GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Terms in boldface are the terms used in the textbook for the concept in question; in some cases more than one term is used synonymously (e.g. ‘meaning’ and ‘semantic content’). Alternative terms are separated by commas. Parenthetical words in the term are often left out in a shortening of the term; for example, ‘complement (clause)’ indicates that this term is often shortened to ‘complement’.

Other terms for the concept that are found in the linguistics literature are given following aka (for ‘also known as’) in the definition. If the alternative term is also used in this textbook, it is also given in boldface and cross-referenced in the glossary. Alternative terms not in boldface are commonly used alternative terms, or in some cases defined in different ways. These terms are included in the glossary since many of them are in common use, even if they are not used in this textbook.

For terms describing categories of constructions and their function (see §1.4)—the vast majority of terms in the glossary—an abbreviation in italics is given after the term, as was done where the term was introduced in the main text:

(sem) semantic category
(inf) information structure category
(cxn) construction
(str) strategy

Boldface terms in the definition are other terms that are defined in the glossary. Examples are provided where possible. The section of the textbook where the term and its definition are introduced are given at the end of the entry. If more than one section is cited, this usually means that the term is discussed in further detail in the later section; the section with the most detailed discussion is given in boldface.

A role (sem): the agent or agent-like central participant role in the prototypical bivalent event (that is, a breaking event) or the prototypical trivalent event (that is, a giving event). Examples: in Jack broke the window, Jack plays the A role in the breaking event; and in Jill gave Joe the keys, Jill plays the A role in the giving event. (§6.3.1)

A-not-A (str): a strategy for polarity question constructions in which both the positive and negative form of the proposition are expressed. Example: Mandarin tā zài jiā bu zài jiā [lit. S/he at home not at home] ‘Is s/he at home?’ is an instance of the A-not-A strategy for polarity questions. The A-not-A strategy is essentially the recruitment of the alternative question construction for the polarity question function.

about(ness) (inf): the relation between what is expressed in a topic-comment sentence and the referent or topic that the comment or predication is predicated of. Example: in The coyote ran across the lawn, the sentence is about the coyote. Aboutness is intended to capture the notion that an utterance is relevant to ‘a matter of standing interest or concern’ (Strawson 1964:97) (§11.2.1)

absolute deranking system (str): a system where both the same-subject reference-tracking construction and the different-subject reference-tracking system use a deranked strategy. The deranked reference-tracking construction may be the same
for both same-subject and different-subject constructions. Example: Tamil avaru kadite erudițțu naaval moripeyartaaru ‘He wrote poetry and then translated a novel’ [same-subject] and naan param kuțuttu avan sinimaavukku poonaan ‘I gave (him) money and he went to the movie’ [different-subject] both use the deranked Adverbial Participle predicate forms, erudițțu ‘write:ADV.PART’ and kuțuttu ‘give:ADV.PART’ respectively. If the same-subject and different-subject constructions systematically use different deranked reference-tracking constructions, then it is a switch-reference system. (§16.3)

absolutive category (str): the category in the ergative alignment strategy that co-expresses both S and P roles. Example: Yuwaalaray argument phrases use the same zero case marker to express the S and P roles, and hence is an absolutive case marker. (§6.3.1)

accessibility (aka activation, topic continuity) (inf): the information status of a referent with respect to the hearer’s knowledge—that is, for which the hearer already has a discourse file. Accessibility refers to how easily the referent can be accessed by the hearer, in the speaker’s estimation. The accessibility categories described in this book are active, semi-active, inactive and inferrable. The adjective ‘accessible’ is also used for the semi-active accessibility status. (§3.1.3, §3.3.1)

Accessibility Hierarchy: an implicational hierarchy that governs universals of the distribution of relative clause constructions and particular strategies of relative clause constructions, depending on the semantic role that the relative clause head plays in the event denoted by the relative clause. The Accessibility Hierarchy is usually formulated as: subject (A/S) < object (P/T) < indirect object (G), oblique < (attributive) possessor. All languages have a relative clause construction that can relativize the subject; a specific construction is used for a continuous segment of the hierarchy; deranked relative clauses are used for the top part of the hierarchy downwards; less explicit relative clause strategies are used for the top of part of the hierarchy downwards; and more explicit relative clause strategies are used for the bottom part of the hierarchy upwards. (§19.3)

Accessibility Scale: an ordering of types of referring phrases by their degree of accessibility. The Accessibility Scale accommodates the fact that referring phrases may provide a more fine-grained set of information status distinctions than the common three-way classification of active, semi-active and inactive. (§3.3.1)

accusative alignment system (str): a system in which the A and S roles are expressed with the same form, but the P role is expressed with a different form. Example: English argument phrases expressing the A and S roles are indexed on Present Tense verbs (Emily sing-s, Emily play-s the piano), while an argument phrase expressing the P role is not indexed (in Emily play-s the piano, the verb does not index the piano). (§6.3.1)

accusative category (str): the morphosyntactic category in the accusative alignment system that exclusively expresses the P role. Example: The English accusative pronoun forms me, him, her, us, and them are used only for the P role (the S and A roles use the nominative forms I, he, she, we and they), and represent the accusative case marker (morphologically manifested in English as base modification). (§6.3.1)
achievement (**sem**): a type of **aspect** that the success or failure in carrying out the 
complement event. Achievement is often, but not always, expressed by a 
complement-taking predicate in a complement clause construction. **Example:** in 
She managed to solve the riddle, managed expresses achievement, namely the 
successful execution of the complement event of solving the riddle. (§18.2.2) 

**action (concept) (**sem**): a concept belonging to a **semantic class** that is relational, 
dynamic, and transitory. **Example:** motion events such as running, or transfer events 
such as giving, are action concepts: they involve change but come to an end. (§2.1; 
chapters 6-7 cover a wide range of action concepts) 

**action nominal** (**aka** nominalization) (**str**): a deranked predicate form that is capable of 
inflecting for case or of taking adpositions in the same way as nouns do, and with 
reasonable productivity. **Example:** in He remains under investigation, investigation is 
an action nominal. Action nominals overwhelmingly lack predicate-like tense-aspect-
mood and argument indexation inflections. (§15.3.2) 

action strategy see **have possessive strategy** 
activation see **accessibility** 
active (**aka** in focus) (**inf**): a referent whose discourse file has been opened and is at the 
center of the hearer’s consciousness. This is the highest accessibility referent at the 
current point in the discourse. (§3.3.1) 
active alignment system (**str**): a system in which some **S roles** are co-expressed with the 
A role, and other S roles are co-expressed with the P role. **Example:** in Lakhota, the 
index for the S role of ‘come’ is the same form as the index for the A role of ‘help’, 
but the index for the S role of ‘be sick’ is the same form as the index for the P role of 
‘help’. (§6.3.3) 
active category (**aka** agentive, actor) (**str**): the morphosyntactic category in the active 
alignment system that co-expresses some S roles—in particular, the S role of ‘walk’—and the A role. **Example:** in Lakhota, the index ya- ‘you (sg.)’ in ó-ma-ya-
kiye ‘you help/helped me’ and ya-ʔu ‘you (sg.) are coming’ expresses the active 
category. (§6.3.3) 
actor (**inf**): the main players in the actions reported in the discourse. Actors are typically 
human or animate (especially personified animals), are referred to multiple times in 
the discourse, and are often introduced by special constructions. The term ‘actor’ is 
also used for the active category. (§3.4.1) 
actual information packaging (IP) strategy (**str**): a strategy found with 
nonprototypical construction types, such as complement constructions which 
express reference to actions. The actual IP strategy is to recruit the strategy used for 
the prototypical semantic content function of the information packaging function 
of the nonprototypical construction. **Example:** in the English Nominalization 
Construction exemplified by the corporation’s neglect of worker’s rights, the action 
concept neglect that is being referred to recruits the construction used for object 
reference, the prototypical referring phrase: it is preceded by the Possessive Phrase 
the corporation’s and following by the Genitive Oblique of worker’s rights; contrast 
the different strategy found with the prototypical action predication construction The 
corporation neglected worker’s rights. The actual IP strategy contrasts with the 
semantic IP strategy and the hybrid IP strategy. (§2.4)
additive (focus) operator (aka inclusive focus operator) (cxn): a focus operator that indicates that the focus is the added information in an expanding counterpresuppositional contrast construction. Example: in the exchange John bought apples. He also bought PEACHES, also is an additive operator. ([§11.4.1]

additive (sem): a relation between two or more entities such that the entities are construed as combined in a sort of totality. The additive relation may be construed as a complex figure, as in The robins drank water and the juncos ate fennel seeds, or in a figure-ground relation, as in Besides missing my bus, I got my feet all wet. The additive relation is considered the prototype for conjunctive coordination. ([§15.2.1]

adjectival phrase (cxn): an attributive phrase whose head denotes a property concept. Example: in a very large balloon, very large is an adjectival phrase; the head large denotes a property concept. An adjectival phrase is the prototypical attributive phrase, and its head is an adjective. ([§2.2.3]

adjective (cxn): the head of an attributive phrase that denotes a property. Example: the word new in a very new book is an adjective: it is a property concept that is the head of the attributive phrase very new and modifies book. ([§2.2.3, §4.1.1]

adjective impersonal strategy (str): a strategy used in the stative complex predicate construction in which the manner (more generally, stative) component is expressed like an adjective (property modifier) in an argument phrase that does not index an argument of the event predicate in the complex predicate construction. Example: in Manchu sargan jui hocikon ucule-he, ‘The girl sang beautifully,’ hocikon ‘beautifully’ does not index sargan jui ‘girl’. ([§14.2]

adjective personal strategy (str): a strategy used in the stative complex predicate construction in which the manner (more generally, stative) component is expressed like an adjective (property modifier) in an argument phrase that indexes an argument of the event predicate in the complex predicate construction. Example: in Latin mendicus a me tristis stipem petivit ‘The beggar asked me sadly for a gift’, the form tristis ‘sadly’ indexes the subject mendicus ‘beggar’ in case, number and gender. ([§14.2]

adjoined strategy (str): a strategy for the relative clause construction in which the relative clause is juxtaposed to the matrix clause. Example: Warlpiri ɲat'uluɲu ɲa yankiri pantuŋu [kut'apa ɲapa ɲaŋu] ‘I speared the emu which was drinking water’ illustrates the adjoined strategy: the relative clause kut'apa ɲapa ɲaŋu ‘which was drinking water’ is juxtaposed to the matrix clause ɲat'uluɲu ɲa yankiri pantuŋu ‘I speared the emu’, and not adjacent to the relative clause head yankiri ‘emu’. The adjoined strategy is quite rare and largely found in Australian languages, where it is identical to the temporal adverbial clause construction and presumably recruited from it. ([§19.2.3]

adjunct: a term that is sometimes used for an oblique argument phrase denoting certain participants that are more peripheral than other participants denoted by oblique phrases, and which is therefore syntactically “optional”. Semantically, there is no clear division between peripheral participants that motivates an (oblique) argument/adjunct distinction. Also, the phrases expressing even central participants that are highly salient may be morphosyntactically “optional”, as is found with zero
anaphora. There is no clear comparative concept of ‘adjunct’, and the term is not used in this textbook.

admodification (inf): the information packaging function of qualifying a modifier, usually via semantically expressing degree or hedging of the property denoted by the modifier. Example: in very slow, the degree admodifier very intensifies the value of the speed dimension denoted by slow. (§2.2.2).

admodifier (cxn): a construction that performs the function of admodification. Example: in very slow, very is an admodifier that qualifies the speed denoted by the modifier slow. (§2.2.2, §4.1.2).

adnominal possessive strategy (aka genitive strategy) (str): a strategy for the presentational possession construction in which the possessor is not represented by an argument phrase but with a possessive modification construction. Example: Mokilese mine woarow woal-o war [exist CLF-3SG man-that canoe] ‘That man has a canoe’ [lit. ‘That man’s canoe exists] is an instance of the adnominal possessive strategy. The adnominal possession strategy is an instance of the internal possessor strategy. (§10.4.2)

adposition (str): a case marker which occurs as an independent word, in contrast to a case affix. Adpositions are distinguished by position: preposition, postposition and circumposition. (§4.3)

adpositional personal strategy (str): a strategy used in the stative complex predicate construction in which the stative component is expressed with a case marker just like an argument phrase, and in addition it indexes a participant in the event. Example: in Russian on umer molodym ‘He died young’, molodym ‘young’ is in the Masculine Singular Instrumental form, indexing Masculine Singular on ‘he’ as well as taking an oblique Instrumental case form. (§14.2)

adpositional strategy (str): a strategy used in the stative complex predicate construction in which the manner (more generally, stative) component is expressed with a case marker just like an argument phrase, either in the basic lexical form or in a nominalized form of the stative concept word. Example: in Mordvin t’ei’t’er-es mor-i mazi-ste ‘The girls sings beautifully’, mazi ‘beautiful’ takes the Elative oblique case marker -ste. (§14.2)

adverbial clause construction (cxn): a complex sentence construction with a figure-ground construal/information packaging of the relation between the events denoted by the two clauses. An adverbial clause construction is made up of a matrix clause and an adverbial dependent clause. Example: I left early because I was bored is an instance of an adverbial clause construction. (§15.3.1)

adverbial dependent clause (cxn): the dependent clause in an adverbial clause construction; it is construed as the ground in the figure-ground information packaging of the construction. Example: in I left early because I was bored, I was bored is the adverbial dependent clause. (§15.3.1)

adverbial strategy (str): a strategy used in the stative complex predicate construction in which the manner (more generally, stative) component is expressed using a distinct and unique morphosyntactic form. Example: in English The girl sang beautiful-ly, beautiful uses the unique suffix -ly to combine with the event predicate sang. The adverbial strategy is probably a more grammaticalized version of other strategies for stative complex predicates. (§14.2)
adverbializer (str): a morpheme that overtly expresses the semantic relation in an adverbial clause construction. Example: in I left the party because I was tired, because is the adverbializer. An adverbial clause construction with an adverbializer is an example of syntactic subordination. If the morpheme is affixed to a predicate, it is not an adverbializer but an overt marker of deranked status. (§15.3.2)
adversative coordination (cxn): a type of coordinate clause construction typically equated with coordination by ‘but’, representing some sort of contrast in the relevant context. Adversative coordination is prototypically with simple contrast, but often may also express an unexpected cooccurrence. Example: Petja is diligent but Vanja is lazy is an instance of adversative coordination, with a simple contrast between the two events. (§15.2.1)
affecting event (sem)/verb (cxn): an experiential event which describes the stimulus causing a change in mental state of the experiencer; and a verb that expresses such an event. Example: The dog surprised me is an instance of an affecting event, and surprise is an affecting verb. (§7.4)
affixation (str): a strategy for encoding the relation in major propositional acts (modifier-referent, predicate-argument), in which one element is an affix on the other. Example: in Somali əʔli-hom [photograph-his], -hom is typically analyzed as an affix expressing the possessor. (§4.2)
age term (cxn): a modifier expressing a concept of age, maturity or ripeness. Examples: old and ripe are English age terms. (§4.1.2)
agent (sem): a semantic role that includes participant roles for a participant that volitionally initiates an event. Example: in Jack broke the window, Jack volitionally initiates the breaking event. (§6.1.2)
agentive category see active category
agentive change of state event (sem)/verb (cxn): a change of state event in which an external volitional agent brings about a change in a patient such that the patient enters a resulting state; and the verb that expresses such an event. Example: the event of a person drying dishes is an agentive change of state event, and dry is an agentive change of state verb. (§6.2.1)
agree/disagree alignment strategy (str): an alignment strategy for the polarity response construction in which in which the answer agrees/disagrees with the polarity of the question. Example: in Gulf Arabic, the answers to the negative polarity question maa ŋindik flus, muu chidhi? ‘You don’t have any money, right?’ are naʃam ‘yes, I have no money’ (agreeing with the speaker) or bala ‘no, I do have money’ (disagreeing with the speaker). (§12.3.3)
agreement feature see indexation feature
Agreement Hierarchy: a typological universal that constrains the “mismatches” that occur in the grammatical categories (typically number and gender/class) of a pronoun or index and the grammatical categories of a prior referring phrase that refers to the same referent as the pronoun or index. The Agreement Hierarchy ranks the constructions as follows: modifier index < predicate index < relative pronoun < personal pronoun. Example: in British English, in this committee, the modifier this must index the committee as a singular, but a following personal pronoun may index the committee as a singular …It... or as a plural …They..., indicating that the
committee is a group. The personal pronoun is lower on the Agreement Hierarchy, and therefore is more likely to index a “semantic” value (plural) that is not overtly encoded on the noun. (§4.4.4)

