



FINITENESS IN MOVIMA: THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN SYNTACTIC AND MORPHOLOGICAL CRITERIA

FINITUDE EM MOVIMA: A DISCREPÂNCIA ENTRE CRITÉRIOS SINTÁTICOS E MORFOLÓGICOS

Katharina Haude¹

Abstract: This paper investigates to what extent finiteness is a useful category for characterizing predicates in Movima (isolate, Bolivia). In the traditional definition, finiteness enables a predicate to function as the main predicate of an independent declarative clause, and finite predicates are verbs containing temporal, aspectual, and/or modal information as well as person indexing. In Movima, however, main-clause predicates are not necessarily verbs, and they are not systematically marked for the above-mentioned categories. In contrast, complement and adverbial clauses, which involve nominalization, convey temporal and aspectual information and show more systematic person encoding; they thereby display more traditional finiteness criteria than main predicates. Furthermore, unmarked predicates can also occur in DPs, which then refer to participants in states and events. I argue that the difficulty to detect finiteness in main-clause predicates is due to a fundamental characteristic of Movima: unmarked predicates characterize entities, i.e. event/state participants rather than the states/events themselves, and this is incompatible with the (traditional) idea of finiteness, which is based on the state/event-denoting character of predicates. Moreover, the obligatory spatio-temporal localization of referents contributes to the “finite” character of pronominal predicates and of complement and adverbial clauses.

Keywords: Movima; finiteness; nonverbal predicates; subordination; temporal reference.

Resumo: Este artigo investiga até que ponto a finitude é uma categoria útil para caracterizar predicados em Movima (isolado, Bolívia). Na definição tradicional, a finitude permite que um predicado funcione como o predicado principal de uma cláusula declarativa independente, e os predicados finitos são verbos que contêm informações temporais, aspectuais e/ou modais, bem como indexação de pessoas. Em Movima, no entanto, os predicados da oração principal não são necessariamente verbos e não são sistematicamente marcados para as categorias mencionadas acima. Em contraste, orações complementares e adverbiais, que envolvem nominalização, transmitem informações temporais e aspectuais e mostram uma codificação de pessoa mais sistemática; eles, portanto, exibem critérios de finitude mais tradicionais do que os predicados principais. Além disso, predicados não marcados também podem ocorrer em DPs, que então se referem a participantes em estados e eventos. Eu argumento que a dificuldade de detectar finitude em predicados de oração principal se deve a uma característica fundamental de Movima: predicados não marcados caracterizam entidades, ou seja, participantes de eventos/estados em vez dos próprios estados/eventos, e isso é incompatível com a ideia (tradicional) de finitude, que se baseia no caráter denotativo de estado/evento dos predicados. Além disso, a localização espaço-temporal obrigatória de referentes contribui para o caráter “finito” dos predicados pronominais e das orações complementares e adverbiais.

Palavras-chave: movima; finitude; predicados não verbais; subordinação; referência temporal.

¹ Researcher at the French National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS), Structure et Dynamique des Langues, Villejuif, France. katharina.haude@cnrs.fr.
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1706-7060>

1. FINITENESS: MORPHOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTIC-PRAGMATIC CRITERIA

Traditionally, the category of finiteness is applied to verb forms that contain the necessary properties for forming the predicate of a declarative main clause, such as tense, aspect, and person morphology. Classical Indo-European languages like Greek and Latin are prototypical examples of languages whose main-clause predicates show overt morphological finiteness features. These features allow to distinguish different kinds of subordinate clauses, depending on the amount of finiteness properties of their predicates. The more finiteness properties a subordinate predicate has, the more “balanced” is its relation with the main clause (Stassen 1985).

However, there are many languages whose verbs cannot be that straightforwardly identified as finite or not: even in English, the predicates of independent declarative clauses do not show many signs of being inflected verb forms (Klein 2006). Therefore, in the last few decades linguists have started to apply the notion more broadly so that it can include more predicate types (Nikolaeva 2007). As the *Concise Dictionary of Linguistics* (Matthews 1997: 140) puts it, a “finite verb” can “[n]ow more generally” be “any verb whose form is such that it can stand in a simple declarative sentence”.

According to this definition, then, finiteness is a clausal notion, which is independent of particular morphological properties of the verb. Indeed, many authors choose to speak of “finite sentences” rather than “finite verbs” (e.g. Jelinek 1984). From this perspective, finiteness can be considered a universally valid category since “all languages have independent declarative clauses” (Cristofaro 2003: 54). Based on acquisition research, Klein (2006) argues that finiteness plays a crucial role in the syntactic and semantic structure of utterances in all languages – including isolating and polysynthetic ones. The notion of finiteness is separated here from the form of the predicate. And it is on this basis that finiteness can be discussed in an omnipredicative language such as Movima, as we will see below.

Movima is a linguistic isolate still spoken by a few hundred adults in the town Santa Ana del Yacuma, a former Jesuit mission in the Bolivian department Beni. My research is based on a 30-hour corpus of annotated spontaneous oral discourse collected between 2001 and 2009. Most of the corpus is archived at *The Language Archive*,² and a number of glossed texts are furthermore stored at the DoReCo archive.³

Movima has the striking feature that nouns and verbs are syntactically interchangeable: both nouns and verbs can function as main-clause predicates, and both nouns and verbs can occur inside a determiner phrase (DP) (see, for example, Haude 2006; 2009a; 2010a). There is no inflectional morphology, and tense is not indicated on the predicate, but rather in the referential domain, e.g. on determiners (Haude 2004; 2010b; 2011a). These properties make it difficult to speak about finiteness in Movima in an uncontroversial way.

