrate the fact negation works similarly for all predicates.

(7) Negative nominal (a-d) and verbal (stative: e-f; active: g-h; transitive: i-j) clauses.

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| a. | <i>Maria pohaḡ</i>
Maria medicine
'Maria's medicine' | b. | <i>yt¹³ Maria pohaḡ 'i</i>
NEG Maria medicine NEG
'It isn't Maria's medicine.' |
| c. | <i>Maria i-pohaḡ</i>
Maria 3:CL-medicine
'Maria has medicine.' | d. | <i>Maria yt i-pohaḡ 'i</i>
Maria NEG 3:CL-medicine NEG
'Maria doesn't have medicine.' |
| e. | <i>aware i-wato</i>
Maria 3:CL-be.big
'The dog is big.' | f. | <i>aware yt i-wato 'i</i>
dog NEG 3:CL-be.big NEG
'The dog isn't big.' |

¹³ Sometimes with a long vowel: *yt* ~ *yyt*.

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|--|
| g. | <i>to-'e</i>
3:CL-say
'S/he says.' | h. | <i>yt to-'e 'i</i>
NEG 3:CL-say NEG
'S/he doesn't say.' |
| i. | <i>a-ti-kuap</i>
1A-CL-know
'I know him/her/it.' | j. | <i>yt a-ti-kuap 'i</i>
NEG 1A-CL-know NEG
'I don't know him/her/it.' |

Tense-aspect distinctions are expressed with particles, not with morphological elements. They do not differentiate verbs from nouns. The completive particle *ra'yn*, for instance, can co-occur with transitive verbs (8a), active intransitive verbs (8b), stative verbs (8c), and nouns (8d).

(8) Verbs (a-c) and nouns (d) with the completive particle *ra'yn*.

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|
| a. | <i>a-tu-'u ra'yn</i>
1A-CL-eat PARTIC
'I've already eaten it.' | b. | <i>a-re-'e ra'yn</i>
1-CL-speak PARTIC
'I've already spoken.' |
| c. | <i>i-wato ra'yn</i>
3:CL-be.big PARTIC
'It's already big.' | d. | <i>Maria i-pohaḡ ra'yn</i>
Maria 3:CL-medicine PARTIC
'Maria already has medicine.' |

4 The situation in Tupí-Guaraní languages

In many languages of the Tupí-Guaraní branch of the Tupian family, a similar situation of almost perfect overlap between 'nouns' and 'stative verbs' has often been noted. Recently, a whole book (Queixalós 2001) was dedicated to this question. The two obvious analyses of stative words – namely, (a) that they are really possessed nouns that can be used predicatively, and (b) that they are stative verbs, a subgroup of the verbal class – have been proposed for different languages.

Seki (2001) champions the verbal analysis for the Kamayurá language. She classifies stative words as a subgroup of verbs (termed 'descriptive verbs'), based on the existence of certain morphemes that are not compatible with both classes. For instance, the case-marking suffixes *-ip* ~ *-im* 'locative', *-(r)am* 'essive', *-a* 'nuclear case', and the nominal past suffix *-(h)et* 'ex-' occur only on nouns. (Final *t* becomes *r* when followed by a vowel.)

(9) Examples of case-marked nouns in Kamayurá (Seki 2000, 2001; glosses mine).

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| a. | <i>ok-ip i-ko-w</i>
house-LOC 3-be-TAM
'He is at home.' | b. | <i>ije rak morerekwar-am</i>
1 PART chief-ESS
'I was (there) as a chief.' |
|----|---|----|---|