agreement see indexical strategy

alienable possession (cxn): a possessive modification construction that always includes the ownership relation, and contrasts in the language with an inalienable possession construction. (§4.1.4)

alignment system (str): a system defined by the co-expression of arguments of a predicate in intransitive, transitive and ditransitive constructions. Example: English expresses the one argument of an intransitive verb construction (The cats slept) in the same way as the semantically agentive argument of a transitive verb (The cats clawed the sofa): both arguments are expressed preceding the verb. (§1.4, §6.3.1)

all new see thetic

allative comparative (str): a fixed-case strategy in comparative constructions in which there is a clause which attributes a gradable predicative scale to the comparee, and the standard is expressed as an oblique argument phrase with a spatial case marker with an allative (‘to’) meaning. Example: Nuer diid ne gän ke ji ‘I am bigger than you’ is an instance of the allative comparative: diid ne gän asserts that I am big, and ke ji expresses the standard, you, with a case marker ke meaning ‘to’. (§17.2.2)

alternative concessive conditional strategy (str): a strategy for expressing a concessive conditional construction where the protasis, which specifies the set of conditions for the concessive conditional, invokes the two polar alternatives possible in the scalar model; the apodosis expresses the unexpected opposite of the expected causal relation between either alternative and the outcome, and so implies the same outcome no matter what. Example: Whether he is right or not, we must support him uses the alternative concessive conditional strategy: either he is right or he is wrong, and under either of those conditions that make up the scalar model, we must support him. (§17.3.3)

alternative proposition (inf): when a contrast situation is construed as an identificational construction, the propositional content is asserted against a background of an alternative proposition (or propositions) expressed or evoked in the discourse context. Example: in the exchange John bought apples. No, he bought PEACHES, the proposition that John bought peaches is asserted against the background of the alternative proposition that John bought apples. The shared part of the proposition and its alternative, that John bought something, is presupposed, that is, ‘John bought X’ is a presupposed open proposition. (§11.4.1)

alternative question (inf/cxn): an interrogative in which the speaker offers a closed list of alternatives to fill in the unknown piece of information in the propositional content; and the construction expressing this function. Example: Do you prefer beer or wine? is an instance of an alternative question construction, where the alternatives offered are beer and wine. (§12.3.1)

ambitransitive see labile

amount term (cxn): a form used to indicate an imprecise quantity for noncountable entities. Example: in some wine, some is an amount term. (§4.1.3)
anaphoric (definite) article (cxn): an article that is used for a semi-active referent. (
§3.3.1)
anaphoric pronoun (cxn): a pronoun that is used for active referents. Example: English unstressed he, she, they are examples of anaphoric pronouns. (§3.3.1)
anaphoric-head construction (cxn): an anaphoric-head construction contains a modifier that modifies a (semantic) head that refers to an individual of the same type as one previously referred to. Example: in I took a red candy and Greg took a green one, a green one is an anaphoric-head construction, referring to a green candy. An anaphoric-head relative clause construction is a special case of the anaphoric-head construction. (§5.4, §19.4)
anaphoric-head relative clause construction (cxn): an anaphoric-head construction in which the modifier is a clause denoting an event. Example: in K’iche’utz [lē xubij lē achi] ‘What the man said is good’, the clause lē xubij lē achi ‘the man said [it]’ is an instance of the anaphoric-head relative clause construction. (§19.4)
anchor (inf): an object that, if its identity is known to speaker and hearer, allows for the identity of a related object to be known to the speaker and hearer. Example: ‘knowing who Peter is we can identify Peter’s bag, arm, brother’ (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002:147), i.e. Peter serves as the anchor for identifying the bag, arm or brother. The anchoring function requires that the modifying object concept denote an individual and not a type, and preferably a highly accessible individual. Another term used for ‘anchor’ is ‘reference point’, but the latter term has another use in this book. (§5.2.1)
anchoring (inf): a type of situating in which the referent of the object modifier serves to identify the referent of the head of the modification construction. (§4.1.1, §4.1.4)
anchoring construction (cxn): a nominal modifier construction whose object modifier functions as an anchor. Example: Peter’s bag is an anchoring construction, since the identity of Peter allows the interlocutors to identify the referent of bag. (§5.2.1)

Animacy Hierarchy: a ranking of entities from human to (nonhuman) animate to inanimate, such that humans are “highest” on the hierarchy. The ranking is presumed to represent the salience of the entity to persons, or possibly the empathy we have towards the entity. (§3.1.2)

animacy-based split ergativity (str): a strategy for the passive-inverse voice construction in which there is a distinct, overt case marker of higher salience P participants and also for lower salience A participants. Example: in Dyirbal, the Accusative Case suffix -na is used for 1st/2nd pronominal P participants, and the Ergative Case suffix -ŋu is used for 3rd person pronominal and common noun A participants. (§8.3)
animate (sem): a semantic category of objects that denotes animate beings. Example: cat denotes an animate entity. The term ‘animate’ is often used to contrast with human, and therefore often is used to refer only to nonhuman animates. (§3.1.2)
announcement (inf): a discourse context which tends to favor a thetic construal. An announcement is an “out of the blue”, usually unexpected and salient reporting of a situation. Example: TRUMP was elected! (with accent on Trump), uttered on November 9, 2016, the day after the Presidential election. (§11.3.1)
antecedent role (sem): a participant role that is antecedent to the participant role expressed as object in the causal chain/causal structure of an event. Example: in
Jack broke the window with a hammer, the hammer is antecedent to the window in the breaking causal chain (Jack → hammer → window), and the window is expressed as object. (§6.1.2)

antecedent see protasis

anterior (sem): a temporal sequential relation between two events such that the following event serves as the reference point for the preceding event. Example: in He washed the car before driving to the party, washing the car has an anterior temporal relation with respect to driving to the party. Used to describe a sequential temporal relation between events in a figure-ground information packaging. (§15.1.3)

anterior deranking (str): the variant of a deranking strategy in which the deranked clauses precede the clause that is expressed like a simple main clause. Example: Japanese ojiisanga yamade hataraite obasanga miseno bano shita ‘The old man worked at the mountain, and the old woman tended the store’ is an instance of anterior deranking: the suffix -te on hataraite ‘worked’ indicates that the anterior predicate is deranked. (§15.2.3)

anticausative (str): a system in which a noncausal event and its counterpart causal event are expressed such that the noncausal event predicate adds overt coding to the causal event predicate. Example: in Yagua, the noncausal event supatá-y ‘come out’ is formed by the causal event predicate supatá ‘pull out’ plus the overt anticausative suffix -y. (§6.3.4)

antipassive construction (cxn): any construction that is used for a P participant that is less salient than it usually is in the basic voice construction. Example: West Greenlandic inun-nik tuqut-si-vuq ‘He killed people’, with an oblique case marker -nik for the argument phrase expressing P and an overtly coded verb form with the suffix -si, is an instance of the antipassive construction. (§8.4)

antonyms (cxn): forms that indicate opposing values on a gradient scale. Example: tall and short are antonyms on the gradient scale of height. (§4.1.2)

apodosis (aka consequent) (sem/cxn): the clause expressing the causally consequent proposition in a causal, conditional, concessive, concessive conditional or comparative conditional construction; or the proposition or event denoted by the clause. Example: in If you press this button, the door will open, the door will open is the apodosis; If you press this button is the protasis. Since the conditional relations are defined both in terms of logical implication and causal relation, the semantic use of ‘apodosis’ can be distinguished as ‘apodosis proposition’ or ‘apodosis event’. (§17.3.1)

application event (sem)/verb (cxn): an event describing placing or applying one object onto (2-dimensional) or into (3-dimensional) another object; and the verb expressing such an event. Examples: smearing (2-dimensional) and loading (3-dimensional) are application events. (§7.3.2)

applicative construction (cxn): a construction describing an event in which a participant other than the P participant is coded as object—that is, a non-P participant is salient enough to be expressed as a core argument phrase, specifically object. Example: Fred baked me a shepherd’s pie, in which Fred baking the pie is the base event, encodes a non-participant, namely the recipient of the shepherd’s pie, as object. (§9.1, §9.3)
applicative object (cxn): the participant role which is expressed as the object in an applicative construction. Example: in Nomatsiguenga na-manantê-ne-ro kayeta ‘I bought crackers for her’, the beneficiary referred to by ‘her’ is expressed as the object, with the 3SG Object suffix -ro. (§9.3)

apposition (str): a strategy for object reference in which two or more separate referring phrases juxtaposed to each other refer to the same referent. Example: in my brother, the geophysicist, two separate referring phrases, my brother and the geophysicist, are juxtaposed and refer to the same individual. (§5.4)

appositive (aka nonrestrictive) modification (inf): an information packaging function in which the modifying stative concept does not narrow the set of possible referents of the object concept it modifies in a referring phrase; it simply adds a further description of the referent. Example: in The angry young men left the party, angry is an appositive modifier in the context in which it is adding a further description to the young men leaving the party, rather than specifying a subset of the young men as with restrictive modification. (§14.3)

apprehensial (sem): the semantic relation between two events where one event serves as the opposite of intended outcome of bringing about the other event. In this respect, the apprehensial relation is a “negative” version of the purpose relation. Examples: I grabbed a stick lest he attack me is a figure-ground construal of the simultaneous relation in an adverbial clause construction, and Grab a stick or he will attack you is a complex figure construal of the relation in a coordinate clause construction. In the figure-ground construal, the “negatively intended” event is construed as the ground. As with the purpose relation, the apprehensial event is unrealized; the complex figure construal is possible because the matrix clause event is also unrealized. (§15.3.1)

argument (inf): a referent of which something is being predicated. Example: in Masha is nice, being nice is being predicated of the referent Masha, and hence the referent Masha is an argument. Most referents are also arguments, but it is possible for a referent to “stand alone” in discourse, particularly in spoken discourse, independent of any predication. Arguments are divided into core arguments (subject and object) and peripheral arguments. (§2.1, §6.1.1)

argument complex predicate (cxn): a complex predicate in which one element denotes an event and is expressed as a verb, but the other element denotes an object and is expressed in an argument phrase, yet the verb-argument combination has lexicalized to have a unitary meaning. Example: in Spanish Pero está haciendo bastante sol ‘But it’s really sunny [lit. But it is making a lot of sun]’, haciendo…sol ‘making sun’ is an instance of an argument complex predicate. (§13.6)

argument phrase (cxn): a referring phrase that refers to an argument. Example: in The tree fell, the tree is an argument phrase because it is a referring phrase that refers to the argument of the predicate, namely the tree that fell. Argument phrases are divided into core argument phrases (subject phrase, object phrase) and oblique argument phrases. (§2.2.2, §6.6.1)

argument structure construction (cxn): a clause construction that consists of the predicate and the argument phrases that are dependent on that predicate. Example: the clause The engineers placed sandbags on the levee is an instance of an English argument structure construction made up of the predicate (placed) and the
combination of three argument phrases, the Subject (the engineers) plus the Object (sandbags) plus the Oblique (on the levee). The function of the argument structure construction is its semantics—the participant roles that the referents of the argument phrases are playing in the event—combined with its information packaging—the relative salience implied by the Subject - Object - Oblique ranking of argument phrases. (§2.2.4, §6.1.1)

**arrival (sem):** the final phase of the path in a motion event. Example: in He went from the tree to the house, the path oblique phrase to the house denotes the arrival phase of the motion event. (§14.4)

**article (cxn):** a contextual form combining with a common noun that expresses only information status. Example: English the and a(n) are articles. (§3.2)

**aspect (aka aspectual structure) (sem):** how an event unfolds over time. The semantics of aspectual structure is not discussed in detail in this textbook. However, certain basic aspectual distinctions are discussed in §6.2.2: dynamic and static, punctual and durative, and telic and atelic. (§6.1.1, §6.2.2)

**aspectual structure** see aspect

**assertion** see pragmatic assertion

**associative construction (cxn):** a construction in which there is reference to an individual and a group associated with that individual. Attention has been focused on the associative construction strategy in which an index refers to not just the referent expressed in a referring phrase in the same construction, but also a group associated with that referent. Example: in the Talîks dialect of Russian, in Góša pr’ïjëx’al’i, ‘Gosha and his family have arrived!’ the plural predicate pr’ïjëx’al’i ‘they have arrived’, combined with the referring phrase Góša ‘Gosha’, expresses that the subject referent is Gosha plus an associated group, namely his family. (§4.4.4)

**associative equative (str):** a fixed-case strategy in equative constructions in which there is a clause which attributes a gradable predicative scale to the comparee, and the standard is expressed as an oblique argument phrase with a spatial case marker with an associative (‘with’) meaning. Example: Mandarin Chinese Tā gèn nǐ yìyàng gāo ‘She is as tall as you’ is an instance of an associative equative: the predicate is yìyàng gāo ‘[is] one.manner tall’ and the standard nǐ ‘you’ uses the case marker gèn ‘with’. The associative marker may also be a coordinating conjunction. (§17.2.4)

**assume position event** see change in (body) position

**asymmetric** see figure-ground

**asyndetic (str):** the combination of clauses in complex sentence constructions, and of coordinands in coordinate constructions (whether the coordinands are clauses or not), by simple juxtaposition. Example: in Lavukaleve ngabakala ngauia tula [my:paddle my:knife small] ‘my paddle and my small knife’, the coordinate construction is asyndetic. (§15.2.2)

**atelic (sem):** an event in which the relevant participant does not end up in a “natural” result state. Example: in I walked in the park, there is not a natural result state for my walking, and so the event is atelic. (§6.2.1)