On the basis of the syntactic definition of finiteness given above, however, in this paper I argue that in Movima, a predicate is finite when it is not preceded by a determiner or other referential expression. The traditional properties of finite verbs, which include temporal information about the denoted situation, are entirely dissociated from syntactic finiteness in Movima. Section 2 shows, first of all, that verbal predicates of independent declarative clauses do not encode TAM and contain only very restricted person

² Available upon request at:

<https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/islandora/object/tla%3A1839_00_0000_0000_0008_4074_D>

³ Available at: <<https://doreco.huma-num.fr/languages/movi1243>>

information (2.1). Furthermore, the predicate of an independent declarative clause does not have to be a verb: it can also be a noun (2.2.1), a personal pronoun, or even a demonstrative (2.2.2). The predicative status of these elements can be seen from their behaviour in negation.

Subordinate clauses (Section 3) are formed with a preceding determiner or referential expression. The predicate of complement and adverbial clauses (3.1), which are DPs referring to states or events, is additionally morphologically derived. A DP whose predicate is underived (3.2) refers to a participant in the state or event. Independent evidence of the subordinate status of the predicate inside a DP comes from negation (Section 4): main-clause negation (4.1) differs from the way in which subordinate predicates are negated (4.2). Section 5 discusses the findings. While there seems to be a clear syntactic criterion for finiteness, the question arises to what extent finiteness is a useful or even necessary concept for describing a language like Movima.

All the facts about Movima presented in this paper have already been described elsewhere in more detail, as indicated in the respective sections, and it would be beyond the scope of this paper to discuss them exhaustively here. General information on Movima grammar can be found in Haude (2006, 2023).

2. INDEPENDENT DECLARATIVE SENTENCES IN MOVIMA

2.1 Basic clause structure

Before turning to the data, I will briefly outline some principles of Movima basic clause structure. Movima clauses are typically predicate initial, and the typical predicate is a verb. Verbs in Movima are not inflected for the classical verbal categories tense, aspect, mood, or evidentiality (TAME). Verbs bear no person agreement morphology, either: person is indicated through partly optional enclitic pronouns that may be replaced by full argument phrases (DPs). As will be shown below, only one argument of a transitive predicate is obligatorily encoded; the other argument, just like the single argument of an intransitive predicate, may remain unexpressed. This means that Movima has no finite verb forms in the traditional sense.

Movima has the further remarkable property that it possesses two transitive constructions: ‘direct’ and ‘inverse’. When the actor ranks higher in a hierarchy of person (1>2>3), animacy (human/animate > inanimate), and topicality (topical > less topical), the direct construction is chosen; when the direction of action goes in the opposite sense, the inverse construction is chosen. The direct construction is also the default transitive construction, which can be used more flexibly than the inverse (Haude 2014); therefore, the focus will here be on the direct construction, with only a brief illustration of the inverse in (5) below.

Example (1) illustrates the two most common basic clause types, intransitive and transitive direct. First, there is an intransitive clause with a verbal predicate (*salmo* ‘return’), whose single argument (S) is expressed by a cliticized pronoun (*--is*); second, there is a transitive clause with a direct-marked verbal predicate (*joy-a-le*), whose A argument (henceforth *A_{DR}*, since it is A of the direct construction) is expressed by a cliticized pronoun (*=is*) and whose P argument (henceforth *P_{DR}*) is expressed by a DP (*os kwe:ya*). The bound pronoun *is* ‘3_{PL.AB}’ is attached to each predicate through a different kind of cliticization: on the intransitive predicate the pronoun is attached through “external” cliticization (represented by a double hyphen, *--*), which is a process that does not trigger a stress shift, among other things; on the transitive predicate, the pronoun is

attached through “internal” cliticization (represented by an equals sign, =), which is suffix-like in that, among other things, it causes a stress shift to the last syllable of the host (see Haude 2006: 97–103). This difference in cliticization is one sign that S of the intransitive clause is encoded differently than A_{DR}. P_{DR}, in contrast, shares the encoding properties of S (Haude 2009b). Furthermore, S and P_{DR} share the syntactic property of extractability and can, therefore, be characterized as “external” argument, contrasting with the “internal” argument A_{DR}, which has no syntactic privileges (Haude 2019a). In all examples, DPs are enclosed in brackets.

- (1) *salmo--is jayna, joy-a-le=is [os kwe:ya] lat*
 return--3PL.AB DSC go-DR-CO=3PL.AB ART.N.PST woman EV
 ‘They returned then, they took the woman, they say.’⁴ [LYO_250808_2 110]

For the present study, the most important feature of Movima argument encoding is that both S and P_{DR} can remain unexpressed (see Haude & Allasonnière-Tang Forthcoming). An intransitive clause with no overt S is illustrated in (2). A direct transitive clause with no overt P_{DR} is illustrated in (3). In all these cases, the identity of the referent can only be inferred from the context.

