Argument encoding in Movima: the local domain

Katharina Haude

ARGUMENT ENCODING IN MOVIMA: THE LOCAL DOMAIN

KATHARINA HAUDE

SEDYL/CELIA, CNRS

Argument encoding in Movima transitive clauses is based on a referential hierarchy (1 > 2 > 3 topic > 3 nontopic). Verbal direct and inverse marking indicates the roles (actor/undergoer) of the event participants. The argument with the higher-ranking referent is obligatorily represented by a constituent directly attached to the predicate, while the argument with the lower-ranking referent is represented by a constituent less closely connected to the predicate, aligning with the single argument of the intransitive clause. First and second person can only be encoded in the first way and therefore do not show any alignment effect with the argument of the intransitive clause. However, pragmatic factors can override the person hierarchy: when, for pragmatic reasons, first and second person are expressed by a free pronoun in clause-initial topic position, they can be treated like lower-ranking persons.

[KEYWORDS: Amazonian languages, inverse, person hierarchy, speech-act participants, argument encoding]

1. Introduction. Movima is an unclassified language spoken in Santa Ana del Yacuma in the Bolivian Beni Department. The number of speakers can be estimated around several hundred (1,452 according to an official census in 1996), but all fluent speakers are over 60 years old and bilingual in Spanish; with very few exceptions, the language is no longer transmitted to children.

Movima has a basically analytic character in that there is no inflectional morphology. There is productive derivational morphology, however. Most derivational morphemes are suffixes; there is also one prefix (the oblique marker *n-*), several reduplication processes, prosodically based infixation, and different types of cliticization. Noun incorporation and composition, normally carried out with classifier-like elements, is very productive. Movima has only a weak noun–verb distinction, which is largely restricted to the morphological level. There is no morphological marking of case, gender, or number on nouns; verbs are not marked for tense and only for some modal and aspectual categories. In general, tense, aspect, and mood are indicated by particles. Referential elements (articles and pronouns) indicate structural vs. oblique case, number, gender, as well as spatial and temporal location of referents. Clausal embedding as well as main-clause negation involves nominalization.

Transitive clauses in Movima are organized according to a referential hierarchy that involves person (1 > 2 > 3) and, in the third-person domain,

[*IJAL* vol. 77, no. 4, October 2011, pp. 559–75]

0020–7071/2011/7704–0006$10.00

topicality (given > new).[1] The higher-ranking person is obligatorily expressed by a pronoun or noun phrase that immediately follows the predicate and is phonologically attached to it. The lower-ranking person is expressed by a pronoun or noun phrase that is not, or less tightly, phonologically attached to the predicate, and it can also be expressed by a free pronoun or noun phrase in clause-initial position; its overt expression is not obligatory. The participant roles (actor and undergoer) are indicated by direct and inverse marking on the verb. Apart from the two core arguments, all nominal constituents in the clause are marked as oblique.

The structure and alignment patterns of clauses with third-person arguments have already been discussed in previous publications (see, in particular, Haude 2009). This paper expands on this discussion by contrasting the patterns found there with those of clauses with first- and second-person arguments.

Section **2** presents the basics of argument encoding in intransitive (**2.1**) and transitive (**2.2**) clauses. Section **3** describes the encoding of speech-act participants (SAPs) in detail, illustrating the difference between free and bound pronouns (**3.1**) and the encoding of SAPs in intransitive (**3.2**) and transitive (**3.3**) clauses. Section **4** discusses the syntactic effects of the person hierarchy (**4.1**) and shows how it can be overridden by pragmatically marked structures (**4.2**). The results and implications of the analysis are summed up in **5**.[2]

2. Basic clause structure. The basic elements of the Movima clause are the predicate and one or two arguments.[3] Constituent order is typically predicate-initial, as illustrated by the intransitive clause in (1). Arguments are identified by a referential element (i.e., they are expressed either by a pronoun or by a noun phrase, which invariably contains a determiner), which is not marked as oblique (see the noun phrase *is suwe:ro* in 1). Ad-

[1] This superficial characterization of "topicality" reflects the fact that this domain has not as yet been sufficiently investigated for Movima. What is meant is that in principle, in the third-person domain, a referent that has been introduced in the preceding discourse or is known from the extralinguistic context is encoded as the high-ranking person.