**attending event (sem)/verb (cxn):** an experiential event which describes the experiencer directing her/his attention to the stimulus; and a verb that expresses such an event. Example: I am looking at the sandhill crane is an instance of an attending event, and look (at) is an attending verb. (§7.4)
attributive phrase (cnx): a construction that performs the act of modification.
   Example: in a very slow truck, the attributive phrase very slow modifies the truck with
   respect to its speed. The head of an attributive phrase is a modifier. The prototypical
   attributive phrase is an adjectival phrase. (§2.2.2, §4.1.1)
attributive possession construction see possessive (modification) construction
attributive possession see possessive modification construction
auxiliary (cnx): the element expressing TAMP meaning in an auxiliary construction.
   Example: in The cats have eaten, have is the auxiliary in the auxiliary construction
   have eaten. (§13.4)
auxiliary construction (cnx): an eventive complex predicate construction in which
   one element of the construction, the auxiliary, denotes tense, aspect, modality
   and/or polarity (typically abbreviated TAMP) and the other element of the
   construction denotes the event whose tense, aspect, modality and/or polarity is
   expressed by the first element. Example: in English She might be sitting in the living
   room, might be sitting is an example of an auxiliary construction. (§13.4)
background description (inf): scene-setting information for a narrative which functions
   as the foreground. A background description is a discourse context which (weakly)
   tends to favor a thetic construal. Example: DOGS were running in the yard can
   function as a background description for telling a narrative. (§11.3.1)
balanced, balancing (str): a strategy in which the predicate in a complex sentence
   construction or a complex predicate construction recruits the predicate
   construction in a simple predication, inflections and all. Example: The robins drank
   water and the juncos ate fennel seeds is an instance of a balanced coordinate clause
   construction: drank and ate are in the same form as in the simple predications The
   robins drank water and The juncos ate fennel seeds. (§14.2, §15.2.3)
bare verb stem (str): a strategy for the imperative-hortative construction, particularly
   the second person variant, in which the verb stem without any inflection is used.
   Example: English Dance! is an instance of the bare verb stem strategy for the second
   person imperative-hortative. (§12.4.1)
base event (sem): the event that is expressed in the basic voice construction, with its set
   of central and peripheral participants in their prototypical level of
   salience/topicality, whose valency is considered basic for that event semantic class.
   Example: in Fred baked me a shepherd’s pie, the base event is Fred baking the pie
   (i.e., excluding transferring the pie to me). A noncausal event is simply a
   monovalent base event. (§9.1)
base voice construction (cnx): an argument structure construction that conforms to
   the prototypical parallel ranking of participant role and argument salience.
   Example: I ate the smoked salmon is an instance of a basic voice construction:
   semantically, I act upon the salmon, and I am more salient than the salmon in the
   discourse. Basic voice constructions are also called ‘active’ or ‘direct’ constructions.
   (§6.1.1, §8.1)
basic word order (str): a strategy for expressing the categories of subject (S), verb (V)
   and object (O) in a transitive construction, and subject in an intransitive
   construction. Some linguists use A and P instead of S and O respectively in
   describing the basic word order of transitive constructions. Basic word order is
   distinguished from nonbasic word orders in terms of information packaging (basic
word order represents topic-comment information packaging); less structural coding; and higher token frequency. Example: the basic word order of English is SVO, as in *Jerry saw the bluebird on Sunday*. Some linguists analyze basic word order in terms of the pair of binary orders subject-verb and object-verb. Sometimes the order of oblique phrases is included; if so, the oblique phrase is abbreviated X; English is SVOX. (§6.2.2)

behavior see word class

behavioral potential: the ability of form in a construction to take the inflections or other grammatical elements characteristic of a construction. Example: the noun tree in a referring expression *the huge trees* has the behavioral potential of inflecting for number (singular and plural) and taking an article (*a* or *the*). (§2.4, §2.5)

belong possession see predicational possession

beneficiary (sem): a semantic role including participant roles for a participant that is positively affected by the outcome of the event. Example: in *Terry made lunch for Sandy*, Sandy is positively affected by the outcome of the event. (§6.1.2)

biclusal reciprocal (str): the strategy of recruiting a construction with two clauses to use as a reciprocal construction. Example: Colloquial Cantonese *léih hóyíh bōng ngóh ngóh hóyíh bōng léih* ‘We can help each other’ is literally ‘You can help me, I can help you’. (§7.2)

Binding Hierarchy (aka Complement Deranking-Argument Hierarchy): an implicational hierarchy of events that have other events as participants (the complement events), that appears to govern a wide range of strategies for complement clause constructions, including balancing vs. deranking (§18.3.1), the grammaticalization of purpose adverbial clauses into deranked complements (§18.3.2), the expression of the participants of the complement-taking predicate and complement events (§18.4.1), and the use of logophoric constructions (§18.4.2). The Binding Hierarchy is described in detail in Givón (1980) and Cristofaro (2003); the latter calls it the Complement Deranking-Argument Hierarchy. The version used here is a slightly revised version of Cristofaro’s hierarchy: utterance, propositional attitude, knowledge < evaluative, perception < desiderative, manipulative < modal, phasal. (§18.3.1)

binominal lexeme construction (cxn): a typifying (non-anchoring) construction that expresses a unitary concept by means of two object concepts. Example: in French *moulin à vent* and its English translation *windmill*, two object concepts, *vent/wind* and *moulin/mill*, combine syntactically to express a unitary concept. (§5.2.1)

bisyndetic (str): a strategy used in syndetic coordination where there are as many coordinators as coordinands. Example: in Upper Kuskokwim *dineje ?H midzish ?H* ‘moose and caribou’, the coordinator *?H* occurs with each coordinand. In some cases, the two coordinators are different, as in English *Either…or…*, as in *Either you leave or I leave*. (§15.2.2)

bivalent event (sem): an event with a valency of two, that is, with two central participant roles. Example: drinking is a bivalent event, with the two central roles of drinker and drink. (§6.1.2)

bodily action (sem)/predicate (cxn): the event class of normally uncontrolled actions involving one’s body; and the predicates that express events in this class. Example: coughing is a bodily action, and *cough* is a bodily action predicate. (§6.3.3)
bodily motion event (sem)/verb (cxn): a monovalent event involving an internal bodily motion; and the verb expressing that event. Example: stretch out (oneself) expresses a bodily motion event. (§7.2)
bodily sensation event see sensation event
body care (aka grooming) event (sem)/verb (cxn): a monovalent event involving a person acting on that person’s own body, generally for grooming or hygiene; and the verb expressing that event. Examples: shave and wash (oneself) express body care events. §7.2
body part relation (sem): a relation between a person and a physical body part of hers or his. Example: the child’s arm is a possession construction expressing a body part relation. (§4.1.4)
body position (aka posture, maintain position, locative stative) event (sem)/predicate (cxn): the event class of maintaining a particular body posture or position; and the predicate that express events in this class. Example: standing is a body position event, and stand is a body position predicate. (§6.3.3)
cardinal numeral (cxn): a form that express the number (cardinality) of a set of individuals of the type. Examples: in one tree, two boys, three books, one/two/three are cardinal numerals. (§4.1.3)
case affix (aka flag) (str): a case marker which occurs as an affix. Example: in Russian kniga Ivan-a ‘John’s book’, -a is a Genitive case marking suffixed to Ivan ‘John’. (§4.3)
case marker (str): a strategy for encoding the relation in major propositional acts (modifier-referent, predicate-argument), in which there is a third morpheme that encodes the semantic relation between the two concepts, where the dependent concept (modifier in a modification construction, argument in a clause) is an object concept. Case markers subsume adpositions and case affixes. Examples: in the plate on the table, on is a case marker, and I dug the hole with a shovel, with is a case marker; both are adpositions. (§4.3, §6.2.2)
categorical see topic-comment
causal (sem): the semantic relation between two events where one event causes the other. Example: I left the party because I was tired is a figure-ground construal of the simultaneous relation in an adverbial clause construction, and I was tired and (so) I left the party is a complex figure construal of the relation in a coordinate clause construction. In the figure-ground construal, the causing event (the protasis; §17.3.2) is construed as the ground, and expressed in the adverbial dependent clause. Causal relations also occur in conditional, concessive, concessive conditional and comparative conditional constructions. Causal relations are divided into content, epistemic and speech act relations. (§15.3.1, §17.2.1, §17.3.2)
causal chain (sem): a causal/force dynamic structure in which one participant acts on a second participant, which acts on a third participant, and so on. Example: in Jack broke the window with a hammer, Jack acts on the hammer (grasping and moving it), and the hammer acts on the window (breaking it). A causal chain is often represented with arrows: Jack → hammer → window. (§6.1.1, §6.1.2)
causal event (sem): an event that has an external cause participant in addition to a participant that undergoes some sort of change. Example: a person breaking a vase is
an example of a causal event. Causal events are contrasted with noncausal events. (§6.3.4)

causal structure (aka force dynamics, transmission of force) (sem): the interactions among participants in an event, specifically causal interactions (although there are other types of interactions among participants in an event which are subsumed under the term). Example: in The cats scratched the furniture, the cats act on the furniture, and the furniture undergoes a change of state. The causal structure of events that is expressed by a single argument structure construction in a single clause is generally in the form of a causal chain. (§6.1.1, §6.1.2)

causative (str): a system of strategies in which a noncausal event and its counterpart causal event are expressed such that the causal event predicate adds overt coding to the noncausal event predicate. Example: in Turkish, the causal event predicate öl-dür-‘kill’ is formed by the noncausal event predicate öl ‘die’ plus the overt causative suffix -dür. (§6.3.4)

causative construction (cxn): a construction describing an event to which an external cause has been “added” to the base event, and the external cause is salient enough to be expressed as a core argument phrase, specifically the subject. Example: I made Fred wash the car is an instance of a causative construction in which Fred washing the car is the base event, and an external cause (me) is added and is encoded as the subject. (§9.1, §9.2)

causative event (sem): an event consisting of a salient external causer participant role added to the causal chain of a base event. Example: Fred made me fill out the questionnaire is a causative event since an external causer (Fred) is added to the base event of filling out the questionnaire. A causal event is simply a causative event based on a monovalent base event. (§9.2)

causative-applicative co-expression (str): a system in which the causative construction and an applicative construction are identical. Example: Kinyarwanda Umugabo a-ra-andik-iiš-a umugabo ibáriwa ‘The man is making the man write a letter’ is a causative construction with the overt suffix -iiš on the verb, and Umugabo a-ra-andik-iiš-a ikáramu ibáriwa ‘The man is writing a letter with a pen’ is an applicative construction with the instrument role expressed as applicative object, with the same suffix -iiš on the verb. (§9.3)

cause (sem): a semantic role including participant roles for a participant, usually an event, that causes the event expressed by the predicate. Example: in The house collapsed from neglect, the neglect is the cause of the house collapsing. (§6.1.2)

causee (sem): in a causative event, the participant role that is the initiator of the causal chain of the base event. Example: in Sandra had Phil sweep the patio, Phil fills the participant role of causee because Phil is the initiator of the sweeping event. The term ‘causee’ is used only when there is a causer in the event as well. (§9.2)

causer (sem): a participant role which names an external cause that brings about an event, and is conceptualized as a central participant in the event. Example: in Harry made the antelope jump, Harry is in the causer role. (§7.4, §9.2)

central participant (sem): certain participants are considered to be more central to the event, in particular those that initiate the action and those that are most strongly affected by the action. Example: in an eating event, the eater and the food are the more central participants, in that the eater initiates the action and the food is
completely affected by the action. In contrast, the place where the eating takes place is a **peripheral participant** in the action. (§6.1.1)

**chaining event (sem)/construction (cxn):** an event type in which one **participant** acts upon another participant, and the second participant acts on a third participant in the same way, and so on; and the **construction** expressing such an event. That is, each participant in the chain is both the **initiator** and **endpoint** of **transmission of force** for the same type of action—except the first in the chain, who is only an initiator, and the last, who is only an endpoint. *Example:* in *The guest followed one another into the room,* each guest is a follower and a “followee”, except the first and last in the chain. It is also possible to have a closed chain, as in people following each other in a circle, in which all participants are both initiator and endpoint. (§7.2)

**change in (body) position (aka change in posture, assume position) event (sem)/verb (cxn):** a monovalent event involving a person changing one’s bodily position; and the **verb** expressing that event. *Example:* *sit* and *lean* express change in body posture events. (§7.2)

**change in state (aka COS) event (sem)/verb (cxn):** an event in which a **participant**, the **patient**, undergoes a change such that the patient enters a resulting **state**, usually a change of physical state; and the **verb** expressing that event. *Example:* the event of dishes becoming dry is a change of state event, and *dry* is a change of state verb. (§6.1.2, §6.2.1)

**choosing (inf):** a subtype of **counterpresuppositional contrast** in which some semantic content is chosen from a list of alternatives. *Example:* in the exchange *Would you like coffee or tea? COFFEE, please,* the discourse context presents two alternatives (coffee or tea), and the response chooses one of the alternatives (coffee). (Dik 1997 proposes the term ‘selecting’, but this term is used here with a different meaning.) (§11.4.1)

**circumposition (str):** an **adposition** which occurs as two morphemes, one before and one after the **modifier** or **argument head**. *Example:* in Pashto *ter maktaba poori* ‘as far as the school’, the meaning ‘as far as’ is expressed by the combination of *ter* preceding *maktaba* ‘school’ and *poori* following it. (§4.3)

**classifier (str):** a indexical strategy in which a modifier, or sometimes a predicate, is combined with a morpheme that indicates a set of contrasting semantic classes that denote a referent which may also be denoted by an accompanying referring phrase. *Example:* in Chrau *du tong aq* ‘one crossbow’, *tong* is a classifier for long objects that refers to the crossbow (*aq*) and combined with the modifier *du* ‘one’. (§4.4.3)

**clause (cxn):** a construction that performs the function of **predication**, including the **predicate** (which may be a **complex predicate**) and the **referring phrases** and other roles dependent on the predication. Example: *The birds were singing* is an instance of a clausal construction. This is the prototypical function of clauses; there are also **nonpredicational clauses** that perform different information packaging functions. The prototypical predicational clause is a **verbal clause**. (§1.3, §2.2.2, §6.1.1)

**clause chaining** see coordinate clause construction

**cleft strategy (str):** a **strategy** for **identificational constructions** that uses an **equational copula** to link the **focus** and the **presupposed open proposition** that makes up the remainder of the **clause**. *Example:* the English Pseudocleft Construction that is the
second sentence in Nikki Caine, 19, doesn’t want to be a movie star. What she hopes to do is be a star on the horse-show circuit, uses the cleft strategy: the equational copula is links the presupposed open proposition what she hopes to do and the focus be a star on the horse-show circuit. (§11.4.2)

coe-expression strategy: a system of two (or more) functionally related constructions that uses the same form to express a role in one construction and a role in the other construction. Example: Mandarin uses the same particle de for the object modification (genitive) construction and for the action modification (relative clause) construction. (§1.4)

cognate head-dependent (aka cognate object) strategy (str): a strategy for an argument complex predicate in which the verb and the noun (argument phrase) are phonologically related (and sometimes even identical). Example: in Maale ŋízí jeefi jếék’k’-á-ne ‘He is urinating’, jeefi ‘urine’ and jếék’k’ ‘urinate’ are morphologically related as well as semantically extremely close. (§13.6)

Cognate object see cognate head-dependent

cognition event (sem)/verb (cxn): an experiential event involving an experiencer’s cognition directed towards a stimulus; and a verb that expresses such an event. Example: Tim thought about the war is an example of a cognition event, and think (about) is the cognition verb. (§7.4)

Collective event (sem)/construction (cxn): an event type in which two participants both play the same role in two related events (that is, they do it “together”); and the construction expressing such an event. Example: in Mary and Sue left together, Mary leaves and Sue leaves, and the two leaving events are connected. (§7.2)

Color term (cxn): a modifier expressing a color concept. Examples: red, black and green are English color terms. (§4.1.2)