- (2) *salmo rey [n-os asna=is]*
 return EPIST OBL-ART.N.PST home=3PL.AB
 ‘(They) returned to their home.’ [EGA Carneval Estel 011]

- (3) *joy-a-le=us [n-os asna=us] lat*
 go-DR-CO=3M.AB OBL-ART.N.PST home=3M.AB EV
 ‘He took (it) to his home, they say.’ [PMP_HRR_etal_210908 086]

The A argument of the direct transitive clause (A_{DR}), by contrast, is obligatorily expressed. When there is no overt internally encliticized element on a direct-marked transitive verb, as in (4), this is a zero marker referring to the first person singular.

- (4) *joy-a:-le=Ø [kinos senyo:ra], jankwa=us*
 go-DR-CO=1SG ART.F.AB lady say=3M.AB
 ‘I’ll take the lady, he said.’ [EAO_120906_3 267]

Movima has a second transitive construction, in which the verb is marked as inverse and the argument roles are reversed (see e.g. Haude 2009b). The P argument of this construction (P_{INV}) has the same formal properties as A_{DR} and is, like A_{DR}, obligatorily encoded. By contrast, A of the inverse construction (A_{INV}) has the same properties as P_{DR}, and can therefore be dropped. Example (5) illustrates the inverse construction, which will, however, not be discussed in detail here.

- (5) *joy-le-kay-a=us [os diya:volo]*
 go-CO-INV-LV=3M.AB ART.N.PST devil
 ‘The devil took him.’ [LYO_250808_2 246]

⁴ In the story cited here, the ‘woman’ referred to is a transformed jaguar, hence the use of the neuter (non-human) article.

Thus, verbal person indexation cannot be considered a finiteness feature in Movima. If it were, then only transitive verbs would be finite, and only in part, since they are obligatorily marked for only one person (A_{DR} or P_{INV}).

The temporal interpretation of a Movima sentence arises from the context, but it can often also be retrieved from the form of the article in a DP. The article paradigm is given in Table 1. If the referent of a DP is not present at the speech situation, the form of the article indicates whether the referent still exists somewhere else or whether it is not existing anymore at the time of speaking; also when the referent's existence at the time of speaking is of no particular importance (as is presumably the case in (1), (2), and (5) above), the past-tense form of the article is used.⁵ The tense-marking function of the article in subordinate clauses is discussed in Section 3.1.

Table 1. The Movima article

	male (M)	female (F)	non-human (N)	plural/mass (PL)
present/generic	<i>us</i>	<i>(i) 'nes</i>	<i>as</i>	<i>is</i>
absent (AB)	<i>kus</i>	<i>kinos</i>	<i>kos</i>	<i>kis</i>
ceased existence (PST)	<i>us</i>	<i>isnos</i>	<i>os</i>	<i>is</i>

Apart from that, tense, aspect, modal and evidential (TAME) categories are optionally indicated through particles. In (6), the particle *la'* indicates past tense. In (7), the particles *ona*, *jiya* and *loy* all indicate that the action expressed by the verb has not yet been carried out.

- (6) *che* [*kinos* *alwaj-a=us*] *la'* *tera:ni--sne*
and ART.F.AB spouse-LV=3M.AB ANT ill--3F.AB
‘And his wife had been ill.’ [ERM_140806_1 0645]

- (7) *ona* *jiya*, *loy* *chi:~chi* *nosdé* *dochik*
let's_see let's_go ITN MD~go_out over_there a_little
‘Let's see, let's go, (we)'ll go a bit further out over there.’
[JGD_160808-Fundacion_1 749-751]

Summing up, Movima verbs do not encode tense, aspect, or mood in their morphological form. Furthermore, person is not obligatorily encoded on intransitive verbs, and on transitive verbs only one argument (A_{DR} on direct, P_{INV} on inverse verbs) is obligatorily encoded.

2.2. Nonverbal predicates

2.2.1 Nominal predicates

Nouns and adjectives can function as intransitive main-clause predicates, too. Their argument is encoded in the same way as that of an intransitive verbal predicate. A nominal predicate with a bound pronoun encoding the argument is illustrated in (8), and a nominal predicate whose argument is expressed as a DP is given in (9). Example (10) shows a

⁵ Detailed discussions of the tense-marking function of the article with different kinds of DPs and the relationship between the temporal and spatial categories encoded by the article are found in Haude (2004; 2010b; 2011a), as well as in Haude (2006: 155-173).

nominal predicate whose argument is not overtly expressed. Since most adjectives share their properties with nouns and verbs (Haude 2006: 112–119), they will not be discussed separately in this paper.⁶

- (8) *bo* *rey* ***wa:ka--'ne***
 REAS EPIST cow;meat--3F
 ‘Because she is a cow.’⁷ [EGA_et-al._180706_1 151-152]
- (9) *bo* *ja'* ***charaye:-lo*** [*is* *tadoy-na-wanra=is*]
 REAS just syrup-CLF.liquid ART.PL sweet-DR-NMZ.INSTR=3PL.AB
 ‘Because their sweetener was just (cane) syrup.’ [HRR_Erlan Rojas 285]
- (10) *bo* ***po~poy-kwa,*** *bo* *jayna* *jankwa=Ø,* ***rulrul***
 REAS RED~BR.animal-ABS REAS DSC say=1SG jaguar
 ‘Because (it is an) animal, because I already said, (it is a) jaguar.’
 [HRR_120808-tigregente 141]

The words *wa:ka*, *charaye:lo*, *popoykwa* and *rulrul* are nouns. This can be seen from the following facts, which are defining properties of Movima nouns:

- They can be marked as possessed by an internal enclitic.
- They (or their roots) can be incorporated into a verb.
- In subordination (e.g. in negation or in a complement or adverbial clause) they undergo reduplication or take the suffix *-le*.