[2] This paper is based on text and elicitation data collected in Santa Ana del Yacuma, Bolivia, between 2001 and 2008, and I wish to thank the Movima speakers who provided them. The article was prepared within the Movima documentation project of the DoBeS programme (Volkswagen Foundation, II/81914). I am grateful to the editors of this volume, to Joana Jansen, and to an anonymous reviewer for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

[3] The phonological inventory of Movima is as follows (deviating orthographic representations are provided in parentheses). The five vowel phonemes are /a/, /e/, /i/, /o/, /u/. The 19 consonant phonemes are /p/, /t/, /k/, /kʷ/ (*kw*), /ʔ/ (*'*), /ɓ/ (*b*), /ɗ/ (*d*), /tʃ/ (*ch*), /β/ (*v*), /s/, /h/ (*j*), /ɾ/, /m/, /n/, /l/, /ɾ/ (*r*), /w/, /j/ (*y*), /jˀ/ (*y'*). In coda position, the phonemes /p/, /t/, and /k/ are realized as [pʔ̂ᵐ], [tʔ̂ⁿ], and [ʔ], respectively. Stress normally falls on the penultimate syllable, but words ending in one of these glottal(ized) consonants carry stress on the last syllable. Syllable structure is (C)V(C). For more information on Movima phonology and grammar, see Haude (2006).

juncts are marked by the oblique prefix *n-* (*nV-* before consonants), like the oblique-marked first-person pronoun *ninła* in (1).[4]

(1) *bat-cheł* *is* *suwe:ro* ***n-****inła*
put-R/R ART.PL saline_solution OBL-PRO.1SG
[ˈɓatʔⁿʃeɬ ʔis suˈweːɾo ˈninła]
'A saline solution was put into me'. (tx)

2.1. Intransitive clauses. Intransitive clauses may maximally contain one overt argument (ARG_s), represented by a noun phrase (*is suwe:ro* in 1 above). When ARG_s is represented by a bound pronoun, as in (2), the pronoun is cliticized to the predicate through "external clitization," represented by a double hyphen (--):

(2) *bat-cheł--****is***
put-R/R--3PL.AB
[ˈɓatʔⁿʃeɬis]
'They (the birds) settled down'. (tx)

External cliticization (in opposition to "internal cliticization"; see below) is characterized by resyllabification with a host-final consonant. This can be observed by comparing the phonetic representations of (1) and (2): the plural article *is* in (1) is, like any vowel-initial word, preceded by a glottal stop (see Haude 2006:38), whereas the bound plural pronoun *is* in (2) takes the preceding consonant as its onset.[5] When ARG_s is retrievable from the context, it does not have to be overtly realized.

ARG_s can also be represented by a free pronoun, typically in clause-initial topic position, as in (3). Usually the referent has been introduced immediately before.

(3) *is* *dichi:ye,* ***isko*** *ney* *rey* *ja'* *ka<ma~>may*
ART.PL child PRO.PL.AB here MOD just shout<MD~>
'The children, they just shout nowadays'. (tx)

[4] Elicited examples are marked by (e), text examples by (tx). The symbols and abbreviations used are: = internal cliticization; -- external cliticization; < > infixation; ~ reduplication; 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; AB = absential; AGT = agentive; APPL = applicative; ART = article; BDP = bodily process; BE = bound nominal element; BEN = benefactive; CAUS = causative; CO = coparticipant; CTF = counterfactual; DES = desiderative; DETR = detransitivizer; DM = demonstrative; DR = direct; DSC = discontinuous; EMPH = emphatic; EV = evidential; F = feminine; HOD = hodiernal past; HYP = hypothetical; INTR = intransitive; INV = inverse; ITN = intentional; LN = linking nasal; LV = linking vowel; M = masculine; MD = middle; MLT = multiple; MOD = modal; N = neuter; NEG = negation; NMZ = action nominalizer; NTR = neutral; OBL = oblique; OBV = obviative; OPT = optative; PL = plural; PRO = free pronoun; PST = past; R/R = reflexive/reciprocal; REAS = reason; RED = reduplication; REL = relativizer; SG = singular; SPK = close to speaker.

[5] The presential plural article and the absential plural bound pronoun are homophonous, but they belong to different paradigms.

2.2. Transitive clauses. Transitive clauses are identified by the fact that they may contain two argument expressions, which typically both follow the predicate. The linear order of the arguments corresponds to the position of their referents in a referential hierarchy, which basically involves person (1 > 2 > 3) and, in the third-person domain, topicality (roughly: given > new). The argument expression denoting the higher-ranking participant occurs in first position and the one denoting the lower-ranking participant in second position after the predicate. In (4), the bound pronoun *us* represents the higher-ranking participant, which is human and whose identity was established in the preceding context; the noun phrase *os rulrul* represents the lower-ranking participant, which is nonhuman and is newly introduced by this clause.

(4) *dewaj-na=us* *os* *rulrul*
see-DR=3M.AB ART.N.PST jaguar
'He saw a jaguar'. (tx)

The participant roles of the arguments are indicated by verbal morphemes. When in a two-participant event the actor outranks the undergoer in the referential hierarchy, the verb is marked as direct, as in (4); when the undergoer outranks the actor, the verb is marked as inverse, as in (5).

(5) *bu'ni* *yok-**kay**-a=u* *os* *rulrul*
perhaps catch-INV-LV=3M.AB ART.N.PST jaguar
'A jaguar might catch him'. (tx)

Since the encoding of the arguments in a transitive clause is determined by the semantic and pragmatic properties of their referents rather than by participant roles, they cannot uncontroversially be assigned labels such as "subject" and "object."[6] Following Bickel (2010), I use the term "Proximate Argument" (short: ARG_{prox}) to refer to the argument expressed in first position and "Obviative Argument" (short: ARG_{obv}) to refer to the argument expressed in second position after the predicate.