Combining event (sem)/verb (cxn): an event describing combining of two objects; and the verb expressing such an event. Example: blending is a combining event. (§7.3.2)

Comitative (sem): a semantic role including participant roles for a participant that accompanies another participant, usually the agent. Example: in I went to the concert with Carol, Carol is in the comitative role. (§6.1.2)

Comment (inf): in a topic-comment information packaging, the comment is the information that is predicated of the topic. Example: in Bill is a teacher, being a teacher is the comment that is predicated of Bill. Comment is basically synonymous with predication. (§10.1.2)

Commentative event (sem)/predicate (cxn): an evaluative event in which an evaluative judgement about a proposition expressed by the complement of the commentative event is made, and there is a positive epistemic stance by the speaker towards the proposition; and the predicate expressing that event. Example: in Nancy is glad that Joe won the election, the commentative predicate is glad expresses Nancy’s evaluation of Joe’s winning the election, and also presupposes that the speaker believes that Joe indeed won the election. (§18.2.2)

Common noun (cxn): a linguistic form that usually refers to individuals, via the category that the individual belongs to. Often referred to as just noun. Example: cat is usually used to refer to a particular cat via the category of felines. Note that being a common noun is a function of a form; one can use the form city to refer to an
individual city, for example in the San Francisco Bay Area, *the City* refers to the city of San Francisco. (§3.1.1)

companion strategy see with-possessive strategy

**comparative concept**: a concept that can be used to compare the morphosyntactic structure of different languages. *Example*: a good example of a comparative concept that can easily be defined on a crosslinguistically valid basis is one based on a semantic class, such as words referring to humans. Other examples of comparative concepts are those based on an information packaging function; constructions (in the specific sense); and strategies. (§1.4)

**comparative conditional relation** (*sem*)/construction (*cxn*): a relation between two events, each on a gradable predicative scale, such that an event at one degree on the first predicative scale causes an event at the corresponding degree on the second predicative scale. *Example*: *The longer that Bill had to wait, the angrier he got* is an instance of the comparative conditional relation and construction: a degree of length of time that Bill had to wait can (in a generic conditional) or does (in an ordinary, specific conditional) cause the occurrence of the corresponding degree of Bill’s anger. (§17.4.1)

**comparative construction** (*cxn*): a construction that has the semantic function of assigning different positions on a gradable predicative scale to two referents, the comparee and the standard. The comparative construction therefore consists of three propositions: the predicative scale applies to the comparee, it also applies to the standard, and the comparee exceeds the standard on the scale. *Example*: *The tree is taller than the house* is an instance of the comparative construction: the comparee is the tree, the standard is the house, the gradable comparative scale is height, and the comparee exceeds the standard in height. (§17.2.1)

**comparative form** (*cxn*): indicates a higher value on a property scale than the comparable value for another object. *Example*: *in more intelligent, more* indicates a value higher on the intelligence scale than the comparable value for the person to whom the current referent is being compared. (§4.1.2)

**comparative referent** (*inf*)/pronoun (*cxn*): an unspecified referent occurring in the standard of comparison in a comparative construction. *Example*: *in The boy runs as fast as anyone in his class, anyone* is a comparative pronoun expressing a hypothetical referent selected from the class representing the standard to which the boy’s running is being compared. (§3.5)

**comparee** (*sem*): in a comparative construction or equative construction, the referent whose position on the gradable predicative scale is specified relative to the position of the standard on the predicative scale. *Example*: in the comparative construction *Your cat is bigger than my dog*, the cat is the comparee: it is asserted to exceed the dog on the scale of size. (§17.2.1, §17.2.4)

**complement** (*aka complement dependent clause*) (*cxn*): a construction defined by the function of referring to an action concept. *Example*: a variety of strategies are used for complements, including the English Gerund, as in *Hiking in Canyonlands (is fun)* and the English Finite Complement, as in *Frieda thinks that Janet won’t come to the party*. (§2.2.5, §18.2.1)

**complement clause construction** (*cxn*): a construction consisting of a matrix clause and a complement. *Example*: *I told her that I would go* is an instance of a
complement clause construction; the matrix clause is *I told her* and the complement is *I would go*. (§18.2.1)

Complement Deranking-Argument Hierarchy see Binding Hierarchy

**complement-taking predicate** (*aka CTP*) (*cxn*): the matrix clause predicate in a complement clause construction. Example: in *I told her that I would go*, *told* is the complement-taking predicate. (§18.2.1)

**complementary** (*cxn*): forms that indicate opposing values on a scale where there is no gradience, only categorical values (either the object has the value or it doesn’t). Example: *alive/dead* are complementaries in that one is either alive or not. (§4.1.2)

**complementative** (*aka* predicative complement) (*inf*): an information packaging function in which specification of the modifying stative concept is required by the predicate. Example: in *I consider John intelligent*, the property of intelligence is necessarily specified of the participant John by the main predicate of attributing a property of a participant. (§14.3)

**complementizer** (*str*): a morpheme that overtly expresses the semantic relation in an complement clause construction. Example: in *She thought that he was tired*, *that* is the complementizer. A complement clause construction with a complementizer is an example of syndetic subordination. If the morpheme is affixed to a predicate, it is not a complementizer but an overt marker of deranked status. (§18.3.1)

**complex** (construction) (*cxn*): a construction made up of more than one element. Example: the referring phrase *an ancient watch* is complex because it is made up of three elements (*an*, *ancient* and *watch*). (§2.2.1)

**complex figure** (*aka symmetric*) (*inf*): a construal or information packaging of two events such that the two events are construed as parts of a complex whole. Example: in *Jim was promoted and Cindy quit*, the events of Jim being promoted and Cindy quitting are conceived of as parts of a complex whole (e.g. a causal sequence). A complex figure packaging construes the events as equal in status, and also requires a common denominator for the two events. This information packaging is found in coordinate constructions. (§15.1.3)

**complex predicate** (*cxn*): a predicate consisting of more than one semantic component, and hence the construction consists of multiple elements. These semantic components are quite varied. This textbook takes a broad view of what constitutes a complex predicate; most dependents of a clause that are not argument phrases are parts of a complex predicate. Example: in *The soldier quickly walked off*, *quickly walked off* is the complex predicate consisting of *quickly*, *walked* and *off*. (§2.2.2, §13.1.1)

**complex predicate applicative strategy** (*str*): a strategy for the applicative construction in which there is a second verb accompanying the main verb that encodes the fact that there is an applicative object. Example: *Yoruba ó ra iṣu fún mi* ‘He bought a yam for me’ is an instance of a complex predicate applicative strategy with the verbs *ra* ‘buy’ and *fún* ‘give’. (§9.3)

**complex predicate causative** (*aka* periphrastic causative) strategy (*str*): a strategy for the causative construction in which there is a second verb accompanying the main verb that encodes the fact that this is a causative event with a causer participant role added to the causal chain of the base event. Example: the English Periphrastic Causative Construction, illustrated by *Sandra had Phil sweep the patio*, is an example
of the complex predicate causative strategy: there is a second verb *had* accompanying the verb *sweep* that indicates that Sandra is the causer of the causative event. (§9.2)

**complex predicate passive-inverse (voice) strategy (str):** a strategy for the passive-inverse voice construction in which there is a second verb accompanying the main verb that encodes the fact that the subject referring phrase expresses the participant. Example: in Vietnamese *Nam bị Nga đánh* ‘Nam was beaten by Nga’, the verb *bi* ‘suffer’ accompanying the main verb *đánh* ‘beat’ is an instance of the complex predicate passive-inverse voice strategy. (§8.3)

**complex sentence (cxn):** a construction made up of more than one clausal construction. Example: *[The birds were singing] [when I went out to get the newspaper]* is an instance of a complex sentence construction consisting of two clauses, indicated by square brackets in the example. (§1.3, §15.1.1)

**compounding (str):** a strategy for encoding the relation in major propositional acts (modifier-referent, predicate-argument), in which the two elements are combined in a single word. Example: in *doorknob*, *door* and *knob* are an instance of compounding. The term ‘compounding’ or ‘compound’ is also used for the typifying construction and the binominal lexeme construction. (§4.2)

**conceptual space:** an underlying network of semantic relationships among functions that are co-expressed across the world’s languages. The conceptual space represents a universal pattern in the semantic map model. (§3.5)

**concessive conditional relation (sem)/construction (cxn):** a causal relation between a set of events that are associated with a scalar model on the one hand, and another event such that the other event would occur under the entire range of conditions described in the scalar model associated with the first set of events; and the construction that expresses that relation. Example: *However much advice you give him, he does exactly what he wants to do* is an instance of the concessive conditional relation and construction: the protasis *However much advice you give him* introduces a scalar model of your giving him a full range of amounts of advice; and the apodosis *he does exactly what he wants to do* describes the event that occurs or would occur under any of those conditions. The speaker has a neutral epistemic stance towards the range of events associated with the scalar model. The apodosis has an unexpected causal relation with respect to the set of events that make up the protasis. A concessive conditional may express a content, epistemic or speech act causal relation. (§17.3.3)

**concessive relation (sem)/construction (cxn):** a relation between two events such that there is an expected causal relation between the two events, but the opposite of the second event, expressed in the apodosis, unexpectedly occurs. Example: *Although it was raining, I went out* is an instance of a concessive relation and construction: the expected causal relation is that rain would lead to my staying in; but in fact I went out. The speaker has a positive epistemic stance towards the concessive construction. A concessive may express a content, epistemic or speech act causal relation. (§17.3.2)

**concomitant role (sem):** a subset of antecedent roles that includes participant roles in between the participant role expressed as subject and the participant role expressed as object. Example: in *Jack broke the window with a hammer*, the hammer is antecedent to the window in the breaking causal chain (*Jack* → *hammer* → *window*), and the
window is expressed as object; and it is also subsequent to Jack in the breaking causal chain, and Jack is expressed as subject. (§6.1.2)

conditional deranking system (str): a system where a same-subject reference-tracking construction uses a deranking strategy, whereas the different-subject reference-tracking construction uses a balanced strategy. Example: Wolof dem na ma à o ko ‘I went and called him’ [same-subject] uses a Serial Marker à and a deranked Subjunctive verb form o; nyeu on na te wakh on na ma ko ‘He came and I told (it to) him’ uses the balanced construction with the simple verb form, the Past Tense on and the Indicative Marker na. (§16.3)

conditional discourse reference system (str): a system where a same-subject reference-tracking construction uses a different strategy from the standard discourse reference strategies found in connected discourse. This is essentially the use of zero anaphora in the same-subject reference-tracking construction that conditional on the construction rather than on the discourse context. Example: the coordination clause construction illustrated in Bilbo found a ring and Ó, put it in his pocket uses zero anaphora in the second clause; zero anaphora is not generally allowed in discourse reference (*Put it in his pocket). (§16.2)

conditional referent (inf)/pronoun (cxn): an unspecified referent in the protasis in a conditional construction. Example: If you hear anything, tell me, anything is a conditional pronoun expressing a referent that is found only in the hypothetical world introduced by the protasis of the conditional construction. (§3.5)

conditional relation (sem)/construction (cxn): a semantic relation between two events that involves logical material implication relation between their corresponding propositions; some type of causal relation between the corresponding events; and non-positive epistemic stance; and the construction that expresses that relation. Example: If you press this button, the door will open is an instance of the conditional relation and construction. The causally antecedent proposition is the protasis, and the causally consequent proposition is the apodosis. A conditional may express a content, epistemic or speech act causal relation. (§17.3.1)

conjoined comparative (str): a derived-case comparative strategy which consists of a coordinate clause construction where the two clauses assert that the gradable predicative scale applies to the comparee and the standard. Example: Sika dzarang tica gahar, dzarang rei kesik ‘That horse is bigger than this horse’ is an instance of the conjoined comparative: it conjoins dzarang tica gahar ‘That horse is big’ and dzarang rei kesik ‘This horse is small’. (§17.2.2)

conjoined exceed comparative (str): a rare strategy for the comparative construction which recruits a coordinate clause construction (making it similar to the conjoined comparative), but where one clause expresses the proposition that the comparee exceeds the standard (making it similar to the exceed comparative), while the other clause expresses that the gradable predicative scale applies to the comparee, or sometimes, to the standard instead. Example: Acholi gwok mera dit ki kato meri ‘My dog is bigger than yours’ is an instance of the conjoined exceed comparative strategy: the first clause gwok mera dit ‘my dog [is] big’ attributes size to the comparee, the dog; the second clause kato meri ‘[it] exceeds yours’ expresses the relation of the comparee to the standard, your dog; and the clauses are conjoined by ki ‘and’. (§17.2.3)
conjunct see coordinand

**conjunction (str):** a free morpheme or clitic that encodes the relation between the events denoted by the two clauses in a complex sentence construction. A conjunction in a coordinate clause construction is a coordinator; in an adverbial clause construction it is an adverbializer; in a complement clause construction it is a complementizer; and in a relative clause construction it is a relativizer. (§15.2.2):

**conjunctive coordination (cxn):** a type of coordinate construction typically equated with coordination by ‘and’, representing some sort of grouping together in the relevant context. Conjunctive coordination is prototypically associated with an additive relation between the two (or more) entities, but often also may express a consecutive relation. Example: The robins drank water and the juncos ate fennel seeds, is an instance of conjunctive coordination with an additive relation. (§15.2.1)

**consecutive (sem):** a sequential relation between two events, as expressed by a complex figure construal of the relation between the two events. Example: in He washed the car and drove to the party, the washing of the car and the driving to the party are in a consecutive relation. Used to describe the temporal relation between two events in a complex figure information packaging. (§15.1.3)

consequent see apodosis

**construction grammar:** a model of morphosyntax in which the basic unit of grammatical analysis is a construction. (§1.1)

**construction:** the basic unit of morphosyntactic analysis: a construction is conventional pairing of form and function; its form is morphosyntactic structure, and its function is a combination of meaning (semantic content) and information packaging (§1.1). When combined with a modifier describing a specific construction, ‘[Modifier] construction’ refers to any pairing of form and function in a language (or any language) used to express a particular combination of semantic content and information packaging denoted by the modifier of ‘construction’. (§1.4). Example: the numeral modification construction exemplified by three tree-s consists of (i) a form which can be described schematically as [NUM NOUN-NUMBER], (ii) which performs the function of referring to a group of objects of the type denoted by the noun (tree) and modifying that information with the additional information that the cardinality of the group is the amount denoted by the number (three). Specific constructions (aka criteria, tests, evidence) are used to define word classes. (§1.2.3)

**contact by impact event (sem)/verb (cxn):** an event describing contact by impact; and the verb expressing such an event. Example: hitting is a contact by impact event, and hit is a contact by impact verb. (§7.3.2)