Possessor encoding is identical to the encoding of A_{DR} or P_{INV}, i.e. the possessor is encoded through internal cliticization, and inalienable nouns unmarked for person are interpreted as having a first-person singular possessor (Haude 2006: 234). However, while verbs need an overt marker of transitivity (i.e. the direct or inverse marker), possessed nouns do not require overt morphological marking. Possession is illustrated in (11). Here, the noun is combined with an internally cliticized article (=is) of the possessor DP.

- (11) *iso'* [*is* *wa:ka=[is* *juyeni]*]
 DEM.PL.PST ART.PL cow;meat=ART.PL person
 ‘The people had cows’ (lit.: ‘there were [the] people’s cows’)
 [NAO_FSG_300706_1 464]

In (12), the noun *wa:ka* is incorporated into a verb.⁸ This kind of incorporation is not possible for verbs or verb roots, so it is another feature that distinguishes nouns from verbs.

- (12) *ja:yi* *buka'* *net-a-wa:ka--y'ti*
 run DUR.MOV drive-DR-cow;meat--1PL
 ‘We ran around, we drove the cattle.’ [EAO_Dichiyeye 022]

⁶ For instance, on the one hand, adjectives can be reduplicated in subordination, like nouns; on the other hand, they cannot be marked as possessed, like intransitive verbs.

⁷ This was said jokingly about a woman whose surname is *Vaca* (Spanish ‘cow’).

⁸ Verbs with an incorporated argument contain the direct marker but are intransitive (Haude 2006: 283-286).

In Section 3.1 it will be shown that when subordinated or negated, verbal predicates undergo a different morphological derivation than nominal predicates.

2.2.2 Pronominal and demonstrative predicates

Just like the pronominal enclitics, free pronouns indicate presence and absence of the referent, as well as gender (i.e. natural sex of humans) and number; see Table 2.

	male (M)	female (F)	non-human (N)	plural/mass (PL)
present/generic	<i>u'ko</i>	<i>i'ne</i>	<i>a'ko</i>	<i>i'ko</i>
absent (AB)	<i>usko</i>	<i>isne</i>	<i>asko</i>	<i>isko</i>

- (13) *isko* *manes-ni*
PRO.3PL.AB tasty-PRC
'Those (absent) are tasty.'
[ERM_140806_1 0305]
- (14) *asko* *naykachin* *man-na=us*
PRO.3N.AB first shoot-DR=3M.AB
'That one he shot first.'
[EGA Sicurí 080]

Table 3. Movima demonstratives (selection)

Demonstrative predicates are followed by a full DP, whose article corresponds to the demonstrative's gender/number and spatio-temporal categories. Demonstrative predicates form existential, locative, and possessive clauses, as illustrated in (15), (16), and (17), respectively.

- (15) *uso'* [us Buscha]
 DEM.M.PST ART.M Buscha
 'There was the/a (guy called) Buscha.' [PMP_HRR_etal_210908 011]

- (16) *kino'* [kinos kwe:ya], *kiro'* [kis o:ye]
 DEM.F.AB ART.F.AB woman DEM.PL.AB ART.PL.AB two_person
di' itila:kwa] nosdé
 REL man over_there
 'There is a woman, there are two men (lit.: "two persons who [are] men") over there.' [EAO Cbba 256]

- (17) *iso'* [is nono=sne di' chot we:ye]
 DEM.PL.AB ART.PL domestic_animal=3F.AB REL HAB ox
 'She had animals, which were always oxen.' [CCT_120907_2 222]

Thus, personal pronouns and demonstratives can function as syntactic predicates of main declarative clauses in Movima. Unlike nominal and verbal main-clause predicates, they encode some of the traditional finiteness features such as tense and person. Sentences with a pronominal or demonstrative predicate also differ from lexical predicates in that they do not form a categorical statement since they do not "contain a constituent referring to a state of affairs reported about an entity" (Sasse 1987: 257); they only indicate the identity, existence or location of the referent.

Personal pronouns and demonstratives can also function as predicates of complement and adverbial clauses as illustrated in (18) and (19), respectively. They are then nominalized with the suffix *-niwa* (see 3.1).

- (18) *che rey inla kem<a:>ye [os asko-niwa*
 and EPIST PRO.1SG assume<DR> ART.N.PST PRO.N.AB-VBZ:NMZ
bana:ma]
 anteater
 'And I thought it was an anteater.' [EAO_tigrepperro_150808 027]

- (19) *kempa-kay-a=y'ti [n-os isno'-niwa [isnos*
 tell-INV-LV-1PL OBL-ART.N.PST DEM.F.PST-VBZ:NMZ ART.F.PST
kwe:ya di' yey-kay-a=us]]
 woman REL want-INV-LV=3M.AB
 'He told us that there was a woman who liked him (lit. he told us about there being a woman ...).' [ERM_150806 595-596]

3. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

3.1 Complement and adverbial clauses: "situation-denoting DPs"

If finiteness implies the presence of one or more TAME and person feature(s) on the predicate, then Movima complement and adverbial clauses encode more finiteness

(20) *yey-na=is* [as *rey salmo:-wa=Ø*
want-DR=3PL.AB ART.N again return-NMZ:DYN=1SG
'They want me to return again (lit.: they want my returning again).' (NOT: "They
want to return.") [GCM Bacho 072]

(21) *lavo:ni* [n-os *tol<ko:~>kos=Ø*], *lavo:ni*
suffer OBL-ART.N.PST young_woman<NMZ.ST~>=1SG suffer
'(I) suffered when I was a young woman, (I) suffered.' [Balvina 147]

Despite being DPs, Movima complement and adverbial clauses show some properties which belong to the traditional notion of finiteness, but which are not marked on main-clause predicates: due to the possessive marking, person is obligatorily encoded on intransitive predicates; the two types of derivation, suffixation and reduplication, distinguish between dynamic and time-stable situations; and the deictic properties of the article locate the subordinate event in time.