Apart from their linear order, the two arguments of a transitive clause are differentiated by their obligatoriness of realization and by whether and how the referential element is attached to the preceding constituent. I describe this in detail in the remainder of this section, first for ARG_{obv}, then for ARG_{prox}.

ARG_{obv}, the argument in second position after the predicate, has the same formal properties as ARG_s (see **2.1**). When realized as a noun phrase, it is phonologically independent, as in (4) and (5) above. When realized as a bound pronoun, the pronoun is attached to the preceding constituent through external

[6] In fact, when considering formal and behavioral properties, the second nominal constituent is the one with the most subject properties (see Haude 2009).

cliticization (6), like a pronominal ARG_s (see 2); furthermore, ARG_{obv} can be replaced by a clause-initial free pronoun instead of an enclitic (7), but it is not obligatorily overtly expressed (see 8*b* below).

(6) *dewaj-na=n**--is***
see-DR=2--3PL.AB
'You see them'. (tx)

(7) *isko* *dewaj-na=n*
PRO.PL.AB see-DR=2
'It is them you see'. (e)

ARG_{prox} behaves differently from ARG_{obv} in all these respects. First of all, a referential element representing ARG_{prox} is phonologically attached to the predicate through "internal cliticization," which, in contrast to external cliticization, creates the stress patterns of a prosodic word and leads to shortening of a long penultimate vowel.[7] The phonetic representations in (8) illustrate the stress pattern and the shortening of the vowel: in (8*a*), there is no overt internally cliticized pronoun (the first-person singular is zero; see below), so the penultimate syllable of the verb is long and carries stress. In (8*b*), the pronoun *us* is internally cliticized, so the penultimate syllable of the verb is short and stress falls on the last syllable of the verb.

(8*a*) *aya:-na=∅--us*
wait_for-DR=1SG--3M.AB
[aˈ**ja:**naʔus]
'I wait for him'. (e)

(8*b*) *aya-na**=us***
wait_for-DR=3M.AB
[ajaˈ**na**ʔus]
'He waits for (him/her/it/them)'. (e)

Internally cliticized elements require a preceding vowel: when the host ends in a consonant, the linking vowel *-a* is inserted, as in (9).

(9) *kay-a-poj-a=us* *itila:kwa* *as* *pa:ko*
eat-DR-CAUS-LV=ART.M man ART.N dog
'The man feeds the dog'. (e)

(9) also illustrates that, unlike external cliticization, internal cliticization involves determiners in the same way as pronouns. It is for this reason that this process is analyzed as cliticization instead of suffixation.

[7] Note, however, that the new open penultimate syllable is not lengthened, as would usually be the case for a Movima word; this is the main phonological difference between internal cliticization and canonical suffixation in Movima.

TABLE 1
FORMAL PROPERTIES OF MOVIMA ARGUMENTS

ARG_{prox}	ARG_{obv} and ARG_{s}
Internal Cliticization (=)	**External Cliticization (--)**
Stress shift, epenthetic /a/, affects lengthened vowels	Resyllabification, no stress shift, no epenthetic /a/, does not affect lengthened vowels
Pronouns and articles are cliticized	Only pronouns are cliticized
Grammatically obligatory	Not grammatically obligatory

The realization of ARG_{prox} is grammatically obligatory. The absence of an internally cliticized referential element from a transitive predicate identifies ARG_{prox} as the first-person singular, as in (8*a*). Furthermore, ARG_{prox} is also expressed by an enclitic element when there is a coreferential free pronoun in clause-initial topic position, as in (10) (the free pronoun here refers back to a participant that was topical in the preceding discourse).

(10) *U'ko* *invitar-na=u--k-isne*
PRO.M invite-DR=3M--OBV[8]-3F.AB
'He invited her'. (tx)

The formal properties that distinguish ARG_{prox} from both ARG_{obv} and ARG_{s} are summed up in table 1.

Since, when third persons are involved, ARG_{s} aligns with ARG_{obv}, direct and inverse marking on the predicate leads to an alignment-split pattern when participant roles are considered: the direct construction, in which ARG_{obv} is the undergoer, patterns ergatively, and the inverse construction, in which ARG_{obv} is the actor, patterns accusatively (see Haude 2010). It will be shown that when speech-act participants are involved, such an analysis is not possible.

3. The encoding of SAPs. The representation of SAP arguments is more complex than that of third persons, since it is not only carried out by enclitics but also by elements preceding the predicate. Furthermore, the ARG_{prox} paradigm contains morphemes different from those of the ARG_{s} paradigm, while for third persons, the morphemes are identical in both paradigms. Finally, note that apart from the second-person plural, a SAP argument cannot be encoded as ARG_{obv} (see table 2).

Before I go into the details of the encoding of SAP arguments, some general remarks are necessary regarding the formal differences between the free and the bound pronouns.