**container term (cxn):** a mensural term that selects an amount of a referent according to the container it is found in. Example: in a bottle of wine, bottle functions as a container term for wine. (§4.1.3)

containing inferrable see inferrable

**content causal relation (sem)/construction (cxn):** the semantic relation in a conditional, causal, concessive or conditional concessive construction that expresses a causal relation between events in the world; and the construction expressing that relation. Example: in If you press this button, the door will open, there is a content causal relation between the event of your pressing the button and
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the event of the door opening. A content causal relation contrasts with an epistemic causal relation or a speech act causal relation. (§17.3.1)

content question see information question
contextual (sem): an entity defined relative to some factor in the speech act context. Examples: this table is defined as a table but relative to the location of the speaker (this expresses the contextual component); the table is defined as a table relative to the shared knowledge of speaker and hearer (the expresses the contextual component). (§3.1.1)

contiguity of serial verbs (str): alternative strategies found with serial verb and auxiliary constructions, whether they are contiguous or not. Example: in Jeh ēn loh chièu reng rūp būh cha chô ‘wan ‘He went out and got somebody’s pig and roasted and ate it’, the serial verbs n loh chièu reng rūp būh cha [exit go search catch roast eat] are all contiguous. Another alternative contiguity strategy in auxiliary constructions is to position the auxiliary in a fixed position in the clause, typically second position, rather than relative to the position of the verb in the auxiliary construction. (§13.2, §13.3.2)

contrast (inf): a discourse context in which there is shared information between two propositions but some information contrasts between the two propositions. The two major types of contrast are counterpresuppositional contrast (the one usually meant with the term ‘contrast’) and parallel contrast. (§11.4.1)

control-based causative strategies (str): monoclausal strategies for the causative construction in which the causee is coded differently depending on how much control the causee has in the outcome of the event. Example: in Hungarian, there is a contrast between encoding the causee in the Accusative Case when the causee has no control (Köhögtettem a gyerek–et ‘I made the boy [ACC] cough’) and encoding the causee in the Instrumental Case when the causee has some control over the outcome (Köhögtettem a gyerek–kel ‘I had the boy [INST] cough’). (§9.2)

controlled activity (sem)/predicate (cxn): the event class of agentive processes, and the predicates that express events in this class. Example: running is a controlled activity event, and run is a controlled activity predicate. §6.3.3

controller (str): in a construction using the indexation strategy, the referring phrase that denotes the same referent that is denoted by the index. Example: in Spanish los libros rojos ‘the red books’, libros is the controller; it denotes the same referent that the masculine singular nonperson index -os in rojos does. The controller is almost always a referring phrase. (§4.4)

converb (str): a deranked predicate form in an asyndetic deranked adverbal clause construction that lacks subject person indexation. Example: Sitting in front of his desk, he noticed a bright light out the window, sitting is a converb. Haspelmath (1995:5) excludes from the converb category forms that are deranked with subject person indexation that is different from that found with declarative main clause predication.

converb strategy (str): a strategy used in the stative complex predicate construction in which the manner (more generally, stative) component is packaged as a separate primary predication coordinated with the event predication using a deranked complex sentence strategy. However, the stative predicate does not index (any of) its argument(s). Example: in Turkana è-pēs-e-tè ni-a-ron-o-nį ‘They kick him badly’ [lit.
‘They kick him, it being bad’) the form of *mr-a-ron-o-n̥* ‘be bad’ is a Neuter deranked form, not indexing the third person plural subject of ‘kick’. (§14.2)

coordinand (*aka* conjunct) (**cxn**): a component of a *coordinate construction*. Example: in *Jerry played the guitar and Billy was on drums, Jerry played the guitar* is one of the coordinands and *Billy was on drums* is the other coordinand. Since coordination constructions link entities other than *events* and the clause constructions that express them, coordinands may also be other constructions than clauses; in particular, coordinands are often *referring phrases*. (§15.2.1)

coordinate clause construction (**cxn**): a *construction* in which two *events* are construed as part of a *complex figure information packaging*. Example: in *Jerry played the guitar and Billy was on drums, Jerry played the guitar* and Billy being on drums are combined in a coordinate clause construction that construes the two events as part of a complex whole. Deranked coordinate clause constructions are also called clause chaining, medial verb constructions, or cosubordination (§15.2.1)

coordinate construction (**aka** coordination) (**cxn**): a *construction* in which two *entities* are construed as part of a *complex figure information packaging*. Example: in *John, Paul, George and Ringo, the four referring phrases* are combined into a coordinate construction that construes the four referents as part of a complex whole.

coordinate impersonal strategy (**str**): a *strategy* used in the *stative complex predicate construction* in which the *manner* (more generally, *stative* component) is packaged as a separate primary *predication coordinated* with the *event* predication using a *balanced complex sentence strategy* (**str**). However, the stative predicate does not index (any of) its argument(s). Example: in Koasati *wayôhka-k ho-palkálki-palâmni-n* ‘They fly all very fast.’ [lit. ‘They fly (and) it is fast’], the second clause *ho-palkálki-palâmni-n* recruits the form of a main clause predicate, but does not index the fliers. §14.2

coordinate personal strategy (**str**): a *strategy* used in the *stative complex predicate construction* in which the *manner* (more generally, *stative* component) is packaged as a separate primary *predication coordinated* with the *event* predication using a *balanced complex sentence strategy* (**str**). In addition, the stative predicate *indexes* (one of) its argument(s). Example: in Muna *ne-rimba no-tende* ‘he runs fast’ [lit. ‘He is fast (and) he runs’], *ne-rimba [3SG.RL-be fast]* recruits the form of a simple predicate and indexes its subject argument. (§14.2)

coordination see *coordinate construction*

coordinator (**str**): a morpheme that overtly expresses the coordination relation in a *coordinate construction*. Example: in *She picked up the pieces and dumped them in the wastebasket, and* is the coordinator. A coordinate construction with a coordinator is an example of *syndetic* coordination. If the morpheme is affixed to a predicate, it is not a coordinator but an overt marker of *deranked* status. (§15.2.2)

copula (**str**): a strategy in which an additional morpheme is used in nonprototypical predication. Copulas can be divided into *verbal copulas* and *nonverbal copulas*. (§1.4, §10.2)

copular participle strategy (**str**): a *strategy* used in the *stative complex predicate construction* in which the *manner* (more generally, *stative* component) recruits a nonprototypical *predication* construction that employs a *copula*, and in addition the copula is in a *deranked* form. Example: in Malayalam *aval bhamgiy-aayi*
prasamgiccu ‘She spoke beautifully’, bhamgiy ‘beauty’ is suffixed with a deranked form of the copula -aayi. (§14.2)

**core argument phrase (cxn):** the subject and object phrases in a clause, generally considered to refer to the more central participants in an event. Example: in Sally threw the letter into the wastebasket, Sally and the letter are the core argument phrases; in The letter was thrown into the wastebasket, only the letter is a core argument phrase. (§6.1.1)

**core arguments (inf):** the most salient arguments associated with a predication. Example: in Sally threw the letter into the wastebasket, Sally and the letter are construed as the most salient arguments; in The letter was thrown into the wastebasket, only the letter is construed as a salient argument. When there are two core arguments, the more salient argument is the subject and the less salient argument is the object. Core arguments are expressed by core argument phrases. (§6.1.1)

**coreference (inf):** the act of referring to a referent that recurs in different occasions in a stretch of discourse. The stretch of discourse may constitute a single construction, such as a complex sentence construction. This is the primary context in which coreference is discussed in this book. Example: in Jared praised his father, but his father ignored him, the referent Jared recurs four times in the sentence, and so represents an example of coreference. In linguistic analysis, coreference is often notated by subscript indices such as i in the example. (§16.1)

**correlative strategy (str):** a strategy for the relative clause construction in which the relative clause is juxtaposed to the matrix clause (not unlike the adjoined strategy), the necessarily shared participant is expressed in the relative clause (not unlike the internally headed strategy) accompanied by a relative clause marking morpheme (which may be a relative pronoun form), and the shared participant is also expressed in the matrix clause, as either a noun or a pronoun. Example: Hindi [ādmī ne jis cākū se murgī ko mārāthā] us cākū ko rām ne dekhā ‘Ram saw the knife with which the man killed the chicken’ is an instance of the correlative strategy: the relative clause ādmī ne jis cākū se murgī ko mārāthā ‘The man killed the chicken with which knife’ contains the relative clause head cākū ‘knife’, modified by the relative pronoun jis ‘which’, and is preposed to the matrix clause us cākū ko rām ne dekhā ‘that knife Ram saw’, which contains a second expression of the relative clause head us cākū ‘that knife’. (§19.2.3)

**COS** see change of state

cosubordination see coordinate clause construction

**counterpresuppositional contrast (inf):** a type of contrast in which the sentence rejects one component of a previously asserted full proposition; this discourse context favors an identificational construal. Example: in the exchange John bought apples. No, he bought PEACHES, the second sentence rejects the previous assertion of what John bought. (§11.4.1)

**coverb** see support verb

criteria (for word classes and other grammatical categories) see construction

**crosslinguistic categories:** categories that are applicable across languages, that is, that a linguist can identify in multiple languages and characterize as the same across those languages. Example: many linguists argue that word classes such as Adjective or
Auxiliary are crosslinguistic categories, but it is argued here that there do not exist crosslinguistic categories. (§1.2.3)

crosslinguistically valid: a property of a construction (in the general sense) that can be defined across languages independently of any language-specific categories.  
_example: relative word order of adjective and noun is a crosslinguistically valid property, depending only on the order in which the adjective and noun are uttered. (§1.4)

CTP see complement-taking predicate

cumulation: the expression of multiple “grammatical” (not lexical) meanings in a single morpheme.  
_example: English -s in She sing-s cumulates third person, singular number and present tense in a single morpheme. (§1.6, §4.4.1)

damage event (sem)/verb (cxn): an event describing material damage to an object; and the verb expressing such an event.  
_example: scratching something is a damage event, and scratch is a damage verb. (§7.3.2)

deadjectival referring phrase (cxn): a construction that expresses reference to property concepts.  
_examples: length (< long), happiness (< happy) are examples of the deadjectival nominal construction. Deadjectival nominals are very rare in discourse, little described in reference grammars, and little studied in typology, so they are not further discussed here. (§2.2.5)

dea declarative (inf/cxn): a speech act which simply asserts its propositional content, and the construction that expresses this speech act.  
_example: The English sentence Sandra picked up the children is an instance of a declarative speech act. The declarative is the most common speech act construction, and is considered the default speech act construction. (§12.1)

declarative negation construction (cxn): a construction that expresses negative polarity of a declarative speech act.  
_example: in English, Kit didn’t like the movie is an instance of a declarative negation construction, with the morpheme not~n’t combining with the past tense auxiliary did to negate the declarative speech act ‘Kit liked the movie’. (§12.2)

definite null instantiation see zero anaphora

definite pronoun/article (cxn): this term is applied to referring phrases—pronouns and articles combined with nouns—that are associated with the top end of the information status continuum, where the identity of the referent is already known to both speaker and hearer. This includes active, semi-active, inactive and inferrable referents.  
_example: the glass bowl is an example of a definite referring phrase, used in a context where the individual glass bowl in question is identifiable by both speaker and hearer (Table 3.4, §3.3.1)

degree (sem): for scalar concepts, a value on the scale that may be expressed by a distinct word.  
_example: in very long, the admodifier very indicates that the value on the scale of length is beyond the normal value implicit in the word long. (§2.2.2)

degree affix (str): a scalar admodifier expressed by an affix.  
_example: -er in sillier is a degree affix. (§4.1.2)

degree equative (str): a fixed-case strategy in equative constructions in which there is a clause which attributes a gradable predicative scale to the comparee, and the standard is expressed as a nominal modifier of a word denoting ‘degree’, ‘manner’ or ‘quantity’.  
_example: Harar Oromo isii akkà isaani d’eertuu ‘She is as tall as
them’ is an instance of the degree equative strategy, with the predicate d’eertuu ‘is tall’, and the standard, isaani ‘they [GEN]’ modifies akká ‘manner’. (§17.2.4)

degree marker (cxn): a free morpheme or affix that expresses the relative degree of the gradable predicative scale applied to the comparee, in comparative and equative constructions. Example: in taller, the suffix -er is a degree marker. In addition to comparative and equative degree markers, some languages have a distinct superlative degree marker, such as -est in English tallest. (§17.2.2)

degree modifier (aka degree adverb) (str): a scalar admodifier expressed by an independent word. Example: very in very happy is a degree modifier. (§4.1.2)
deixis/deictic (aka situational) (sem): a contextual factor defined in terms of the speech act event. We will use the term in its narrow sense of spatial location relative to the speaker and addressee in the speech event. Example: in that book, that is picking out the book deictically, via its location relative to the speaker. (§3.1.1)

demonstrative attributive (cxn): a deictic contextual expression that combines with a common noun to form a referring phrase. Example: in This machine drives me crazy!, This is a demonstrative attributive combined with the common noun machine. (§3.1.3, §3.2)

demonstrative pronoun (cxn): a deictic contextual expression that stands alone as a referring phrase. Example: in This is a collared lizard, This is a demonstrative pronoun. (§3.1.1, §3.1.3, §3.2)
deontic modality (sem): a type of modality which expresses the attitude of a speaker or other conceiver towards performing an action (i.e. making the action come true). Example: Jerry must get his hair cut is an instance of deontic modality: the speaker expresses her attitude that the situation necessarily will come about. Deontic modality is construed broadly in this textbook, to include wishes as well as intentions and commands, attitude toward oneself performing the action as well as toward others performing the action, and to include objective as well as subjective characterization of the attitude. (§12.1, §12.4)
departure (sem): the initial phase of the path in a motion event. Example: in He went from the tree to the house, the path oblique phrase from the tree denotes the departure phase of the motion event. (§14.4)
dependent (cxn): any element of a construction that is not the head. Example: in the phrase an ancient watch, ancient and an are dependents. (§2.2.1)
dependent clause (cxn): a clause that is a dependent of a matrix clause in a complex sentence construction. Adverbial clauses, complement clauses and relative clauses are all examples of dependent clauses. Example: in She watered the plants before she ate lunch, before she ate lunch is an instance of an (adverbial) dependent clause. Dependent clauses are often, but not always, subordinate clauses. (§15.1.2)
dependent time reference (sem): in a complement clause construction, this is the semantic property that the time reference of the complement event is determined by the time reference of the matrix clause event. Example: in Sally persuaded John to make the cake, the time reference of John’s making the cake is dependent on the time reference of Sally’s persuading him—it must follow the persuading event. (§18.2.2)

depictive (complex predicate) (aka depictive secondary predicate) (cxn): a stative complex predicate in which the stative component of the complex predicate describes a state that holds at the same time as the event denoted by the main
A depictive complex predicate is participant-oriented. *Example*: in English *I ate the carrots raw, ate...raw* is a depictive complex predicate, and *raw* describes a state of the carrots as they were being eaten. (§14.1)

depictive secondary predicate see depictive (complex predicate)
deranked, deranking (*str*): a strategy in which the predicate in a complex sentence or a complex predicate construction does not recruit the predicate construction in a simple predication, in contrast to the balanced strategy. Instead, the deranked predicate either (i) lacks the inflections of the predicate, (ii) uses different inflections from the predicate, (iii) has an affix that overtly codes its relation to the other predicate; or some combination of these three possibilities. *Example*: in *Reaching the top of the hill, Ron found a stone monument*, the predicate *reaching* is a deranked form: it lacks verbal inflections and is overtly coded by the suffix -ing. Deranked predicate forms are also called infinitives, gerunds, participles, verbal nouns, masdars, action nominals, and nominalizations. (§12.4.2, §14.2, §15.2.3)
derived intransitive (*str*): the strategy of recruiting the intransitive construction for use in a reflexive construction or a reciprocal construction but with overt coding of the predicate indicating the reflexive event or reciprocal event type. *Examples*: Abkhaz l-çò-l-k°abe-yt ‘she washed herself’ is an Intransitive Verb form with the Reflexive prefix çò-, and Swahili wa-na-pend-an-a ‘they love each other’ is an Intransitive Verb form with the Reciprocal suffix -an. §7.2
derived-case (*str*): a set of strategies found in comparative and equative constructions in which the case marking of the standard is derived from the case marking of the comparee. *Example*: *I love you more than him* uses a derived-case strategy: the referring phrase referring to the standard, *him*, uses the Object case marker because the referring phrase referring to the comparee, *you*, is in the Object case. Derived-case strategies include the conjoined comparative strategy, the particle comparative and equative strategies, the conjoined exceed comparative strategy, the relative-based equative strategy, and the relative equal equative strategy. (§17.2.2)