Complement and adverbial clauses are DPs referring to situations, i.e. events or states. This is also reflected by the function of the article. In Movima, the article indicates inherent and spatio-temporal properties of the referent. With a concrete referent, i.e. a person or object, the article distinguishes between presence, absence, and ceased existence (see Haude 2004; 2010b; 2011a). With a situation-denoting predicate, however, the absential article indicates not spatial absence, but hodiernal past, while the presential article indicates non-past and the past article indicates any time before the day of speaking. This can be observed in (22)–(24).

- (22) *kem<a:>ye=Ø* [*as* *di:ra* *buka'* *iloni-wa=nkwel*]
 assume<DR>=1SG ART.N still;yet DUR:MOV walk-NMZ.DYN=2PL
 'I thought you would still be walking (later today).' [ERM 140806 1 0401]

¹⁰ The only exception is formed by subordinate clauses introduced by the particle *jan* 'that's why', whose predicates are derived by a suffix *-na*, not identical to the direct marker (see Haude 2006: 474f.).

(23) *kem<a:>ye=Ø* [*kos pek-yemes kwey iloni-wa=nkwel*]
 assume<DR>=1SG ART.N.AB whole-day HOD walk-NMZ.DYN=2PL
 ‘I thought you had been walking all day today.’ [ERM_140806_1 0311]

(24) *bo ja’ ena’ kem<a:>ye=Ø [os jayna*
 REAS just DUR.STD assume<DR>=1SG ART.N.PST DSC
kayni-wa=’ne]
 die-NMZ.DYN=3F
 ‘Because I was just thinking that she was already dead.’ [Escape Marivel 090]

The properties of complement and adverbial clauses constitute further evidence that the traditional definition of finiteness does not work for Movima: according to the criterion that a finite predicate is marked for the categories tense, aspect, and/or person, in Movima only the predicates of complement and adverbial clauses would be finite. Obviously, this goes against the criterion that a finite predicate must be able to form an independent declarative clause.

3.2 Underived subordinate predicates: “participant-denoting DPs”

Movima can be characterized as an “omnipredicative” language (Launey 1994; 2004): all content words can directly function as predicates, and all content words can be combined with a determiner to form a DP. A DP that contains a verb refers to the entity that is the external argument of the verbal predicate, i.e. S of intransitive or P_{DR} of direct transitive verbs. The article indicates the same spatio-temporal categories as with underived nouns (see Table 1), i.e. presence, absence or ceased existence of the referent.

A DP containing an intransitive verb is depicted in (25) and a DP containing a transitive direct verb is given in (26). In (25), the referent of the DP is the sole participant of the event denoted by an intransitive verb; in (26), the referent of the DP is the patient (P_{DR}) of the event denoted by a direct-marked verb (see Haude 2019b).

(25) *bo kiro’ [kis salmo chot]*
 REAS DEM.PL.AB ART.PL.AB return HAB
 ‘Because there are (people) who always return.’ [ERM_140806_1 0680]

(26) *ko’ lat [os joy-a-le=us]*
 tree;pole EV ART.N.PST go-DR-CO=3M.AB
 ‘A pole, they say, (was) what he carried.’ [PMP_HRR_etal_210908 244]

Since DPs with a verb refer to participants in the state or event denoted by their content word, I label them here “participant-denoting DPs”. The DPs can easily be understood and translated as light-headed relative clauses (Citko 2004), with the determiner as the head. TAM particles can be included in a DP, like the habitual particle *chot* in (25) or the past-tense particle *la’* in (27).

(27) *sokakte [kus la’ joy-chet]*
 one_person ART.M.AB PST go-R/R
 ‘One (man/boy) (was who) went.’ [ERM_140806_2 380]

While the content words inside a DP of this type has the same form as in a main clause and can also cooccur with TAM particles, its syntactic properties reveal that its status is different. The most important difference is seen in negation, discussed in the following section: when the predicate inside a DP is negated, this is done with a different operation than main-clause negation.

4. NEGATION AS A CRITERION FOR DISTINGUISHING MAIN VS. SUBORDINATE PREDICATES

4.1 Main clause negation

When a main-clause predicate is negated, it is converted into a complement clause, which follows the negative copula *ka*. In this construction, the predicate is nominalized and preceded by the determining element =s, which is an integral part of all determiners (see Table 1). Verbal predicates are nominalized with the suffix *-wa*, shown in (28) with an intransitive and in (29) with a direct transitive verb.