[8] The marker *k-* labeled "OBV" occurs on the externally cliticized pronoun whenever the referent of the internally cliticized one is or includes a third person (i.e., a third person or, as here, the first-person plural exclusive).

TABLE 2
MOVIMA SAP PRONOUNS

	Free Pronouns	ARG_{prox}		ARG_s	
		Proclitic	Enclitic	Proclitic	Enclitic
1st SG	*inła*	*(i)ł*	*=∅*	*(i)t*	–
1st PL	*iy'łi*	*(i)ł*	*=y'łi*	*(i)t*	*--(i)y'łi*
1st INCL	*i:de*	*(i)ł*	*=n*	*(i)ł*	–
2nd SG	*ulkwat*	–	*=n*	*(i)s*	–
2nd PL	*iy'bikweł*	–	*=n-kweł*	*(i)s*	*--(i)y'bi* (also ARG_{obv})

3.1. Free and bound pronouns. The free SAP pronouns, like the free third-person pronouns, typically occur in topic position before the predicate, either with (11) or without (12) the coreferential proclitic element.

(11) *jayna* ***inła*** ***t*** *ba:baycho*
DSC PRO.1SG 1INTR bored
'I was bored'. (tx)

(12) *jayna* ***inła*** *sutu:ka*
DSC PRO.1SG angry
'I was angry'. (tx)

The SAP proclitics differ from the free pronouns in that they form a syntactic unit with the subsequent content word and can therefore be analyzed as syntactic proclitics (Klavans 1985). Only a particle can occur between these two elements of a phrase, as in (13).

(13) ***ił*** *kwey* *peł-a:-cho*
1 HOD tear-DR-BR.inside
'I just tore (it)'. (e)

Proclitics basically consist of a coda consonant: when the preceding word ends in a vowel, the SAP proclitic appears as the consonant alone (like *t* in 11 above). When the pronoun follows a consonant or occurs clause-initially, as in (13), the proclitic is augmented by the dummy vowel /i/ (Haude 2006:61–62).

Unlike the cliticization processes described in **2** above, this phonological attachment to the preceding constituent has no effect on the pronunciation of the phonological host. This can be observed with the proclitic first-person ARG_s marker *t*, which is realized as [t͡ʔⁿ] in coda position. A word-final glottal(ized) consonant normally attracts stress (see n. 3), but this is not the case with the first-person pronoun. In (14), the phonetic representation of the relevant segment of (11) is provided. Note that stress remains in place, i.e., on the first (the penultimate) syllable of the host. In (15), this is contrasted with a word ending in /t/: here, stress is on the last syllable, as is usual for words ending in a glottalized consonant.

(14) *inła* ***t*** . . . [ˈʔinłatʔ͡n] (see 11)
(15) *nijbe****t*** [nihˈɓetʔ͡n] ‘mangy’

The proclitics are not grammatically obligatory, as shown in (16) (see also 12 above).

(16) *che* *joy-cheł* *vaye:łe* *n-as* *wa:ka-wa-n-di*
and go-R/R look OBL-ART.N cow-NMZ-LN-BE.house
‘And (I’ll) go and have a look at the corral’. (tx)

As for the enclitics, the SAP paradigms basically have the same properties as the third-person enclitics (**2.2**): ARG_s and ARG_{prox} are distinguished by the type of phonological cliticization. This is best illustrated with the first-person plural enclitic, which has the same form in both paradigms ((*i*)*y’łi*). When representing ARG_{prox}, the cliticization of the pronoun triggers stress shift and shortening of the penultimate vowel (17), and when representing ARG_s, it does not (18). When attached to a consonant-final host, the internally cliticized pronoun requires the linking vowel *-a* (19), whereas the externally cliticized element occurs with the dummy vowel (*i*) and is resyllabified with the host (20).

(17) *aya-na****=y’łi***
wait-DR=1PL
[ʔajaˈnajʔɬi]
‘We waited for (him)’. (tx)

(18) *ilo:ni****--y’łi***
walk--1PL
[ʔiˈlo:nijʔɬi]
‘We walked’. (tx)

(19) *vel-kay-a****=y’łi***
look-INV-LV=1PL
‘(They) looked after us’. (tx)

(20) *it* *kuyna:nak****--iy’łi***
1INTR play--1PL
[itʔ͡n kujˈna:naˈkijʔɬi]
‘We played’. (tx)

With respect to the SAP enclitics that encode ARG_{prox}, it may be asked whether they are indeed enclitics or rather suffixes. I analyze them as enclitics simply because the morphological process is exactly the same as the one involving third-person forms, including articles. As for the second-person singular enclitic *=n*, which is nonsyllabic and therefore cannot cause stress shift, the evidence for internal cliticization is provided only by the appearance of the linking vowel, as illustrated in (25), and the absence of a long penultimate syllable:

(21) *kay-a-poj-a**=n***
eat-DR-CAUS-LV=2
[kajaˈpohan]
'You feed (him/her/it/them)'. (e)

The second-person plural is the only case of a morphological difference between the ARG_{prox} and the ARG_{obv}/ARG_{s} enclitic in the entire person-marking system. For ARG_{prox}, it is the second part of the free pronoun (*i*)*y'bikweł*, *-kweł*, that is copied and attached to the second-person marker *=n* (22);[9] for ARG_{s} (as well as for ARG_{obv}; see below), it is the first part, (*i*)*y'bi*, that is externally cliticized (23).[10]

(22) *aya-na=n**-kweł***
wait-DR=2-2PL
'You (pl.) waited for (him)'. (tx)

(23) *ilo:ni**--y'bi***
walk--2PL
'You (pl.) walked'. (tx)

The following sections analyze in further detail SAP encoding in intransitive and transitive clauses.