desiderative event (*sem*)/predicate (*cxn*): an event that expresses a desire towards the realization of a future event that is expressed by the complement; and the predicate that expresses the event. *Example*: in *Meagan wants to climb Mt Baldy on Saturday, wants* denotes a desiderative event. Noonan (2007:135) includes intending events in the category of desiderative events. (§18.2.2)
detached (topic phrase) (*str*): a strategy for expressing a topic in which the topic referring phrase differs from the expression of a prototypical subject phrase. *Example*: in German *Peter, ich habe ihn heute nicht getroffen ‘Peter, I have not met him today’,* the topic phrase *Peter* is in initial position, prosodically separated from the rest of the clause, and there is a pronoun *ihn ‘him’* referring to Peter in the clause. Not all detached topics have all three of the morphosyntactic properties of the German example; there is a continuum from the prototypical subject/topic phrase and a “fully” detached topic phrase. (§11.2.2)

determiner (*cxn*): a superordinate category of contextually defined forms that combine with common nouns; determiners include both demonstrative attributives and articles. (§3.2)
different-subject (aka DS) (inf): in complex sentence constructions that express reference tracking, the situation where the salient participant in the current clause is indicated as not coreferential with the salient participant in another clause in the construction. The salient participant is typically but not always encoded as the subject of the predicate. Example: in *Harry having finished preparing the salad, Bill brought it to the table*, the overt referring phrase *Harry* in *Harry having finished preparing the salad* signals that the subject referent of finishing the chapter is not coreferential with the subject referent of the matrix clause, namely Harry. (§16.1)

differential object marking (str): a strategy that is marginal for the passive-inverse voice construction in which there is a distinct, overt case marker of higher animacy/higher information status, that is, higher salience, Ps. Example: in Spanish, *El director busca a un empleado* ‘The director is looking for a [specific] clerk’, the phrase *un empleado* ‘a clerk’, referring to the P participant, uses the overt case marker *a*. Differential object marking is not usually considered a strategy of the passive-inverse construction because the A participant is not reduced in salience although the P participant is higher in salience. (§8.3)

dimension term (cxn): a modifier expressing a concept of extent on a spatial dimension. Examples: tall, small and thin are English dimension terms. (§4.1.2)

direct causation (sem): a causative event in which the causee has no control over the action. Example: *I laid the child in the crib* in an instance of direct causation. (§9.2)

direct negation referent (inf)/pronoun (cxn): an unspecified referent which is in the scope of negation in the same clause. Example: in *I noticed nothing*, *nothing* is a direct negation pronoun expressing a referent found only in the negative alternative world to the real world. (§3.5)

direct object category (str): the morphosyntactic category in the indirective alignment system that co-expresses both T and P roles. Example: in *Randy gave the car to his daughter*, the T role (*the car*) is expressed in the same way as the P role in *Randy started the car*. (§7.5.2)

direct report (str): a strategy for the complement of an utterance event in which the form as well as the content of an utterance is expressed. Example: in *Sandy said, “I’m buying the house”*, the complement *I’m buying the house* is presented in its original form—the speaker is not asserting that s/he is buying the house. A direct report strategy may be accompanied by a quotative marker. Although the direct report strategy originates with utterance complement clause constructions, it is also used with other complement clause constructions lower in the Binding Hierarchy. (§18.2.2, §18.3.2)

directed change (sem): an event in which the change that a participant undergoes in the course of an event is in one “direction”. Example: in *The storm expanded* there is a gradual unidirectional increase in size, and so the event is a directed change. (§6.2.1)

discourse deictic (inf): reference to events or propositions already described in the discourse, in contrast to reference to objects. (§3.3.3)

discourse function see information packaging

discourse markers (cxn): a construction that serve a variety of discourse functions, including linking sections of discourse together. Example: in the discourse passage *...all you gotta do is put the outdoor condensing unit, ...and refrigerant piping to that coil. So it .. saves-- .. it saves additional work in the future*, the word *so* is a discourse
marker that links the preceding section of discourse to the following section. Discourse markers are not discussed in this book except as sources of conjunctions. (§15.1.1)

discourse reference system (str): a system where both same-subject and different-subject reference-tracking constructions use the standard discourse reference strategies found in connected discourse. Discourse reference systems are found when both same-subject and different-subject constructions are balanced. Example: in Spanish, syndetic coordinate constructions such as El Gobierno Nacional volvió a prorrogar los actuales mandatos en los sindicatos y Øi suspendió los procesos electorales hasta 2021 express the same-subject relation in the same way as in connected discourse, namely with zero anaphora and subject person indexation on the verb. (§16.2)

disjunctive coordination (cxn): a type of coordinate construction typically equated with coordination by ‘or’, representing alternatives in the relevant context. Example: I will take the bus or ride my bicycle is an instance of disjunctive coordination of clauses; an apple or an orange in I'll have an apple or an orange is an instance of disjunctive coordination of referring phrases. Disjunctive coordination can be divided into inclusive disjunction and exclusive disjunction. (§15.2.1)

disposition see human propensity term

distal (deixis) (sem): a contextual category of deixis defined as away from the location of the speaker in the speech event. (§3.1.1)

distributed subject possessive strategy see topic possessive strategy
distribution see word class

distributive quantifier (cxn): a form that specifies the members of the set but treats them individually (that is, the predicate applies to the whole set by virtue of applying to the individual members of the set). Example: in Every dog has fleas, every is a distributive quantifier. (§4.1.3)

ditransitive construction (cxn): the construction used to express the agent of the trivalent giving event (the A role), the theme of the giving event (the T role), and the recipient of the giving event (the R role) when the agent is more salient than the theme or recipient. Example: Randy gave the car to his daughter is an instance of the ditransitive construction. (§6.1.2, §7.5.1)

ditransitive predication (inf): a predication predicated of three salient arguments. Example: in Sarah sent Jerry a letter, sending is a ditransitive predication because it is predicated of three arguments, Sarah, Jerry and the letter. (§6.1.2)

DNI see zero anaphora

domain (str): in a construction using the indexation strategy, the construction as a whole that the controller, target and index occur in. Example: in Spanish los libros rojos ‘the red books’, the domain is the modification construction including the modifier rojos ‘red’ (the target), the modifier suffix -os ‘[masculine plural]’, and the head noun libros ‘books’ (the controller). (§4.4)

double expression (aka double marking, double framing) (str): a strategy for the expression of motion events in which the path of motion is expressed as (at least) part of the predicate and also as a satellite. Example: in Russian Ja vy-bežal iz doma
‘I ran out of the house’, the path of going out of the house is expressed both as part of the verb (the prefix vy- in vy-bežal) and as the case marker iz. (§14.5)

double framing see double expression
double marking see double expression

double negation strategy (str): a strategy found in negation constructions, particularly declarative negation constructions, in which there are two morphemes that express negative polarity. Example: the French sentence Je ne vois pas la lune ‘I do not see the moon’, negative polarity is expressed by both ne and pas. (§12.2)
double object see neutral ditransitive alignment system
double subject see topic possessive strategy
double-coding strategy (str): a strategy used for experiential constructions in which both experiencer and stimulus are expressed with the same core argument phrase (either subject or object). Example: in the Japanese sentence Dare ga eiga ga suki desu ka ‘Who likes movies?’, both the experiencer dare ‘who’ and the stimulus eiga ‘movie’ are expressed with the Subject case marker ga. (§7.4)
double-oblique strategy (str): a strategy used for experiential constructions in which both experiencer and stimulus are both expressed in an oblique argument phrase (the two participant roles are usually expressed with different oblique case markers). Example: in Ancient Greek mélei moi toúto:n hô:n ero:táis ‘I care about what you ask’, the experiencer argument phrase moi ‘I’ uses the oblique (Dative) case marker form, and the stimulus argument phrase toúto:n hô:n ero:táis ‘what you ask’ uses the oblique (Genitive) case marker form. (§7.4)
deriving (str): expression of a referent twice in a construction, by a referring phrase and simultaneously by an index. (§3.3.3)
downtoner (cxn): indicates a lower than normal value on a property scale. Example: in somewhat long, somewhat indicates a value shorter than is normal for length. (§4.1.2)

DS see different-subject
durative (sem): an event that is construed as taking place over a period of time. Example: They inflated the balloon is a durative event. (§6.2.1)
dynamic (sem): a concept construed as involving change over the time course of the event. Example: walking involves change over the time course of the walking event. (§2.1, §6.2.1)
echo strategy (str): a strategy for the polarity response construction in which the answer to a polarity question repeats part of the question. Example: in Welsh, the answers to the polarity question A welwch chwi hwy? [interrogative see you them] ‘Do you see them?’ are either Gwelaf ‘I see (them)’ or Na gwelaf ‘I don’t see (them)’. (§12.3.3)
element (cxn): a word or construction that is part of, that is, functions in a role in a construction. Example: in an ancient watch, the elements are an, ancient and watch. (§2.2.1)

ellipsis (str): a strategy for identificational constructions in which the presupposed open proposition is deleted, or sometimes expressed only by a ‘pro-verb’. Example: in English, elliptical responses to the question Who took the cookies? are It was JIM, JIM, or JIM did (with the pro-verb form did), in contrast to the full prosodic strategy JIM took the cookies or the equational strategy It was JIM who took the cookies. (§11.4.2)
emotion event (sem)/verb (cxn): an experiential event involving an experiencer’s emotions directed towards a stimulus; and a verb that expresses such an event. Example: He fears dogs is an example of an emotion event, and fear is the emotion verb. (§7.4)

encoding strategy: a strategy for a construction defined by the presence (or absence) of certain morphosyntactic structures that are defined in a crosslinguistically valid fashion. (§1.4)

endpoint (sem): a participant role defined in terms of the participant being acted upon by another participant in a causal chain. Example: in The cats scratched the furniture, the furniture is the endpoint of the causal chain [cats → furniture]. (§6.1.1, §6.1.2)

entity (sem): a superordinate category including object concepts, property concepts and event concepts. (§2.1)

entity-central (inf/cxn): a type of thetic in which the most important new information being presented is the identity of the object (entity); and the construction that expresses that information packaging. Example: There’s a snake in the kitchen sink is an instance of an entity-central thetic construction, where the primary new information being presented is the snake. (§10.1.2; §11.3.1)

epistemic causal relation (sem)/construction (cxn): the semantic relation in a conditional, causal, concessive or conditional concessive construction that expresses an epistemic inferential relation between two propositions; and the construction expressing that relation. Example: in If Professor Smith’s door is closed, then she is not on campus, there is an epistemic causal relation between the fact that Professor Smith’s office door is closed and the inference that she is not on campus. An epistemic causal relation contrasts with a content causal relation and a speech act causal relation. (§17.3.1)

epistemic modality (sem): a type of modality which expresses the attitude of a speaker or other conceiver towards the truth of the situation described in the clause, that is, degree of certainty that the situation is true. Example: Jerry might get his hair cut is an instance of epistemic modality: the speaker is expressing a relatively neutral attitude towards whether the future situation will actually come about. Epistemic modality is construed broadly in this textbook, to include objective as well as subjective characterization of the epistemic modal attitude. (§12.1, §12.3.4)

epistemic stance (aka hypotheticality) (sem): the speaker’s commitment to the actuality of the proposition expressed in a clause. Epistemic stance is normally presupposed. Epistemic stance is divided by Fillmore (1990b) into three categories: positive, neutral and negative. Others use a finer-grained categorization (e.g., partial positive and partial negative), and still others refer to a continuum of hypotheticality. Non-positive (i.e., neutral and negative) epistemic stances are referred to as hypothetical. (§17.3.1)

equal equative (str): a fixed-case strategy in equative constructions in which there are two predicates, one which attributes a gradable predicative scale to the comparee, and another which asserts that the comparee is identical to the standard on that scale. Example: Nkore-Kiga noingana Mugasho oburaingwa ‘You are as tall as Mugasho’ [lit. ‘you-are-equal-to Mugasho in-height] is an instance of the equal equative strategy. (§17.2.4)
**equational (inf/cxn):** a type of **identificational information** **packaging** in which two **referents** that the hearer assumed were different individuals are asserted to be in fact one and the same individual; and the **construction** that expresses that information packaging. **Example:** in *The Morning Star is the Evening Star*, it is asserted that two celestial objects that were once thought to be distinct objects (and given distinct names) are one and the same, namely the planet Venus. (§10.1.2)

**equative construction (cxn):** a construction that has the semantic function of assigning the identical position on a **gradable predicative scale** to two **referents**, the **comparee** and the **standard**. **Example:** *The tree is as tall as the house* is an instance of the equative construction: the comparee is the tree, the standard is the house, thegradable comparative scale is height, and the comparee exceeds the standard in height. (§17.2.4)

**equipollent (str):** a **strategy** in which a **noncausal event** and its counterpart **causal event** are expressed by forms of equal morphological structure. **Example:** in German, the causal event predicate *aufwechen* ‘wake (someone) up’ and the causal event predicate *aufwachen* ‘wake up’ are expressed by morphologically related forms, but one form is not morphologically more complex than the other. In English, the suppletive causal event predicate *kill* vs. noncausal event predicate *die* are also analyzed as instances of the equipollent strategy. The term ‘equipollent’ is used for the same strategy in other constructions as well. (§6.3.4)

**ergative alignment system (str):** a **system** in which the **S** and **P** roles are expressed with the same form, but the **A** role is expressed with a different form. **Example:** in Yuwaalaraay, argument phrases expressing the A role use the **Ergative case marker** *-gu*, but argument phrases expressing both the S and P roles use the zero-coded Absolutive case marker. (§6.3.1)

**ergative category (str):** the morphosyntactic category in the **ergative alignment system** that exclusively expresses the A role. **Example:** The Yuwaalaraay case marker *-gu* exclusively expresses the A role, and hence is an ergative case marker. (§6.3.1)

**evaluative event (sem)/predicate (cxn):** an **event** in which an evaluative judgement is made about the truth of the **proposition** expressed in its **complement**; and a **predicate** expressing this event. Evaluative events may assume different **epistemic stances** towards the proposition expressed in their complement. **Commentative events** assume a positive epistemic stance; **hoping** and **fearing events** assume a **neutral epistemic stance**; and **wishing events** assume a **negative epistemic stance**. (§18.2.2)

**event (aka eventuality, situation, state of affairs, SOA) (sem):** a superordinate category including both **action concepts** and **state concepts**. The term ‘event’ has other meanings, including what we call a **telic event**. Other terms listed above are also used for ‘event’ as it is defined here. (§2.1, §6.1.1)

**event-central (inf/cxn):** a type of **thetic** in which the more important new information being presented is the **event** reported; and the **construction** that expresses that information packaging. **Example:** in *The PHONE’s ringing*, the most important new information is the ringing of the phone, not the existence of the phone. (§10.1.2; §11.3.1)