- (11) Nouns with and without *-a* in Kamayurá (Seki 2000, 2001; glosses mine)
- a. *kunu'um-a tete rak o-ho ko'yt*
 boy-NUC only PARTC 3-go PARTC
 'Only the boy went.'
- b. *kunu'um-a ka'i-a r-uwaj-a w-ekyj*
 boy-NUC monkey-NUC POS-tail-NUC 3-pull
 'The boy is pulling the tail of the monkey.'
- c. *kara'iw-a pe-ko*
 non.Indian-NUC 2PL-COP
 'You (PL) are non-Indians.'
- d. *je=tutyr-a morerekwar-a*
 1=uncle-NUC chief-NUC
 'My uncle is the chief.'
- e. *je=tutyr-a morerekwat*
 1=uncle-NUC chief
 'My uncle is a chief.'
- f. *je=y*
 1=mother
 'Mother!'
- g. *jawat*
 jaguar
 'jaguar'; 'It's a jaguar.'
- h. *je=pyt*
 1=house
 'It's my house.'; 'I have a house.'
- i. *jawar-a 'aŋ i-memyt*
 jaguar-NUC DEIC 3-son
 'This jaguar has child(ren).'
- j. *a'e-a rak paku-a o-juka, mytũ, jakuaem*
 this-NUC PARTC paca-NUC 3-kill mutum jacu
 'This (man) killed paca, (also) mutum (=curassow), (also) jacu (=bird sp.).'

Seki classifies possessive clauses like (11h-i) as a subtype of descriptive clauses. This seems to imply that predicative possessed nouns are to be seen as descriptive (stative) verbs. This claim, however, is not made explicitly, nor is it clear whether the tests that classify stative stems as verbs (case markers, nominalization with *-(t)ap*) are also valid for predicative possessed nouns like those in (11h-i).

Dietrich (2001) defends the nominal analysis for the Tupí-Guaraní sub-branch, with special emphasis on the Guaranian languages (Paraguayan Guaraní, Chiriguano, Kaiwá, Mbya); Rodrigues (2001) also prefers this analysis for Tupinambá. Both authors stress the defining character of the verbal person-marking prefixes (corresponding to the Mawé Set I): only the stems on which they can occur are verbs. Nouns take other person markers (corresponding to the Mawé Set II). Since stative words take the same person markers as nouns, Dietrich and Rodrigues classify them as nouns, noting that nouns can also be predications. Dietrich thus interprets nouns (12a-b) and stative words (12c) with Set II person markers as implicit existential predications. He further proposes the same interpretation for transitive verbs with Set II markers, analogous to the Mawé O-oriented conjugation in (2): he claims that they also contain implicit existential predications (12d). His conclusion is that only verbs with Set I markers are fully verbal, i.e., describe processes or actions.

(12) Chiriguano (a-c) and Paraguayan Guaraní (d) (Dietrich 2001; glosses mine)

- a. *háe i-wírápa*
 he 3-bow
 ‘(There is) his bow with respect to him.’ = ‘He has a bow.’
- b. *kóa wírápa*
 this bow
 ‘(There is) a bow with respect to this.’ = ‘This is a bow.’
- c. *jánde r-órí*
 1PI POS-joy
 ‘(There is) joy with respect to us.’ = ‘We are happy.’
- d. *che=juhu*
 1=meet/find
 ‘(There was) meeting with respect to me.’ = ‘S/he/they found/met me.’

Rodrigues proposes basically the same analysis for Tupinambá (except for transitive verbs with Set II prefixes, which he apparently does not consider as nominal predicates). Stative words (13c-d) are nouns and can, like all nouns (13a-b), be the heads of verb phrases functioning as nominal predicates. The Kamayurá nuclear case marker *-a* exists also in Tupinambá; Rodrigues calls it the ‘argumentative case’ marker. Note that, unlike Kamayurá, Tupinambá allows case-marking suffixes to occur on stative words (13c), and, in fact, on all verbs (13e-f). Rodrigues’ analysis is simply that, just as

nouns can occur as predicates (i.e., as heads of verb phrases: 13b, d), verbs can occur as arguments (i.e., as heads of noun phrases: 13e-f).