- (28) *ka[=s rey salmo-wa=i]*
 NEG.COP=DET EPIST return-NMZ. DYN=3PL
 ‘They (i.e. people who leave) don’t come back again (lit. “their returning is not”).’
 [ERM_140806_1 0682]

- (29) *ka[=[s rey joy-a-le-wa=us rey [is dokwe=Ø]]*
 NEG.COP=DET EPIST go-DR-CO-NMZ.DYN=3M.AB EPIST ART.PL clothes=1SG
 ‘He didn’t bring me clothes (lit. “his bringing my clothes was not”).’
 [BVA_Balvina 161]

Negated nominal main-clause predicates, in contrast, are nominalized through reduplication, as in (30)a, or with a suffix *-le*, as in (30)b.

- (30) a. *ka[=s wa:<ka~>ka=a]*
 NEG.COP=DET cow;meat<NMZ.ST~>=3N
 b. *ka[=s wa:ka-le=a]*
 NEG.COP=DET cow;meat-NMZ.ST~>=3N
 ‘It’s not meat (lit. “its being meat is not”).’
 [EAO_Eli 16, 386]

Personal and demonstrative pronominal predicates are nominalized with the suffix *-niwa*, as in (31) and 0, respectively, which is a fossilized combination of the verbalizer *-ni* ‘PRC’ and the nominalizer *-wa*.¹¹ These nominalized forms are not possessed – the referent is encoded by the predicate itself.

- (31) *ka[=s a’ko-niwa pa:di]*
 NEG.COP=DET PRO.3N-PRC:NMZ guava
 ‘This is not guava (lit. “its being guava is not”).’
 [ERM_140806_2 440]

¹¹ The suffix is considered fossilized because these words do not exist with the ending *-ni* alone.

- (32) *ka[=s rey iso'-niwa [is is~is-ra]]*
 NEG.COP=DET EPIST DEM.PL.PST-PRC:NMZ ART.PL RED~roast-CLF.meat
 'There was no roasted meat (lit. "there being roasted meat was not").'
 [HRR_120808-tigregente 565]

4.2 Negation of subordinate clauses

Complement and adverbial clauses are negated with the particle *loy*, as in (33) and (34), respectively.

- (33) *kem<a:>ye=Ø [kos **loy** jiwa-wa=nkwel]*
 assume<DR>=1SG ART.N.AB NEG.SUB come-NMZ.DYN=2PL
 'I thought you wouldn't come.' (lit.: "I assumed your not-coming [earlier today]").
 [PMP Cabildo_020907 057]

- (34) *u'ko kayle-kay-a=n [n-as **loy** terani-wa=n]*
 PRO.3M give-INV-LV=2 OBL-ART.N NEG.SUB be_ill-NMZ.DYN=2
 'He [i.e. God] gives you that you don't get ill.'
 [EAO Solopaye 008]

The particle *loy* is also used to negate the predicate of participant-denoting DPs. Here, the predicate is only nominalized if intransitive, as in (35), but unlike in event/state nominalization this nominalized form is not possessed. Negated transitive verbs in a DP remain unchanged, as in (36) (see Haude 2006: 544–555), where the verb *tenapanle=i* 'they can do (it)' has the same form as in the affirmative.

- (35) *la:kwa [kos **loy** tijkarim-wa]*
 worse ART.N.AB NEG.SUB work-NMZ.DYN
 'Someone/the one who doesn't work is worse.'
 [LTC_020906_1 206]

- (36) *bo oso' [os **loy** rey ten<a>pa-n-le=i]*
 REAS DEM.N.PST ART.N.PST NEG.SUB EPIST can_do<DR>-LN-CO=3PL
 'Because there was what they could not do.'
 [PMP_HRR_etal_210908 288]

Negated nominal predicates inside a DP, analyzed as a subordinate predicate with the meaning 'who is/was not X', are rare in the corpus. Example (37) shows that this is at least possible for unpossessed common nouns, i.e. those nouns which can also act as main-clause predicates. They are nominalized with the suffix *-le*, reserved for the nominalization of nonverbal predicates (nouns and adjectives). While uncommon, therefore, this possibility to negate a noun inside a DP indicates that also nouns in DPs can be analyzed as subordinate predicates, in the same way in which they can act as main-clause predicates.

- (37) *ka[=s rey ja' sal-na-wa=i [kos **loy***
 NEG.COP=DET EPIST just look_for-NMZ.DYN=3PL ART.N.AB NEG.SUB
rey mowimaj-le]]
 EPIST Movima-NMZ.ST
 'They don't just look for someone who is not Movima.'
 [EAO Tolkosya II 014]

Bare content words with the same properties do not only occur in DPs, but also in headed relative clauses and in topicalization (Haude 2019a). All these constructions have

in common that the predicate is preceded by a referential expression, which can be a determiner (as illustrated above), a full DP which it modifies (as in the headed relative clause), or a free pronoun (as in topicalization). In contrast, no predicate that is *not* preceded by a referential expression is negated with *loy*.¹² This property, therefore, distinguishes main-clause predicates from subordinate ones.

Thus, the content word in a participant-denoting DP has the same form as in a main clause, but it has different syntactic properties – the position behind a determiner and the negation with *loy* –, which it shares with other subordinate structures. Therefore, if main-clause predicates are analyzed as finite, then the predicate of participant-denoting nominalization is higher on the finiteness scale than that of a complement or adverbial clause: it has similar syntactic properties as the latter, but its morphological shape corresponds to that of a main-clause predicate.