3.2. SAP encoding in intransitive clauses. In intransitive clauses (see the rightmost column of table 2), all SAPs can be represented by proclitic elements; plural SAPs are additionally represented by enclitics, which are identical (in the case of the first-person plural, *--iy'łi*) or partly identical (as in the case of the second-person plural, *--iy'bi*) with the corresponding free pronoun.

There are three different proclitic elements in the ARG_{s} paradigm: (*i*)*t* for first person, (*i*)*ł* for first-person plural inclusive ('me and you sg./pl.'), and (*i*)*s* for second person. The enclitic elements, in addition to person, mark the plural of first (exclusive) and second person.

Like third-person pronouns, the SAP pronouns can be omitted from an intransitive clause when they can be retrieved from the context. This is illustrated in (24), where the main clause (*jayna chi:chi*) lacks the first- person plural pronoun.

[9] The ending *-kweł* of the second-person plural ARG_{prox} enclitic is also a plural marker on imperative verb forms (Haude 2006:354).

[10] I have so far not been able to find adequate glosses for distinguishing the two second-person plural morphemes, since each covers two possibly synchronically distinct functions: *=n-kweł* encodes ARG_{prox} as well as a nominal possessor; *--y'bi* encodes ARG_{obv} and the argument of an intransitive clause. For the time being, the difference has to be read from the form of the morpheme and the cliticization symbol.

(24) *jayna* *chi:~chi* *bo* *kas* *bawara-wa=y'ɬi* *usko*
DSC MD~go_out because NEG be_paid-NMZ=1PL PRO.3M.AB
'Then (we) left because he didn't pay us'.[11] (tx)

3.3. The ARG_{prox} paradigm. The paradigm of SAP pronouns that encode ARG_{prox} is given in the center column of table 2. In contrast to the ARG_S paradigm, where all persons can be represented by proclitic forms, in the transitive paradigm there is a clear split between first and second person: throughout, the first person is represented by the proclitic *(i)ɬ* and the second person by the enclitic *=n*. The combination of the two markers represents the first-person plural inclusive, illustrated in (25).[12]

(25) *loy* *iɬ* *sal-na=n*
ITN 1 search-DR=2
'We (incl.) will search for him/her/it/them'. (e)

Plural SAPs are encoded by additional enclitic forms which are identical to (part of) the corresponding free pronouns. Therefore, the encoding of SAPs as ARG_{prox} can be simplified as in (26):

(26) Person marking of SAP ARG_{prox}
First person: proclitic *(i)ɬ*
Second person: enclitic *=n*
Plural: enclitic (partly) identical to free pronoun

The proclitics are not grammatically obligatory, while the internal enclitics are; the absence of an internal enclitic indicates the first-person singular. From the optionality of the proclitics, it follows that the first-person singular is best analyzed as being marked not only by the proclitic *(i)ɬ* but also by a zero enclitic, which unambiguously indicates a first-person singular ARG_{prox} (see 8*a* above).

In the case of the first-person inclusive, encoded by the combination of the proclitic marker of the first-person *(i)ɬ* and the enclitic encoding the second-person *=n*, the optionality of the proclitic can cause ambiguity. When the proclitic is omitted, the encoding of the first-person inclusive is identical to that of the second-person singular, as in (27).

(27) *josi-ka-poj-kay-a=n--i'ne* *ɬat* *ay'ku*
laugh-MLT-CAUS-INV-LV=2--3F EV my_aunt
'She has made you/us (incl.) laugh, hasn't she, aunt?' (tx)

Both the ARG_{prox} paradigm and the ARG_S paradigm contain proclitics and, in both, plural persons are marked by enclitics. The forms of the pronouns

[11] The inverse marker is absent from some nominalized verb forms (see Haude 2006:361ff.).
[12] The first-person inclusive is also used for generic reference.

are distinct, with two exceptions: the first-person plural ARG_s proclitic *(i)ɬ* is identical to the first-person ARG_{prox} proclitics, and the first-person plural enclitic has the same form in both paradigms. The occurrence of a proclitic *(i)ɬ* in the two paradigms is unambiguous, however, since transitive predicates are morphologically identifiable by containing either a direct or an inverse marker.