**event-oriented (sem):** a **stat**e in a **static complex predicate** that describes a **state** of the **event** denoted by the complex predicate. **Example:** in English *I ate the
carrots slowly, slowly is a property of the event of eating. Event-oriented contrasts with participant-oriented. (§14.1)

eventive complex predicate (cxn): a complex predicate in which both elements of the complex predicate denote processes, and those processes constitute the subevents of the event denoted by the basic event complex predicate as a whole. Example: in English Please go get the newspaper, go get is an example of a basic event complex predicate. (§13.1.2)
eventuality see event
evidence (for word classes and other grammatical categories) see construction
evidentiality (sem): a category related to epistemic modality which indicates the epistemic justification for believing a proposition. Example: English I hear you’re going to Stanford this fall is an evidential construction, using the first singular simple present form I hear..., that indicates that my evidence for your going to Stanford in the fall is hearsay. (§12.3.4)
exceed comparative (str): a fixed-case strategy in comparative constructions in which there are two predicates, one which attributes a gradable predicative scale to the comparee, and another which asserts that the comparee exceeds the standard on that scale. Example: Vietnamese vang quí hon bac ‘gold is worth more than silver’ is an instance of the exceed comparative: the first part vang quí ‘gold [is] valuable’ attributes a degree of value to gold, and the second part hon bac ‘[it] exceeds silver’ asserts that gold exceeds silver in value. (§17.2.2)
exclamative (inf/cxn): a speech act which expresses a strong emotional reaction to the propositional content that it conveys; and the construction that expresses this speech act. More precisely, the exclamative speech act expresses the speaker’s surprise towards the degree of a scalar property contained in the propositional content of the speech act; the rest of the propositional content consists of a presupposed open proposition. Example: What a beautiful house! is an instance of an English exclamative construction. (§12.1, §12.5)
exclusive disjunctive coordination (cxn): a type of disjunctive coordination in which the alternatives expressed cannot be combined. Example: You can have the soup or the salad is an instance of exclusive disjunctive coordination in the situation where you cannot have both. Exclusive disjunctive coordination can be an instance of exhaustive list coordination. (§15.2.1)
exclusive focus operator see restrictive (focus) operator
exclusive pronoun (cxn): a first person pronoun that refers to a group including the speaker but excluding the addressee. Example: Kosraean kitel is a first person exclusive pronoun referring to a group that includes the speaker but not the addressee. (§3.1.1)
exhaustive list coordination (aka summary conjunction) (cxn): a type of coordination construction in which all the entities that are understood to be coordinated are expressed (and hence no other entities are included). Example: Hua dgaimo-gi kgaimo-gi ‘you and I’ is an instance of exhaustive list coordination, in that you and I and no others are included. Exhaustive list coordination can include exclusive disjunction. (§15.2.1)
existential (sem): a situation in which the existence of some entity is presented. Existential situations favor a thetic construal. Example: There are apples in the kitchen expresses the existence of the relevant set of apples. (§11.3.1)

existential negation construction (cxn): a construction that expresses negative polarity with respect to an existential situation type. Example: Malay tanana seraya ‘There was no substitute’ is an example of a negative existential construction using a special negative existential form tanana. (§12.2)

expanding (inf): a subtype of counterpresuppositional contrast in which the sentence rejects a component of a prior assertion by adding something else to the rejected component rather than simply replacing it. Example: in the exchange John bought apples. He also bought PEACHES, the speaker rejects that what John bought was just apples, and adds peaches to what John bought. Also is an additive (focus) operator. (§11.4.1)

experience event (sem)/verb (cxn): an experiential event which describes the state holding between an experiencer directing her/his attention to a stimulus and the stimulus altering the mental state of the experiencer (or the inception of such a state); and a verb that expresses such an event. Example: I saw the dog is an instance of an experience event, and see is an experience verb. (§7.4)

experiencer (sem): the person who experiences the internal mental phenomenon or bodily sensation in an experiential event. Example: in Freddy saw the bear, Freddy is the experiencer. The experiencer is almost always human. (§6.1.2, §7.4)

experiential construction (cxn): an argument structure construction used to predicate an experiential event. Example: Shelley tasted the soup is an instance of an experiential construction, with the experiencer expressed as subject and the stimulus expressed as object. (§7.4)

experiential event (sem)/verb (cxn): an event that names a human internal mental or bodily experience; and a verb that expresses such an event. Experiential events include perception events, cognition events, emotion events and (bodily) sensation events; ingestion events also exhibit some semantic similarities to experiential events. (§6.1.2, §7.4)

explanation (inf): a discourse context which tends to favor a thetic construal. The fact that something happened is presupposed, and the statement explains or elaborates what happened. Example: My CAR broke down, as for instance a response to the question “What happened?”, is an instance of an explanation. (§11.3.1)

explicitness (aka recoverability): the property of relative clause construction strategies the refers to how explicitly the strategy encodes the semantic role of the shared participant in the event denoted by the relative clause. For example, the pronoun-retention strategy is more explicit than the gap strategy because the former strategy
overtly encodes the semantic role of the participant in the relative clause event via the retained pronoun, whereas the latter strategy does not encode the semantic role at all. Explicitness plays a role in determining the distribution of relative clause strategies with respect to the Accessibility Hierarchy. (§19.3)

**expression** see form

**Extended Animacy Hierarchy** (aka Referentiality Hierarchy): a ranking of entities including contextually defined and individually defined entities as well as categories of entities. The Extended Animacy Hierarchy is given below, with the construction for each position on the hierarchy given in square brackets: first/second person [pronoun] < third person [pronoun] < individual [proper noun] < human [common noun] < (nonhuman) animate [common noun] < inanimate [common noun]. The Extended Animacy Hierarchy figures in many grammatical phenomena. (§3.1.2)

extended intransitive see subject-oblique strategy

**external possessor strategy** (str): a strategy in which a referent in a possessive relation to a participant in an event (normally in the P role or sometimes the S role of the event), is expressed as an argument of the predicate instead of in a possessive modification construction. Example: in Maasai áa-boak-ìta ọldìa ‘My dog is barking’, the portmanteau index áa-indexes the owner of the dog as the object argument of the predicate. (§7.5.3)

**externally headed** (str): a relative clause construction in which the relative clause head is expressed as an argument of the matrix clause predicate. Example: in I ate the cheesecake [that Carol baked], that Carol baked is an externally headed relative clause; the relative clause head is the cheesecake, which is the Direct Object of the matrix predicate ate. The externally headed strategy is by far the most common strategy for relative clause constructions. Externally headed relative clauses may be prenominal, postnominal or extraposed. Externally headed relative clause may use a gap, pronoun-retention or relative pronoun strategy. (§19.2.2)

**extraposed strategy** (str): a word order strategy for externally headed relative clause constructions in which the relative clause, rather than being adjacent to the external relative clause head (either pronominal or postnominal), instead follows the entire matrix clause. Example: I found a linguistics book in a used bookstore last week [that I have been looking for for years] is an instance of the extraposed strategy: the relative clause that I have been looking for for years does not immediately follow the external relative clause head a linguistics book, but instead follows the entire matrix clause I found a linguistics book in a used bookstore last week. (§19.2.4)

**extroverted event** (sem)/verb (cxn): an event not normally performed on oneself or on each other; and a verb expressing such an event. Examples: seeing something vs. oneself, or loving someone vs. oneself (or even each other), are instances of extroverted events, and see and love are extroverted verbs. (§7.2)

**factive event** (sem): an event in which a positive epistemic stance is taken by the speaker towards a proposition denoted by some part of that construction. Example: It is appalling that Donald won the election—an example of a commentative complement clause construction—is factive in that the speaker takes a positive epistemic stance towards the complement proposition that Donald won the election.
false cumulation: the translation of an object language morpheme by more than one English word because English lacks a one-word translation. Example: Spanish *buscar* must be translated into English as ‘look for’. In an interlinear morpheme translation the English combination is ideally notated look_for. (§1.6)

fearing event (sem)/predicate (cxn): an evaluative event in which a negative evaluative judgement about a proposition expressed by the complement of the commentative event is made, and there is a neutral epistemic stance by the speaker towards the proposition; and the predicate expressing this event. Example: in Jill fears that Donald has won the election, the commentative predicate fears expresses Jill’s evaluation of Donald’s winning the election, and also presupposes that the speaker does not know whether Donald has won the election. (§18.2.2)

figure (sem): the object in a spatial scene whose location or path of motion is being described relative to a ground. Example: in Meagan ran into the cave, Meagan is the figure, and her path of motion is described relative to the location of the cave. (§7.3.1, §14.5)

figure-ground (aka asymmetric) (inf): a construal or information packaging of two events such that one event (the ground) serves as the reference point for the other event (the figure). Example: in Cindy quit after Jim was promoted, the two events are in a figure-ground packaging such that Jim’s being promoted serves as the reference point for the time of Cindy’s quitting. This is an extension of the figure-ground construal beyond spatial relations. This information packaging is found in adverbial clause constructions. (§15.1.3)

figure-ground spatial relation (aka locative relation) (sem): a spatial relation that holds between two objects such that the ground object functions as a reference point for locating the figure. Example: the bicycle in the garage is a locative modification construction that expresses a figure-ground spatial relation between the bicycle and the garage. (§4.1.4, §10.4.1)

figure-incorporating (str): a strategy for the expression of motion events in which the predication incorporates the semantic type of the figure of motion. Example: in Atsugewi w’ost’aq’ik:a ‘Runny icky material [e.g. guts] are lying on the ground’, the verb *st’aq* ‘lie [of runny, icky material] incorporates the semantic type of the figure (the guts) as runny, icky material. (§14.5)

file metaphor: a metaphor used by linguists from different theoretical traditions to describe the propositional act information packaging functions. The metaphor is based on the notion of a file in which information about referents is stored. (§2.1, §10.1.2)

first person pronoun (cxn): a personal pronoun used to refer contextually to a person in their role as speaker. The term is conventionally used also to refer to a group of persons, one of whom is the speaker. Example: I and we are first person pronouns, the former referring to the speaker and the latter to a group including the speaker. (§3.1.1)

fixed-case (str): a set of strategies found in comparative and equative constructions in which the case marking of the standard is fixed (unchanging). Example: Mundari sadom-ete hati mananga-i ‘The elephant is bigger than the horse’ is an instance of the fixed-case strategy: sadom-ete ‘horse-from’ always occurs in the case expressed by -ete ‘from’. (§17.2.2)
flag see case affix

**focus (inf):** in **identificational information packaging**, the information which is identified as the “filler” for the open part of the **presupposed open proposition**.  
*Example:* in *It was Jack who stole my cookies!*, the presupposed open proposition is ‘X stole my cookies’, and the filler of X is Jack, i.e. X = Jack. The focus may be any part of the information in the clause, not just an argument. The term ‘focus construction’ is sometimes used as a synonym for ‘identificational construction’, but we avoid that usage here. (§11.4.1)

**focus marker (str):** expression by a separate morpheme of what information in an **identificational construction** is the focus. *Example:* in Rendille *inam-é y-imi* ‘The BOY came’, the suffix -i marks the Noun *inam-* ‘(the) boy’ as the focus. (§11.4.2)

**focus operator (cxn):** a construction that indicates the range of the focus of an **identificational construction**. Focus operators may be additive or restrictive. (§11.4.1)

**force (sem):** a semantic role including **participant roles** for a **participant** that initiates an event but is not volitional (usually because it is not human), i.e. is not an agent.  
*Example:* in *Lightning shattered the old tree*, the lightning initiates the shattering event but is not an agent. (§6.1.2)

**force dynamics (sem):** see **causal structure**

**form (aka expression):** the morphosyntactic structure of a **construction**. (§1.1)

**form term (cxn):** a mensural term that selects an amount of a **referent** according to the shape defined by the amount. *Example:* in *two piles of sand*, *pile(s)* is a form term. (§4.1.3)

Frame Element see **participant role**

**free choice referent (inf)/pronoun (cxn):** an unspecified **referent** in certain contexts whose identity can be freely chosen without affecting the truth value of the utterance.  
*Example:* in *After the fall of the Wall, East Germans were free to travel anywhere*, *anywhere* is a free choice pronoun expressing a referent—a place—towards which the agent in the clause, the East Germans, is free to choose to travel to. (§3.5)

**free relative clause (cxn):** a relative clause construction in which the head has one of several possible **indefinite** functions, that is, **specific**, **irrealis**, **free-choice** and/or **universal**. *Example:* in *Take what(ever) you like*, *what(ever) you like* is a free relative clause using a **headless strategy**, and in *Take anything you like*, *anything you like* is a free relative clause using an **overt head strategy**. (§19.4)

**free translation see translation**

**function:** the combination of **meaning** and **information packaging** conveyed by a **construction**. *Example:* the numeral modification construction illustrated by *three trees* combines the meanings of an object, or more precisely a group of objects (trees) and the cardinality of the group (three), packaged as referring to the (group of) trees and adding information about the group of trees, namely that its cardinality is three. Another use of the term ‘function’ is to refer to a **role** in a construction. (§1.1)

**functionalism:** an approach to the study of language that seeks explanations of language structure in the function of language in communicative interaction. This textbook takes a functionalist approach. (§1.1)

**fusion (str):** a highly grammaticalized strategy for encoding the relation in **major propositional acts** (**modifier-referent, predicate-argument**), in which the two
elements are fused in a single morpheme. Example: Lakhota ina ‘my mother’ fuses ‘my’ and ‘mother’. (§4.5)

**future-oriented (sem):** the event in question is a future event from the reference time of the deontic modal situation. Examples: in English You may leave now, a subjective deontic modal construction, the event is in the future from the speech act time (that is, simple future). In English Carol intended to close the door, an objective deontic modal constructions, the event is in the future from the reported deontic modal event time: that is, closing the door is projected to a future from the past event of Carol’s having the intention. (§12.4)

**G role** see **R role**

**gap strategy (str):** a strategy for the expression of the necessarily shared participant in the relative clause of an externally headed relative clause construction, in which the participant is not expressed at all in the relative clause. Example: I ate the cheesecake [that Carol baked] uses the gap strategy because the shared participant, the cheesecake, is expressed only as the external relative clause head, and not at all in the relative clause that Carol baked. (§19.2.2)

**gender term (cxn):** a modifier expressing the concepts of sex gender. Example: male and female are English gender terms. (§4.1.2)

**gender/class (sem):** a semantic category that is expressed as an indexation feature, and covers both distinctions based primarily on sex and animacy (‘gender’) and distinctions based on animacy, sex, and various semantic properties of inanimate or at least nonhuman objects. (§4.4.2)

**general extender (str):** a form used as part of a non-exhaustive coordination construction that indicates the non-exhaustiveness of the list. Example: in the non-exhaustive coordination construction in She sold baskets, pots and stuff/and everything, and stuff or and everything are general extenders. (§15.2.2)

**generic (inf):** reference to the type itself, and not to a particular referent/token of the type. Example: in the generic use of You can’t come to the party without an invitation, you is referring to the generic category of people. (§3.1.1, §3.6)

**generic article (cxn):** an article used in combination with a common noun (and its modifiers, if any) for generic reference. Example: in A bat is a flying mammal, a functioning as a generic article. (§3.6)