(13) Tupinambá examples (Rodrigues 2001; glosses mine; *v* = IPA [β])

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| a. | <i>sjé re-kúj-a</i>
1 POS-gourd-ARG
'my gourd', 'It's my gourd.' | b. | <i>sjé re-kúj</i>
1 POS-gourd
'I have a gourd / gourds.' |
| c. | <i>sjé r-oráŋ-a</i>
1 POS-joy-ARG
'my joy, happiness' | d. | <i>sjé r-oráŋ</i>
1 POS-joy
'I am happy / joyful.' |
| e. | <i>né kér-a a-j-potár</i>
2 sleep-ARG 1-A-want
'I want your sleep.'
= 'I want you to sleep.' | f. | <i>a-s-epják sjé kér-ipe</i>
1-A-see 1 sleep-LOC
'I saw it in my sleep.'
(= 'in my dreams') |

Thus, Seki's first argument (the impossibility of taking case-marking suffixes) is not true for Tupinambá. It is not known whether the nominal past marker (equivalent to Kamayurá *-(h)et*) and the general nominalizer (equivalent to Kamayurá *-(t)ap*) can also occur on stative stems. It may be that such restrictions vary from language to language in the Tupí-Guaraní sub-branch.

In Mawé, Seki's criteria would not differentiate stative stems from nouns. There are no Mawé equivalents of the Kamayurá nominal case marker *-a* and nominal past marker *-(h)et*. The locative and essive markers (*pe* and *wo* respectively, equivalent to Kamayurá *-ip* and *-am*) can occur on nouns (14a, c) and on stative stems (14b, d).

(14) Mawé examples of locative and essive markers on nouns and on stative stems

- | | |
|----|--|
| a. | <i>u-i-'yaat pe to-ĩ=ne'en</i>
1-CL-house LOC 3:CL-be=PART
'(S/he/it) is in my house.' |
| b. | <i>u-i-kahu pe a-re-ĩ=ne'en</i>
1-CL-pretty LOC 1-CL-be=PART
'I am always pretty.' |
| c. | <i>uito sateré wo teraan</i>
1 Sateré ESS DES
'I want to be a Sateré-Mawé.' |

- d. *u-i-kahu* *wo* *teraan* *u-he-wyry*
 1-CL-pretty ESS DES 1-CL-walk
 ‘I want to walk (being) pretty’, ‘I want to be pretty while/as I walk.’

The action/state nominalizer equivalent to Kamayurá *-(t)ap* is a particle *hap* which changes whole predicates of all kinds into noun phrases (often, like Kamayurá *-(t)ap*, to form subordinate clauses) and thus does not distinguish any of them: transitive verbs (15a), stative stems (15b), nouns (15c), possessed nouns (15d), and possessive predicates (15e).

(15) Examples of the particle *hap* in Mawé.

- a. *a-ti-kuap* *u-he-katu'u* *hap*
 1A-CL-know 1O-CL-bite NOM
 ‘I know that (s/he/it) bit me.’
- b. *a-ti-kuap* *waipaka* *i-hup* *hap*
 1A-CL-know chicken 3:CL-be.red NOM
 ‘I know that the chicken is red.’
- c. *a-ti-kuap* *mohaḡ* *hap*
 1A-CL-know medicine NOM
 ‘I know that (it) is medicine.’
- d. *a-ti-kuap* *Maria* *pohaḡ* *hap*
 1A-CL-know Maria POS:medicine NOM
 ‘I know that (it) is Maria’s medicine.’
- e. *a-ti-kuap* *Maria* *i-pohaḡ* *hap*
 1A-CL-know Maria 3:CL-medicine NOM
 ‘I know that Maria has medicine.’

Table 2 below summarizes the comparison of Kamayurá and Mawé according to Seki’s criteria. The conclusion is that the nominal analysis seems better for Mawé stative stems, while the verbal analysis is preferable for Kamayurá.

Table 2. Seki's criteria in Kamayurá and in Mawé

CRITERIA	KAMAYURÁ		MAWÉ	
	NOUNS	STATIVES	NOUNS	STATIVES
Locative	<i>ok-ip</i> 'in the house'	X	<i>u-i-'yaat pe</i> 'in my house'	<i>u-i-kahu pe</i> 'in my beauty'
Essive	<i>morerekwar-am</i> 'as a chief'	X	<i>satere wo</i> 'as a Sateré'	<i>u-i-kahu wo</i> 'as a pretty one'
Nuclear Case	<i>je r-uw-a</i> 'my father'	X	N/A	N/A
Nominal Past	<i>morerekwar-er-a</i> 'ex-chief'	X	N/A	N/A
Nominalization	X	<i>ne=</i> <i>katu-taw-a</i> 'that you are good'	<i>mohaḡ hap</i> 'that it is medicine'	<i>i-hup hap</i> 'that it is red'