4. The person hierarchy.

4.1. Basic transitive constructions. I now look at the way in which the person hierarchy is reflected in Movima argument encoding—first in situations in which two SAPs interact in a two-participant event and then in those involving a SAP and a third person.

With the exception of the second-person plural, the proclitics in the ARG_s paradigm cannot encode ARG_{obv} of a transitive clause. When a first-person singular or plural interact, the first person is encoded as ARG_{prox} and the second person is not encoded in the clausal core at all (when singular), or it is represented as ARG_{obv} by the external enclitic (when plural). The following examples illustrate the interaction between first-person and second-person singular. When the first person is the actor, the direct construction is used (28); when the first person is the undergoer, the inverse construction is used (29).

(28) *di'* *is* *joy-sicha'kwa* *jayłe* *jayna* *choy* *rey* ***iɬ***
HYP 2INTR go-DES then DSC really again 1
*joy-**a:**-łe**=Ø***
go-DR-CO=1SG
'If you want to go, then I'll take (you) there, of course'. (tx)

(29) *di'* *rey* *yey-na=n* *ulkwat,* *iɬ* *jiwa-kwa-n-kay=Ø*
HYP MOD want-DR=2 PRO.2SG 1 come-BEN-LN-INV=1SG
'If you want to, you come to visit me'. (tx)

Also, when the first-person plural interacts with the second-person singular, the first-person plural is encoded as ARG_{prox} and the second person is not overtly expressed, as illustrated with a direct clause in (30) and with an inverse clause in (31). This shows that the first-person plural outranks the second-person singular in the person hierarchy.

(30) *loy* *joy-a-łe**=y'ɬi***
ITN go-DR-CO=1PL
'We'll take (you sg.)'. (e)

(31) *papá,* *jankwa=sne,* *papá,* *jayna* *ela-kay-a**=y'ɬi***
dad say=3F.AB dad DSC leave_behind-INV-LV=1PL
'Dad, she said, dad, (you sg.) leave us already'. (tx)

The second-person plural is the only SAP that can be represented as ARG_{obv}, by the external enclitic --(*i*)*y'bi* from the ARG_s paradigm. (32) shows this for the direct construction and (33) for the inverse.

(32) *jiwa-łe:-na=**Ø--y'bi*** *bo* *as* *dewaj-na-wa=n-kweł*
come-CO-DR=1SG--2PL REAS ART.N see-DR-NMZ=2-2PL

ayruł *bayłim*
DM.N.SPK.1 my_field

'I brought you (pl.) so that you see my field'. (tx)

(33) *jayna* *rey* *ił* *pet-kay=**Ø--iy'bi**,* *majni*
DSC MOD 1 greet-INV=1SG--2PL my_child

'You (pl.) greeted me already, my children'. (tx)

(34) illustrates the interaction between the first-person plural exclusive and the second-person plural:

(34) *kay<a>łe=**y'łi--k-iy'bi*** *no-kos* *ba:-ra*
give<DR>=1PL--OBV-2PL OBL-ART.N.AB complete-BE.NTR

jum<a>ra=n-kweł
need<DR>-2–2PL

'We'll give you (pl.) all you need'. (tx)

Since the first-person plural, like the second-person plural, can be represented by an external enclitic in an intransitive clause, it might be expected that this enclitic can also be used to encode ARG_{obv} in a transitive clause. However, this does not seem to be possible. Due to the person hierarchy, this case would only be expected in situations in which the first-person plural interacts with the first-person singular; but there are no such examples in the text corpus and, in elicitation, constructions like (35) were not accepted. Hence, the ability to be encoded as ARG_{obv} is not a purely formal phenomenon—representation by an external clitic—it is also based on the person hierarchy, with only the lowest person within the SAP set having access to ARG_{obv} encoding.

(35) **rimeł-na-kwa:-na=**Ø--y'łi***
buy-DR-BEN-DR=1SG--1PL

'I bought it for us (excl)'.[13] (e)

When a SAP interacts with a third person, the SAP is encoded as ARG_{prox} and the third person as ARG_{obv}, as expected typologically (see DeLancey 1981 and Zúñiga 2006). The ranking of the first over the third person is illustrated

[13] In transitive clauses describing three-participant events, the recipient is encoded as an argument and the theme as an adjunct.

in (36) (direct) and (37) (inverse): the third person is encoded as ARG_{obv} and direct or inverse marking indicates the participant roles.[14]

(36) *jema'* *iɬ* *juɬ-a:-pit=**Ø**--**us***
also 1 hug-DR-BE.half=1sg--3M.AB
'. . . because I also held him around the waist'. (tx)

(37) *bo* *jema'* *juɬ-pit-kay=**Ø**--**us***
REAS also hug-BE.half-INV=1SG--3M.AB
'. . . because he also held me around the waist'. (tx)

The first-person plural interacting with a third person is illustrated in (38) and (39) (on the obviative marker *k-*, see n. 7).