5. CONCLUSION: FINITENESS AS A SYNTACTIC PROPERTY

If finiteness is seen as the property of a predicate that heads an independent declarative clause, then Movima, like other languages, has finite predicates. A Movima finite predicate – verb or noun – can be identified by the fact that it is not preceded by a determiner or other referential expression. By contrast, all predicates that occur after a determiner or referential expression are distinct from main-clause predicates because they are negated in a different way.

If, in addition, one takes into account morphological features as indicators of finiteness, one can further distinguish between subordinate clauses containing more “finite” forms, which are the ones that are formally identical to main-clause predicates (i.e. underived) and form participant-denoting DPs, and “nonfinite” or “infinitive” forms, which are overtly derived and form complement and adverbial clauses. In this sense, the combination of syntactic and formal criteria can be useful to identify a cline from more finite to non-finite subordinate clauses.

Nevertheless, this is a puzzling definition of finiteness, since the words that can act as main-clause predicates do not show any of the traditional morphological finiteness criteria. Movima main-clause predicates are not marked for the “verbal” TAME and person categories, whereas the predicates of complement and adverbial clauses bear more of these properties – paradoxically despite their position within a DP.

Table 4 is an attempt to capture the formal properties of Movima predicates in different environments, thereby illustrating the mismatch that arises from applying traditional finiteness criteria to Movima. To simplify matters, the table is restricted to lexical predicates (i.e. verbs and nouns). It shows that main-clause predicates occur in clause-initial position, i.e. not after a determiner or other referential expression. A main-clause predicate cannot be negated directly (e.g. through attachment of an affix and/or combination with a negative particle), but must be turned into a complement clause that is combined with a negative copula. A main-clause predicate is unmarked for tense, whereas subordinate predicates receive their temporal interpretation from the article they are headed by. Main-clause predicates have in common with participant-denoting subordinate predicates that they are morphologically unmarked; there is no inflectional morphology that identifies them. Situation-denoting subordinate predicates are morphologically marked (nominalized), and the type of nominalization includes aspectual

¹² In addition to the negation with *loy*, these predicates have the ability of undergoing a valency-decreasing operation (Haude 2024), not discussed here.

information. The only “finiteness” feature of main-clause predicates is that they show obligatory encoding of the internal argument (A_{DR} of a direct or P_{INV} of an inverse transitive predicate); however, this feature is shared with situation-denoting subordinate predicates as well, which additionally obligatorily encode S .

Table 4: Formal properties of lexical predicates in Movima

	Main-clause predicate	Subordinate participant-denoting predicate	Subordinate situation-denoting predicate
position	clause-initial	after referential element	
negation	no direct negation	negation with <i>loy</i>	
tense	no marking	marked on determiner	
morphological marking	unmarked		derived (NMZ)
aspect	unmarked		marked by NMZ morpheme
person marking	weak (obligatory only for A_{DR} or P_{INV})		stronger (obligatory for S , A_{DR} and P_{INV})

There is, therefore, a mismatch between the morphological and the syntactic finiteness criteria in Movima. The predicates of complement and adverbial clauses contain more finiteness features than the predicates of declarative main clauses. These predicate forms, however, may not occur as predicates of declarative main clauses. Thus, the morphological properties of predicates and their use as main-clause predicates are dissociated in Movima. In the traditional sense, however, finiteness involves an association between the two, in that, for instance, TAME and person marking enables a predicate to function as main-clause predicate.

These findings can be related to my earlier proposal that Movima clauses have a basically equational character: as I argued in Haude (2009a; 2010a; 2019b), Movima main-clause predicates do not primarily denote states or events, but rather characterize the participants in these states or events. This is in line with the fact that underived predicates can be productively used in DPs, which systematically refer to a participant in the denoted state or event. The traditional finiteness criteria, however, are strongly linked to the representation of events with their internal temporal structure and external location in time (see e.g. the overview in Cristofaro 2007: 93). This is why event descriptions are usually carried out by verbs. In Movima, a word denoting a state or event is the derived (“nominalized”) form in a complement or adverbial clause; this, then, explains why these clauses contain more temporal and aspectual information than main clauses. Moreover, Movima determiners indicate the spatio-temporal localization of referents, and thereby contribute to the “finite” character of complement and adverbial clauses. The nominalizing morphology in complement and adverbial clauses, while largely based on the lexical category (verb or noun) of the predicate, furthermore indicates the inherent aspectual properties of the event, a feature that is not overtly marked on main-clause predicates.

The observation that (syntactic) finiteness does not match with morphological properties in an omnipredicative language has, to my knowledge, not been made explicitly before. It is an important observation given the claims that this language type may come into being through the loss of finiteness categories (Sasse 1993), which may again be acquired by main-clause predicates at a later stage. This latter development, however, has not (yet) taken place in Movima.

Abbreviations

1	first person	ITN	intentional
2	second person	LN	linking nasal
3	third person	LV	linking vowel
AB	absent	M	male
ABS	absolute state	MD	middle
ART	article	MOV	moving
CLF	classifier	N	non-human (“neuter”)
CO	co-participant	NEG	negative
COP	copula	NMZ	nominalizer
D	dummy	OBL	oblique
DEM	demonstrative	PL	plural
DET	determiner	PRC	process
DR	direct	PRO	free pronoun
DSC	discontinuous	PST	past
DUR	durative	REAS	reason
DYN	dynamic	RED	reduplication
EPIST	epistemic	REL	relativizer
EV	evidential	SG	singular
F	female	ST	state
INSTR	instrument	SUB	subordinate
INV	inverse	VBZ	verbalizer

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to the Movima speakers who generously taught me their language and let me record their stories. I also thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. All remaining shortcomings are my own responsibility.