5 The situation in other Tupian languages

Among non-Tupí-Guaraní languages, only Awetí, together with Mawé, has the possibility of using possessed nouns, without any modification, as simple possessive predicates. In other Tupian languages, other constructions, usually with the presence of an auxiliary, are necessary.¹⁴

For Awetí, Drude (2001) proposes a large class of nominals ('Nomina') with two subclasses: nouns ('Substantive') and statives ('statische / adjektivische Verben'). These two subclasses differ only in that statives do not have a third-person coreferential ('reflexive possessive') form, and do not take the third-person prefixes of the female speech variety, while nouns do have a third-person coreferential form (prefix *o-*) and take both male-speech (*nã-*, *n-*) and female-speech (*i-*, *t-*) third-person prefixes. Furthermore, statives cannot be referential expressions without being nominalized (unlike, e.g., the Mawé examples in (14b, d)). With respect to predicative uses, however, possessed nouns can be used, without any changes, as possessive predicates (16a), just like statives (16b). Note that possessive predicates occur in the same negative construction as verbs (16c), and can also take verbal tense-aspect markers (16d). Drude sees possessive predicates as existential (since bare nouns can also be used as existential predicates) and wonders if

¹⁴ There often are also existential constructions involving postpositions like Mundurukú *káŋ* or Gavião *tá*, both meaning 'with': 'there is an axe with me' = 'I have an axe'. These are not considered here.

they exemplify zero-derived existential verbs (morphology) or nominal existential predication (syntax).

(16) Awetí (Drude 2001)

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| a. | <i>i-měpyt</i>
1-child
'my child', 'I have a child' | b. | <i>i-katu</i>
1-be.good
'I am good' |
| c. | <i>an i-měpyr-yka</i>
NEG 1-child-NEG
'I don't have a child.' | d. | <i>i-měpyr-eju</i>
1-child-PROG
'I am pregnant.' |

For Munduruku, Croft (1985: 163) claims that possessed nouns must be reduplicated (with replacement of the final vowel by *e*) in order to become possessive predicates (17b): a simple possessed noun (17a) is only a referential expression ('my firewood'), usable at most as an equative or identificational predicate ('it is my firewood'). Interestingly, reduplicating a non-possessed stem is one way of making existential predicates (17c), which agrees with Dietrich's and Rodrigues' analyses of possessive predicates (like 17b) as existential predicates with possessed nouns ('there is my firewood' = 'I have firewood'). Stative stems, on the other hand, do not need reduplication to become predicates (17d); in fact, it is not clear from Croft's description that they can at all be regularly reduplicated. Picanço (p.c.) claims that some stative stems can undergo reduplication, with an added feature of 'intrinsicness' (being 'by itself', 'inherently'; 17e), but some cannot, without obvious reasons, semantic or otherwise (17f).

(17) Munduruku (Croft 1985, Picanço p.c.; tone marking follows Picanço 2002)

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|
| a. | <i>ò-dàfá</i>
1-firewood
'my firewood' | b. | <i>ò-dàfá-fé</i>
1-firewood-RED
'I have firewood.' |
| c. | <i>dàfá-fé</i>
firewood-RED
'There is firewood.' | d. | <i>ò-dírèm</i>
1-be.wet
'I am wet.' |
| e. | <i>jò-bòŋ-bèŋ</i>
3-be.big-RED
'It becomes bigger (by itself).' | f. | <i>*i-díp-dép</i>
3-be.beautiful-RED
(It becomes beautiful.) |

In Mekens, according to Galucio (2001, p.c.), possessive predicates also seem to need an existential element (18a-b) which distinguishes them from

stative predicates (18d). Simple possessed nouns as predicates, usually followed by the focus particle *te*, have the expected equative or identificational meaning (18c).

(18) Mekens (Galucio 2001; p.c.)

- | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----|-------------------|-----------|
| a. | <i>o-tek</i> | <i>piro-apõ=õt</i> | b. | <i>*o-tek</i> | <i>õt</i> |
| | 1-house | exist-NEG=1 | | 1-house | 1 |
| | 'I don't have a house.' | | | (I have a house.) | |
| c. | <i>o-tek</i> | <i>te</i> | d. | <i>o-kërẽ</i> | <i>õt</i> |
| | 1-house | FOC | | 1-angry | 1 |
| | 'It's my house.' 'The house is mine.' | | | 'I am angry.' | |

In Makurap, a language closely related to Mekens, there are, according to Braga (2005), possessive predicates that look at first like simple possessed nouns without an overt existential marker (19b), as in Tupí-Guaraní languages. Note, however, that such predicates cannot be analyzed simply as possessed nouns used predicatively: a possessed noun (19a) takes a prefix (or 'clitic pronoun', as Braga calls them), not a full pronoun, and it also takes an extra 'possessive' suffix *-(e)t* ~ *-(e)n*.¹⁵ For the same reasons, stative predicates like (19c), which do look similar to possessive predicates like (19b), are different from simple possessed nouns (19a). Note that both seem different from usual existential predicates, which, in Braga's description, need the verb *ekoat* (19d).

(19) Makurap (Braga 2005)

- | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------|---------------|
| a. | <i>o-feg-et</i> | b. | <i>on</i> | <i>fek</i> | | |
| | 1-house-POS | | 1 | house | | |
| | 'my house' | | 'I have a house.' | | | |
| c. | <i>on</i> | <i>kãraŋ</i> | d. | <i>paako</i> | <i>toa</i> | <i>ekoat?</i> |
| | I | big | | banana | Q | exist |
| | 'I am big.' | | | 'Are there bananas?' | | |

In Karo (Arara), possessed nouns, possessed predicates and stative predicates are quite different. Inalienably possessed nouns take person-marking clitics (20a), while alienably possessed nouns occur with special possessive

¹⁵ This suffix is different from the Tupí-Guaraní 'nuclear' or 'argumentative' case marker *-a* (see previous section) in that it is restricted to possessed nouns, while Tupí-Guaraní *-a* occurs on any noun, possessed or not, in referential (not predicative) function.

pronouns that are historically derived from a dummy possessive element *at* (20b).¹⁶ The result is a simple referential noun phrase which could occur as an argument but not, by itself, as a predicate meaning ‘I have N’. For predicating possession, it is necessary to use a different construction, with a classifier element (*’a* ‘round’) and a verb (in (20d-e), the verb *kət* ‘live’; postural verbs are also sometimes possible). Stative predicates have different word order, an explicit personal pronoun, and never take possessive pronouns. In Gabas’ analysis, they are a separate sentential type, different from the other types found in this language.

(20) Karo/Arara (Gabas 1999, p.c.; the acute accent marks high tone)

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|--|
| a. | <i>o=cãp</i>
1=leg
‘my leg’ | b. | <i>w-at ka’a</i>
1-POS house
‘my house’ |
| c. | <i>pâttem</i> <i>’õn</i>
beautiful 1
‘I am beautiful.’ | d. | <i>w-at ka’a ’a kət</i>
1-POS house round live
‘I have a house.’
(= ‘my house lives’) |
| e. | <i>’õn ka’a ’a ta-kət</i>
1 house round COM-live
‘I have a house.’ (= ‘I live with my house.’) | | |

In Karitiana (Arikém sub-branch), possessed nouns (21a) need an auxiliary to be possessive predicates (21b). Stative predicates also have an auxiliary, but a different one, and also different word order (21c). This makes stative and possessive predicates clearly distinguishable.

(21) Karitiana (Storto 1999, p.c.).

- a. *ĩ-ʔo sop*
1-head hair
‘my hair’

¹⁶ A cognate of Karo *at* occurs in Mawé: the dummy possessed noun *wat*, which is optionally used in addition to simple person-marking prefixes (with an irregular first-person form *u-j-at* < **u-i-wat*). Thus, ‘my path’ is either *u-i-pu’aap* or *u-j-at e-pu’aap* (pronounced [ujar ujpuʔa:p], with lenition of the final *t*). Interestingly, possessed nouns with *wat* cannot be possessive predicates: *e-wat e-pohaḡ* can mean only ‘your medicine’, not ‘you have medicine’. The same is true for stative stems: *u-i-kahu* ‘I am beautiful’, ‘my beauty’, but *u-j-at u-i-kahu* ‘my beauty’, not *‘I am beautiful’.