(38) *jema'* *ney* *dok-na=**y'ɬi--k-i'***
also here put_on-DR=1PL--OBV-3PL
'We also put these on'. (tx)

(39) *tojeɬ-kay-a=**y'ɬi--k-us***
pass_by-INV-LV=1PL--OBV-3M.AB
'He went past us'. (tx)

(40) illustrates the interaction between the second-person singular with a third person (see 27 above for the inverse construction):

(40) *bu'ni* *yey-na=**n--as***
perhaps want-DR=2SG--3N.AB
'Perhaps you like it'. (tx)

In (41), finally, consider the second-person plural interacting with a third person. Here too, the SAP is invariably encoded as ARG_{prox} and the third person as ARG_{obv}.

(41) *kwaj* *sotak-lomaj* *dis* *dajawa=**n-kweɬ--us*** *di'*
EMPH one-time OPT ask=2-2PL--3M.AB HYP
*bawra-kay-a=**n-kweɬ--us*** *di'* *ka:'i*
pay-INV-LV-2=2PL--3M.AB HYP no
'You (pl.) should ask him at once if he is going to pay you or not'. (tx)

To sum up, the ARG_{prox} slot in a transitive clause is reserved for the higher-ranking person. When two SAPs interact, the first person is encoded as ARG_{prox}. When SAPs interact with third persons, the SAP is encoded as

14. As was confirmed through elicitation, the proclitic pronoun *iɬ* is optional in (36) and would be grammatical in (37) as well.

ARG_{prox} and the third person as ARG_{obv}. Of the SAPs, only the second-person plural can be encoded as ARG_{obv}.

However, in **4.2** I show that this system can be overridden by pragmatic factors: the encoding of the higher-ranking person by a free pronoun can allow the lower-ranking person to be encoded as ARG_{prox}.

4.2. SAP pronouns in the marked-topic construction. Like third persons, SAPs can also be encoded by free pronouns in transitive clauses. This can lead to constructions that seem to contradict the person hierarchy.

Let us first consider the prototypical case, in which the free pronoun refers to the lower-ranking event participant (see 7 above). In the case of two interacting SAPs, the free pronoun refers to the second person and the first person is encoded as ARG_{prox}. (42) illustrates this for a direct and (43) for an inverse transitive clause.

(42) *bo* ***ulkwat*** *yey-na=∅* *as* *joy-a-łe:-wa=∅*
REAS PRO.2SG want-DR=1SG ART.N go-DR-CO-NMZ=1SG
'. . . because it is you I want to take'.[15] (tx)

(43) ***ulkwat*** *ił* *lawajes-kay=∅,* *papi:to*
PRO.2SG 1 heal-INV=1SG father
'It was you who healed me, Father'. (tx)

SAPs can also be expressed by a free pronoun coreferring with ARG_{prox} (see 10 above), as shown in (44) for a direct and in (45) for an inverse construction. This is not uncommon, and it does not seem to put any particular emphasis on the topicalized referent. For strong emphasis, a detransitivizing construction is used (marked by the particle *kwey*; see Haude 2009; 2010), as illustrated in (46).

(44) *che* ***inła*** *jema'* *ew-na=∅--us*
and PRO.1SG too hold-DR=1SG--3M.AB
'And I held him, too'. (tx)

(45) *jayłe* ***inła*** *naye-poj-kay=∅* *kus* *delepa'a*
then PRO.1SG marry-CAUS-INV=1SG ART.M.AB stepfather
'So my stepfather made me marry'. (tx)

(46) *inła,* ***inła*** *rey* ***kwey*** *vel-na* *n-isko*
PRO.1SG PRO.1SG MOD DETR look_after-DR OBL-PRO.PL.AB
'Me, I am the one who looks after them'. (tx)

Interestingly, the encoding of a SAP by a free pronoun can allow a lower-ranking person to be encoded as ARG_{prox}. This construction is apparently

[15] In (42), the free pronoun belongs to the embedded clause with the nominalized predicate.

only used to put very strong emphasis on the person referred to by the free pronoun. The only examples of a SAP and a third person in the text corpus contain the direct construction, as in (47) and (48). In both examples, the SAP is contrasted to other discourse referents.

(47) *ka:,* ***ulkwat*** *yey-na**=’ne***
no PRO.2SG want-DR=3F

‘No, it is you she wants (not me)!’ (tx)

(48) *jayna* *kas* *ve~vel-wa=a* *is* *pa:ko*
DSC NEG DR~look_for-NMZ=3N ART.P dog

bo *jayna* *i:de,* ***i:de*** *sal-na**=a***
REAS DSC PRO.1INCL PRO.1INCL look_for-DR=3N

‘Then it (the jaguar that is hunted) does not care about the dogs anymore, because it is us (i.e., humans), it is us it looks for’. (tx)

Although equally rare, this construction can also occur with an interacting first and second person, as shown in (49) with a direct and in (50) with an inverse predicate (the latter involving the second-person plural). In both examples, the first person is encoded by a free pronoun and the second person by the bound pronoun representing ARG_{prox}.