REFERENCES

- CITKO, Barbara. On headed, headless, and light-headed relatives. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22(1). 95-126, 2004.
- CRISTOFARO, Sonia. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- HAUDE, Katharina. Nominal tense marking in Movima: nominal or clausal scope? In Leonie Cornips & Jenny Doetjes (eds.), *Linguistics in The Netherlands 2004* (AVT Publications 21), 80-90. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://www.benjamins.com/#catalog/journals/avt.21.11hau/fulltext>, 2004.
- HAUDE, Katharina. *A Grammar of Movima*. Nijmegen: Radboud University Doctoral dissertation. <https://repository.ubn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/2066/41395/41395.pdf>, 2006.
- HAUDE, Katharina. Reference and predication in Movima. In Patience Epps & Alexandre Arhipov (eds.), *New Challenges in Typology: Transcending the Borders and Refining the Distinctions*, 323-342. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/67/07/14/PDF/NCT2-13-haude-20090120-HAL.pdf>, 2009a.
- HAUDE, Katharina. Hierarchical alignment in Movima. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 75(4). 513-532, 2009b.
- HAUDE, Katharina. The intransitive basis of Movima clause structure. In Spike Gildea & Francesc Queixalós (eds.), *Ergativity in Amazonia* (Typological Studies in Language 89), 285-316. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.89.11hau>, 2010a.
- HAUDE, Katharina. “She kisses her late husband” = “She kissed her husband”: nominal tense in Movima. In Jan Wohlgemuth & Michael Cysouw (eds.), *Rara & Rarissima*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter

- Mouton. http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/67/09/25/PDF/Rara_Haude-revision-corrected.pdf, 2010b.
- HAUDE, Katharina. Tense marking on dependent nominals in Movima. In Renate Musan & Monika Rathert (eds.), *Tense Across Languages*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter. http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/67/22/48/PDF/haude-TenseAcrossLanguages-revision_1.pdf, 2011a.
- HAUDE, Katharina. Referring to states and events: subordination in Movima. In Rik van Gijn, Katharina Haude & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *Subordination in South American Languages* (Typological Studies in Language 97), 141-168. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.97.06hau>, 2011b.
- HAUDE, Katharina. Animacy and inverse in Movima: a corpus study. *Anthropological Linguistics* 56(3-4). 294-314, 2014.
- HAUDE, Katharina. Nonverbal predication in Movima. In Simon E. Overall, Rosa Vallejos & Spike Gildea (eds.), *Nonverbal Predication in Amazonian Languages* (Typological Studies in Language 122), 217-244. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01848221v1>, 2018.
- HAUDE, Katharina. Grammatical relations in Movima: Alignment beyond semantic roles. In Alena Witzlack-Makarevich & Balthasar Bickel (eds.), *Argument Selectors: New Perspectives on Grammatical Relations* (Typological Studies in Language 123), 213-256. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-02049736v1>, 2019a.
- HAUDE, Katharina. From predication to reference: on “verbal DPs” in Movima. In Christine Bonnot, Outi Duvallon & Hélène de Penanros (eds.), *Individuation et référence nominale à travers les langues*, 53-77. Paris: Editions Lambert-Lucas. <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01971969v1>, 2019b.
- HAUDE, Katharina. 2023. Movima. In Patience Epps & Lev Michael (eds.), *Amazonian Languages: An International Handbook. Vol. 2: Language Isolates: Kanoé to Yurakaré* (HSK 44), vol. 2, 807-849. Berlin ; New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- HAUDE, Katharina. Between symmetrical voice and ergativity: inverse and antipassive in Movima. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 90(1). 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.1086/727522>, 2024.
- HAUDE, Katharina & MARC Allasonnière-Tang. Forthcoming. Lexical, pronominal, and zero argument encoding in Movima. In Claudine Chamoreau & Enrique Palancar (eds.), *Topicality and the Shaping of Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- JELINEK, Eloise. Empty categories, case, and configurationality. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00233713>, 1984.
- KLEIN, Wolfgang. On finiteness. In Veerle van Geenhoven (ed.), *Semantics in Acquisition*, 245-272, 2006.
- LAUNEY, Michel. *Une grammaire omniprédicative: Essai sur la morphosyntaxe du nahuatl classique*. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1994.
- LAUNEY, Michel. The features of omnipredicativity in Classical Nahuatl. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 57(1). 49-69. <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1524/stuf.2004.57.1.49/html>, 2004.
- MATTHEWS, Peter. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. 3rd edn. [2014]. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- NIKOLAEVA, Irina. Introduction. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 1-19. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- SASSE, Hans-Jürgen. The thetic/categorical distinction revisited. *Linguistics* (25). 511-580, 1987.
- SASSE, Hans-Jürgen. Syntactic Categories and Subcategories. In Joachim Jacobs, Armin von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann (eds.), *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung / An International Handbook of Contemporary Research* (Handbücher Zur Sprach- Und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science [HSK] 9), vol. 1, 646-686. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.
- STASSEN, Leon. *Comparison and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

Recebido: 26/7/2024

Aceito: 27/2/2025

Publicado: 26/5/2025