- b. *ʔo sop horop i-taka-ʔa tika-t in*
 head hair long 1-DECL-AUX IMPERF-NFUT 1
 ‘I have long hair.’
- c. *in na-aka-t i-seʔa-t*
 1 DECL-AUX-NFUT PRTCPL-beautiful-OBL
 ‘I am beautiful.’

Finally, also in Gavião (Moore 1984, p.c.) possessed nouns (22a) cannot by themselves be possessive predicates; an existential auxiliary is necessary (22b). Stative (or adjective) stems can also take the existential auxiliary (22d), but another construction, involving what Moore describes as a copula, is also possible (22c). Note that this copular construction is not possible for possessive predicates, which can only take the existential auxiliary. Interestingly, Moore analyzes Gavião adjective stems as always attributive: their occurrences with person-marking clitics, as in (22c), are actually NPs in which the adjective modifies a generic referent (‘something tall’ rather than ‘it is tall’). From this perspective, it is not surprising to find examples in which different person markers occur on the copula and on the adjective (22e). No such cases of ‘disagreeing prefixes’ have been reported thus far for other Tupian languages.

(22) Gavião (Moore 1984, p.c.; the acute accent marks high tone).

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. <i>ẽ-záp</i>
2-house
‘your house’ | b. <i>ẽ-záp mága</i>
2-house EX.AUX
‘You have a house.’ |
| c. <i>taa-tóò zap máà</i>
3-tall house COP
‘The house is tall.’
(= ‘The house is (something) tall.’) | d. <i>zap atóò mága</i>
house tall EX.AUX
‘The house is tall.’
(= ‘There is a tall house.’) |
| e. <i>tá-sot pa-máà aaná</i>
3PL-bad 1PI-COP now
‘We are no good now.’
(= ‘We are something(s) bad now.’, ‘We are bad ones/things now.’) | |

6 Conclusion

Various analyses have been proposed to account for the syntax of stative verbs and possessive predicates in Tupí-Guaraní. For some languages, Rodrigues and Dietrich propose that both are existential predicates, usually without an explicit existential marker (though there are cases in which one does occur: see, e.g., Rose 2002 for Émérillon). For Kamayurá, Seki pro-

poses that stative stems are a subtype of intransitive verb stems: stative predicates are thus a subtype of intransitive predicates. The same analysis is proposed for possessive predicates, which are thus seen as intransitive, not existential sentences.¹⁷ For possessive predicates, a third analysis has been proposed by Vieira: transitive sentences with an abstract zero transitivizer morpheme which introduces a verb phrase with an empty verb node and a possessive phrase (2001: 83). Although some of the differences in the various analyses may reflect personal preference or theoretical orientation, it is also clear that different languages do seem to show some different properties. It would be very instructive to compare the languages of the Tupí-Guaraní sub-branch as to how similar or different their stative and possessive predicates are, using all the criteria mentioned in the various proposals.

For Mawé, Franceschini, as was mentioned in the introduction, describes stative stems as a subclass of verbs (*'verbes d'état'*); however, she did not mention any criteria that differentiate stative and possessive predicates. In view of the data considered in this paper, it seems better not to separate possessive and stative predicates: they are apparently better analyzed as the same kind of construction.

What kind of construction it is, however, is not entirely clear. The optional occurrence of the existential marker *toĩ*, mentioned in fn. 12, suggests an existential construction *à la* Rodrigues and Dietrich. Note, however, that only possessed nouns with an explicit person-marking prefix can occur in possessive predicates: *'Maria's medicine'*, as in (4), cannot be a possessive predicate. Likewise, a stative stem without a person-marking prefix cannot be a stative predicate, as is seen in (5). The predicate constituent in these sentences, therefore, is not simply an NP, not even a possessed NP: it must be a possessed NP with an explicit person-marking prefix on it. In addition, it cannot contain the optional *'dummy possessive'* marker *wat* (cf. fn. 16). This suggests that possessive/stative predicates are not (maybe no longer) simply existential predicates, but have already acquired some properties of their own. Vieira (2001) claims also special properties for possessive predicates in Mbya Guaraní. It would be interesting to investigate this topic in other Tupí-Guaraní languages: for how many of them do possessive constructions have special properties not found in existential constructions? And which are these properties?