(49) ***inła*** *nokowa* *joy-a-łe**=n,*** *kas* *joy-a-łe-wa=n*
PRO.1SG right_now go-DR-CO=2 NEG go-DR-CO-NMZ=2

kos *so:te*
ART.N.AB other_person

‘You will take **me** with you now, you won’t take anybody else’. (e)

(50) ***inła*** *disoy* *oyloni-kay-a**=n-kweł***
PRO.1SG CNTF accompany-INV-LV=2-2PL

‘**I** would have accompanied you (even if nobody else would)’. (tx)

The constructions in (47)–(50) are unexpected in that the lower-ranking event participant is encoded as ARG_{prox}, triggering direct or inverse marking. While the exact functions of the employment of the free pronoun clearly require further research, the above examples show that the person hierarchy, which determines the encoding of a participant as ARG_{prox} or ARG_{obv}, can be overriden by pragmatic factors. In (47)–(50), the SAPs, which are highest in the person hierarchy (and usually also topical; see, e.g., Payne 1994:316), are treated as newly introduced topics; they are not expressed inside the core, but in the fronted topic position, which allows another participant to be expressed in the ARG_{prox} slot. Further research may reveal

that discourse pragmatics is more important for Movima clause structure than the person hierarchy.

5. Conclusion. This paper has shown that the Movima inverse system covers all domains of interaction between different positions in the person hierarchy: local (SAPs), mixed (SAP and third person), and non-local (third persons). This is typologically noteworthy, since a single direct-inverse marking system across all these domains is not the default cross-linguistically (see DeLancey 2001, Gildea 1994, and Zúñiga 2006:48ff.).

At the same time, and leaving aside the marked-topic construction, a split between SAP and third-person encoding can be observed, which occurs on two different levels. The first level is that of formal encoding. While all persons can be encoded as ARG_{prox}, i.e., by internal enclitics, only a limited set of persons can be encoded as ARG_{obv}, i.e., by external enclitics. This set includes third persons and plural SAPs. Only SAPs can additionally be expressed by proclitic elements. Hence, there is a difference in formal marking between persons that are or necessarily include non-SAPs and persons that do not necessarily include a non-SAP, schematized in (51).[16]

(51) Proclitic: [+1] and/or [+2]
External enclitic: [+3]

The second level involves alignment. Except for the second-person plural, the encoding of SAPs in transitive clauses is different from their encoding in intransitive clauses. Therefore, in contrast to clauses with third-person arguments, in clauses with SAP arguments there is no alignment between one argument of a transitive and the single argument of an intransitive clause. This absence of alignment contrasts with the alignment of third-person ARG_s with third-person ARG_{obv} (see **2.2** above).

Hence, within the local domain, and with only the exception of the second-person plural, Movima argument encoding constitutes a typical direct/inverse system, incompatible with typological classifications based on participant roles (see Nichols 1992). In contrast, the system of third-person argument encoding can also be described in terms of participant roles and split alignment (direct clauses patterning ergatively, inverse clauses patterning accusatively). With its split in encoding of local and non-local persons, the Movima argument-encoding system furthermore matches with the cross-linguistically based assumptions on hierarchically determined systems in which there is a cutting point between SAPs and third persons (see DeLancey 1981). However, I also showed that despite the importance of the person hierarchy in Movima clause structure, there are syntactic devices that allow the person hierarchy to

[16] I write "(not) necessarily" because the first-person plural inclusive can also include non-SAPs ('me and you sg./pl.').

be overridden by discourse-pragmatic factors. The pragmatic nuances of the different construction types are clearly a matter for further research.

REFERENCES

BICKEL, BALTHASAR. 2010. Grammatical relations typology. The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology, ed. Jae-Jung Song, pp. 399–444. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DELANCEY, SCOTT. 1981. An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns. Language 57:626–57.

_____ . 2001. Lectures on functional syntax. LSA Summer Institute, University of California at Santa Barbara. <http://www.uoregon.edu/~delancey/sb/fs.html>.

GILDEA, SPIKE. 1994. Semantic and pragmatic inverse: "Inverse alignment" and "inverse voice" in Carib of Surinam. Voice and Inversion, ed. T. Givón, pp. 187–230. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

HAUDE, KATHARINA. 2006. A grammar of Movima. Ph.D dissertation, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. <http://webdoc.ubn.ru.nl/mono/h/haude_k/gramofmo.pdf>.

_____ . 2009. Hierarchical alignment in Movima. IJAL 75: 513–32.

_____ . 2010. The intransitive basis of Movima clause structure. Ergativity in Amazonia, ed. Spike Gildea and Francesc Queixalós, pp. 285–315. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

KLAVANS, JUDITH L. 1985. The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. Language 61:95–120.

NICHOLS, JOHANNA. 1992. Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

PAYNE, DORIS. 1994. The Tupí-Guaraní inverse. Voice: Form and Function, ed. Barbara Fox and Paul Hopper, pp. 313–40. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

ZÚÑIGA, FERNANDO. 2006. Deixis and Alignment: Inverse Systems in Indigenous Languages of the Americas. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.