¹⁷ Seki considers possessive sentences (*'I have a house'*) to be also a type of stative (or *'descriptive'*) sentence. But she distinguishes (possessed) nouns from stative stems with the criteria listed in Table 2. Therefore, Seki's *'descriptive sentence type'* can have two types of predicates: stative (*'descriptive'*) stems, and possessed nouns.

From a comparative point of view, it is interesting that most branches of the Tupian family express possessive and stative predication differently. Possessive predicates are usually possessed nouns in existential or copular constructions (with an obligatory auxiliary, or with special marking, like the Mundurucu reduplication). Only in Tupí-Guaraní, Mawé, and Awetí do we find possessive predicates expressed without an obligatory auxiliary or copula, and with some properties that deviate from those of existential constructions. This fact may constitute a syntactic innovation shared by these languages, thus lending further support to a ‘Mawetí-Guaraní’ sub-branch of the Tupian family.¹⁸

A final comment on the noun-verb distinction in Mawetí-Guaraní is in order. In most languages of this sub-branch, core nouns and verbs can be distinguished by virtue of taking overlapping but not entirely identical sets of person-marking prefixes. The stative stems, however, form a bridge between nouns and verbs. In some languages (e.g., Tupinambá), they are still better seen as nouns; in others (e.g., Kamayurá), a verbal analysis seems preferable. The crucial properties are usually few, even in the best cases: in Kamayurá, a nominalizing morpheme identifies the stative verbs, while case-marking suffixes (argumentative/nuclear, locative, etc.) identify the nouns. Apparently, nouns and stative stems are not very far apart in Mawetí-Guaraní languages. Diachronically, it would be easy for the two classes to merge: it would suffice to allow the case-marking suffixes to extend to stative words and the nominalizing particle or suffix to extend to (predicate) nouns. The opposite path is also not so difficult to imagine: case-marking suffixes and nominalizers/relativizers, originally compatible with stative and nominal predicates, might become restricted to only one of these groups, maybe on semantic grounds. One wonders, in fact, whether such extensions and/or restrictions in distribution were not frequent changes in the history of these languages.

The ‘lack of sharpness’ in the distinction between nouns and stative verbs also applies, to a lesser extent, to the noun-verb distinction itself. In

¹⁸ Moore (p.c.) speculates whether the Gavião pattern, in which stative (‘adjective’) stems with prefixes are actually NPs, could not have been the original situation. From an original ‘it-tall’ with generic reference (= ‘something tall’) it does not seem so difficult to derive ‘its tallness’ (perhaps by making the adjective the head of the NP rather than the prefix?), and also ‘it is tall’ (perhaps by deleting the copula in constructions like 22c?). Moore further suggests that there may be other Tupian languages in which person-marked stative (‘adjective’) stems may actually be NPs with the person markers as their heads. This matter certainly deserves further investigation.

fact, if it were not for the existence of Set I prefixes and their restriction to verbs, one might well say that all lexical stems were capable of being used as arguments or as predicates (i.e., that they might all be heads of noun phrases and verb phrases). The main distinction in these languages would be predication vs. reference rather than nouns vs. verbs. It has already been suggested (Queixalós 2001:126) that, in a Tupian proto-language at some point in the past of the family, all lexical stems may have been inherently predicative (a state of ‘omnipredicativity’; cf. Launey 1994), and that a morpheme *-a*, predecessor of the present-day argumentative/nuclear case marker, was used to derive referring expressions. This morpheme would thus originally mark a referring argument (a noun phrase), and its absence would mark a predicate, a pattern which Queixalós, citing Lemaréchal (1989, 1991), compares with the uses of the morpheme *ang* in Tagalog and other Austronesian languages. This interesting hypothesis is certainly worthy of further investigation.

References

- Braga, Alzerinda de Oliveira. 2005. *Aspects morphosyntaxiques de la langue makurap / tupi*. Thèse de doctorat (PhD dissertation). Toulouse: Université de Toulouse – Le Mirail.
- Cabral, Ana Suelly. 2001. Observações sobre a história do morfema *-a* da família Tupi-Guaraní. In Queixalós (ed.), 133-162.
- Cabral, Ana Suelly & Aryon D. Rodrigues (eds.). 2002. *Atas do I encontro internacional do grupo de trabalho sobre línguas indígenas da ANPOLL*. Belém (Brazil): Gráfica Universitária, UFPA.
- Croft, Marjorie. 1985. *Aspectos da língua mundurukú*. Brasília: SIL (Summer Institute of Linguistics).
- Dietrich, Wolf. 2001. Categorias lexicais nas línguas tupi-guarani (visão comparativa). In Queixalós (ed.), 21-66.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drude, Sebastian. 2001. *Nominale Prädikation im Awetí*. Ms., Freie Universität Berlin.
- Franceschini, Dulce. 1999. *La langue sateré-mawé: description et analyse morphosyntaxique*. PhD dissertation. Paris: Université Paris VII (Denis Diderot).
- Franceschini, Dulce. 2002. A voz inversa em Sateré-Mawé. In Cabral & Rodrigues (eds.), vol. I, 222-233.
- Gabas, Nilson. 1999. *A grammar of Karo, Tupi (Brazil)*. PhD dissertation. Santa Barbara: University of California.

- Galucio, Ana Vilacy. 2001. The morphosyntax of Mekens (Tupi). PhD dissertation. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Graham, Albert, Sue Graham & Carl Harrison. 1984. Prefixos pessoais e numerais da língua Sateré-Mawé. *Série Lingüística*, vol. 11 (Estudos sobre línguas tupi do Brasil), 175-205. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Jensen, Cheryl. 1998. Comparative Tupí-Guaraní morphosyntax. In Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.) *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, vol. 4, 487-618. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Launey, Michel. 1994. *Une grammaire omniprédicative. Essai sur la morphosyntaxe du nahuatl classique*. Paris: Editions CNRS.
- Lemaréchal, Alain. 1989. *Les parties du discours. Sémantique et syntaxe*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (PUF).
- Lemaréchal, Alain. 1991. *Problèmes de sémantique et de syntaxe en palau*. Paris: CNRS Editions.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1991. Active/agentive case-marking and its motivations. *Language* 67: 510-546.
- Moore, Denny. 1984. Syntax of the language of the Gavião Indians of Rondônia, Brazil. PhD dissertation. New York: City University of New York (CUNY).
- Picanço, Gessiane Lobato. 2002. O sistema tonal de Mundurukú revisitado. In Cabral & Rodrigues (eds.), vol. I, 243-253.
- Queixalós, F. (ed.) 2001. *Des noms et des verbes en tupi-guarani: état de la question*. LINCOM Studies in Native American Linguistics, vol. 37. Munich: LINCOM Europa.
- Rodrigues, Aryon D. 2001. Sobre a natureza do caso argumentativo. In Queixalós (ed.), 103-114.
- Rodrigues, Aryon D. & Wolf Dietrich. 1997. On the linguistic relationship between Mawé and Tupí-Guaraní. *Diachronica* 14:2, 265-304.
- Rose, Françoise. 2002. My hammock = I have a hammock: possessed nouns constituting possessive clauses in Emérrillon (Tupi-Guarani). In Cabral & Rodrigues (eds.), vol. I, 392-400.
- Seki, Lucy. 2000. *Gramática do Kamaiurá, língua Tupi-Guarani do Alto Xingu*. Campinas (Brazil): Editora da UNICAMP (UNICAMP Press).
- Seki, Lucy. 2001. Classes de palavras e categorias sintático-funcionais em kamaiurá. In Queixalós (ed.), 39-66.
- Storto, Luciana. 1999. Aspects of a Karitiana grammar. PhD dissertation. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT).

Vieira, Marcia Maria Damaso. 2001. A natureza transitiva das sentenças possessivas em Mbyá-Guarani. In Queixalós (ed.), 67-85.