**generic conditional relation (sem)/construction (cxn):** a subtype of the conditional relation in which an event causes another event generically or habitually. Example: If/When/Whenever a dog starts barking, I run away is an instance of a generic conditional relation and construction: it doesn’t describe a specific instance of a dog barking causing me to run away; instead it describes a general or habitual pattern of this causal sequence of events. (§17.3.1)

**generic pronoun (cxn):** a pronoun used for generic reference. Example: in One always works too much, one is functioning as a generic pronoun. (§3.6)

**genitive phrase** see possessive modifier phrase

**genitive strategy** see adnominal possessive strategy

**gerund** see deranked

**goal strategy** see locational possessive strategy

**gradable predicative scale (sem):** in a comparative construction or an equative construction, the predicate that defines the scale on which the comparee and
**standard** are located. *Example:* in *Your cat is as big as my dog,* size is the gradable predicative scale on which it is asserted that the position of the cat is the same as the position of the dog. (§17.2.1)

**grammaticalization:** the process by which new grammatical **constructions** emerge from novel and specialized uses of other grammatical constructions; once a grammatical construction acquires a novel, specialized **function**, it eventually undergoes changes in **morphosyntactic** structure and scope, and often also phonetic form. *Example:* a *kind of* originally expressed a type of **object,** then shifted meaning to become a hedging phrase for a less-central member of a category, was extended to describe hedging of a property word (*kind of cute*), and was phonetically reduced to *kinda.* (§1.1, §2.3)

**grooming event** see **body care event**

**ground** *(sem):* the reference point for locating a **figure** in a spatial scene. *Example:* in *Meagan ran into the cave,* the cave serves as the ground for locating the path of motion of Meagan. (§7.3.1, §14.5)

**group term** *(cxn):* a **mensural term** that selects an amount of a set of **referents** according to some delimiting function. *Example:* in *a herd of cattle,* *herd* is a group term. (§4.1.3)

**hanging topic phrase** *(cxn):* a phrase that expresses a **topic** that is not a **participant** in the **predicated event.** *Example:* in Mandarin Chinese *xiàng bizi cháng* [lit. elephant nose long] ‘Elephant’s noses are long/’Elephants have long noses’, *xiàng* ‘elephant’ is a topic but not a participant in the predicated event *cháng* ‘be long’. Hanging topics may use a **detached topic phrase** strategy. (§11.2.3)

have possession see **presentational possession**

**have possessive strategy** *(aka action strategy)* *(str):* a **strategy** for the **presentational possession construction** in which the **possessor** is expressed in a **subject phrase,** and the **possessum** in an **object phrase.** *Example:* English *Kerry has a laptop* is an instance of the have possessive strategy. (§10.4.2)

**head** *(cxn):* the most contentful word that most closely denotes the same function as the phrase (or clause) as a whole. *Example:* the head of the phrase *an ancient watch* is *watch.* (§2.2.1)

**headless** *(aka null anaphoric head)* *(str):* a **strategy** for the **anaphoric-head construction** in which there is no **overt** morpheme that functions as the **head.** *Example:* in *My bicycle is older than Greg’s,* the anaphoric-head construction *Greg’s* has no overt morpheme functioning as the head. (§5.4)

**hoping event** *(sem)/**predicate** *(cxn):* an **evaluative event** in which a positive evaluative judgement about a **proposition** expressed by the **complement** of the commentative event is made, and there is a **neutral epistemic stance** by the speaker towards the proposition; and the predicate expressing such an event. *Example:* in *Jill hopes that Joe won the election,* the commentative predicate *is glad* expresses Nancy’s evaluation of Joe’s winning the election, and also presupposes that the speaker does not know whether Joe has won the election. (§18.2.2)

hortative see **imperative/hortative**

**human** *(sem):* a semantic **category** of **objects** that denote persons. *Example:* *woman* denotes a human. (§3.1.2)
human propensity term (aka disposition) (cxn): a modifier expressing a concept of a type of behavior that a person has a propensity to exhibit. Examples: smart, rude, and nice are English human propensity terms. (§4.1.2)

hybrid information packaging (IP) strategy (str): a strategy found with nonprototypical construction types, such as complement constructions which express reference to actions. The hybrid IP strategy uses a mixture of the semantic IP strategy and the actual IP strategy. Example: in Her drinking coffee (surprises me), the English Gerund Construction combines the Possessive Pronoun her, characteristic of the prototypical object reference construction and hence an instance of the actual information packaging of her drinking coffee (reference), with the Object form coffee, characteristic of the prototypical action predication construction and hence an instance of the prototypical information packaging function of the semantics of the action being referred to, namely predication. (§2.4)

hypothetical (aka non-factive) (sem): a superordinate category covering any epistemic stance apart from positive epistemic stance, in particular neutral and negative epistemic stances. Examples: If she comes, I will come too (neutral epistemic stance) and If she had come, I would have come too (negative epistemic stance) are both instances of situations construed by the speaker as hypothetical. (§17.3.1)

hypotheticality see epistemic stance

identifiability, identity (inf): how identifiable a particular referent/token is to the speaker and hearer, based on the description of the referent/token provided by the referring phrase. Examples: felicitous use of the student or she requires that the identity of the referent is known to the speaker and hearer; if a student is used for a real world referent, then the identity of the referent is unknown to the hearer, and possibly also to the speaker; a student may also refer to a referent that is only type identifiable, hence its individual identity cannot be known to the speaker and hearer. (§3.2)

identificational (inf/cxn): information packaging in which a particular piece of information (the focus) is equated with the “open slot” in a presupposed open proposition; and the construction that expresses that information packaging. The presupposed open proposition may be evoked by an alternative proposition that differs from the identificational construction by only the focus. Example: in It was Ollie who was playing the piano, the information in the identificational construction is divided into the presupposed open proposition ‘X was playing the piano’, and the focused information Ollie, and what is being asserted is ‘X = Ollie’. The term ‘focus’ is sometimes used as a synonym for ‘identificational’, but this term is used differently here. (§10.1.2, §11.1, §11.4.1).

identity statements: a superordinate category sometimes used to cover both equational and presentational information packaging. (§10.1.2)

ideophones (aka mimetics) (str): a strategy in which a concept is expressed by a phonologically distinctive word, in which there is argued to be some sort of sound-symbolic relationship between the phonological form and their meaning. A common function for which ideophones are used is as the stative component of a stative complex predicate; they are probably next most commonly used as property predications or as property modifiers in referring phrases. Example: in Emai ó o hian oï dúdúdú ‘He cuts it [wood] energetically’, dúdúdú ‘energetically’ is an
ideophone that describes the manner of cutting using a reduplicated form; reduplication is a common characteristic of ideophones.  (§14.4)

**imperative/hortative** (*inf/cxn*): a speech act which requests that the action expressed in the propositional content of the imperative/hortative be carried out, prototypically by the addressee but possibly by other persons; and the construction that expresses this speech act. *Example:* Dance! is an example of the English imperative/hortative construction for the second person, and *Let’s dance!* is an example of the same for the first person plural. The term ‘hortative’ is sometimes used for a first person imperative/hortative, and ‘jussive’ for a third person imperative/hortative. A negative imperative/hortative is a prohibitive. (§12.1, §12.4)

in focus see active (referent)

inactive (aka noncontaining inferrable) (*inf*): a referent where the speaker and hearer have a discourse file for the referent (also described as: the referent is in the speaker’s long-term memory) but generally has not been activated in the discourse, at least not recently. (§3.3.1)

inactive category (aka static, patientive, undergoer) (*str*): the category in the active alignment system that co-expresses some S roles—in particular, the S role of ‘die’—and the P role. *Example:* in Lakhota, the index *ma-‘I/me’ in ó-ma-ya-kiye* ‘you help/helped me’ and *ma-khuže ‘I am sick’ expresses the inactive category. (§6.3.3)

inalienable possession (*cxn*): a possessive modification construction that always includes either body part relations or kinship relations (but not necessarily both), and contrasts in the language with an alienable possession construction. (§4.1.4, §5.2.3).

inanimate (*sem*): a semantic category of objects that denotes inanimate entities.

*Example:* rock denotes an inanimate entity. (§3.1.2)

inclusive disjunctive coordination (*cxn*): a type of disjunctive coordination in which any entity enumerated or any combination of the entities enumerated is intended. The simplest case is coordination of two entities where one, the other or both are intended. *Example:* Applicants must be a college graduate or have fluency in German is an example of inclusive disjunctive coordination under the assumption that being both a college graduate and fluent in German does not disqualify you from applying. Inclusive disjunctive coordination can be an instance of non-exhaustive list coordination. (§15.2.1)

inclusive focus operator see additive focus operator

inclusive pronoun (*cxn*): a first person pronoun that refers to a group including both speaker and addressee. *Example:* Kosraean *kat* is a first person inclusive pronoun referring to a group that includes both the speaker and the addressee. (§3.1.1)

inclusory construction (*cxn*): a construction in which there is reference to a first or second person participant, and additional third person participants. More specifically, attention is focused on the inclusory construction strategy in which an index encodes nonsingular first (or second) person, and the additional participants are expressed in an accompanying referring phrase. *Example:* In Toqabaqita *dogora-mu mere ngata* ‘Your brother and I spoke (to each other)’, first person ‘I’ is expressed only in the auxiliary form *mere ‘1st person dual exclusive nonfuture’;* the referring phrase *dogora-mu* refers only to ‘your brother’. (§4.4.4)
incorporation *(aka morphological boundness)* of serial verbs *(str)*: alternative strategies found with serial verb and auxiliary constructions, whether they form a single word or not. Example: in Alamblak *yênt mi-ak-tita-r-t* ‘He carried the girl down there on his shoulders’, the verbs *ak* ‘get’ and *tita* ‘carry on shoulders’ form a single word. Noun incorporation refers to a strategy found in other constructions. (§13.2, §13.3.2)

indefinite pronoun/article *(cxn)*: this term is applied to referring phrases—prouns and articles combined with nouns—that are associated with the bottom end of the information status continuum, where the identity of the referent is not known to speaker or hearer (or both). This includes pragmatically specific, pragmatically nonspecific (but semantically specific) and various categories of nonspecific referents (see Table 3.4 and §3.4-§3.5). Example: a glass bowl is an example of an indefinite referring phrase, used in a context where the individual glass bowl in question is not identifiable by the hearer (Table 3.4, §3.3.1)

independent referring phrase strategy *(str)*: a strategy for the presentational construction in which the referring phrase introducing the referent in the discourse is the only element in the construction. Example: in spoken English, the independent referring strategy is used, for example, in the Pear Stories narrative example *and then a little boy, /about/ a bic a red bicycle, that was too big for him, he stopped,..., a little boy* is an independent referring phrase that is used to present a new referent in the discourse. (§10.4.3)

independent strategy *(str)*: the strategy for comparative (and possibly equative) constructions which directly expresses two of the propositions that form the meaning of the comparative: that the gradable predicative scale applies to the comparee and that the scale applies to the standard. That is to say, the independent strategy recruits a different subject, simultaneous temporal complex sentence construction (usually a coordinate clause construction) to express comparison. The conjoined comparative and particle strategies are examples of the independent strategy. (§17.2.3)

independent time reference *(sem)*: in a complement clause construction, this is the semantic property that the time reference of the complement event is not determined by the time reference of the matrix clause event. Example: in Sally thinks John made/is making/will make the cake, the time reference of John’s making the cake is independent of the time reference of Sally’s thought. (§18.2.2)

index *(str)*: the third morpheme in an indexical strategy which refers to (indexes) the referent. Example: in Spanish *las chicas cantaban* ‘the girls were singing’, the 3rd person plural suffix *-an* on the imperfective form of ‘sing’ is the index, referring to the same referent as *las chicas* ‘the girls’. (§4.4)

indexation feature *(aka agreement feature)* *(str)*: in a construction using the indexation strategy, the categories of the referent that the index expresses. Typical categories are person, gender/class and number. Example: in Spanish *los libros roj-os* ‘the red books’, the suffix *-os* on the modifier *rojos* ‘red’ indexes the plural number and masculine gender of *libros* ‘books’. (§4.4)

indexation see indexical strategy
indexed (str): a strategy in which the stative predicate in a stative complex predicate construction indexes an argument of the other (dynamic) predicate in the construction. (§14.2)

indexical strategy, indexation (aka agreement) (str): a strategy for encoding the relation in major propositional acts (modifier-referent, predicate-argument), in which there is a third morpheme that refers to the referent. The third morpheme is called an index. Example: Spanish las chicas cantaban ‘the girls were singing’ uses indexation to express the relation between the singing and the singers (the girls), with the 3rd person plural suffix -an. Indexation usually expresses the categories of person, number and/or gender. Since personal pronouns usually express only those categories, personal pronouns are arguably also indexes. Often the referent/argument is left unexpressed when the indexical strategy is employed; hence the referent/argument is expressed only by the index. Indexical strategies include person indexation, nonperson indexation, and classifiers. (§3.3.2, §4.4, §6.2.2)

indirect causation (sem): a causative event in which one agent (the causer) gets the other agent (the causee) to do something but doesn’t participate in the carrying out of the action. Example: I had the students fill out the questionnaire is an instance of indirect causation. (§9.2)

indirect negation referent (inf)/pronoun (cxn): an unspecified referent which is in a clause embedded in a negated clause. Example: in I don’t think that anybody has seen it, anybody is an indirect negation pronoun expressing a referent that is found only in the negated “world” of the speaker’s beliefs. (§3.5)

indirect object category (str): the morphosyntactic category in the indirective alignment system that exclusively expresses the R role. Example: in Randy gave the car to his daughter, the to case marker exclusively expresses the R role. §7.5.2

indirect report (str): a strategy for the complement of an utterance event in which only the content of an utterance is expressed. Example: in Sandy said that she was buying the house, only the content of Sandy’s utterance is reported (contrast with the direct report strategy in Sandy said, “I’m buying the house”). (§18.2.2)

indirective alignment system (str): a system in which the P and T roles are expressed with the same form, but the R role is expressed with a different form. Example: in Randy gave the car to his daughter, the T role (the car) is expressed in the same way as the P role in Randy started the car and the R role is expressed distinctly, with the case marker to. (§7.5.2)

individual (aka instance, token) (sem): a particular entity with its own identity. Examples: a particular person such as Charlie Chaplin, or a specific table, are individuals. (§3.1.1)

inferrable (aka containing inferrable) (inf): a referent whose identity can be inferred via the type described by the referring phrase. Example: in the bowl of noodles on the kitchen counter, the identity of the referent can be inferred from the type description (is a bowl, contains noodles, is on the kitchen counter) even if the referent has not previously been mentioned. Inferrable referents are very similar to inactive referents (which are sometimes called noncontaining inferrables) and may not be clearly distinguishable from them. (§3.3.1)

infinitive see deranked
information (question) response \((inf/cxn)\): the answer to an information question, and the construction that expresses that answer. Example: the answer to the English information question *Who is coming?* could be *Sandra is coming*, *Sandra is*, or just *Sandra*. (§12.3.3)

information content see meaning (§1.3)

information gap \((inf)\): a discourse context which favors an identificational construal. An information gap is a proposition in the discourse context with a “missing” piece of information. Example: in *So I learned to sew books. They’re really good books. It’s just the covers that are rotten*, asserting that the books are really good evokes an information gap in that something is not good/rotten, since the books need repairing. The proposition with the information gap is the presupposed open proposition. (§11.4.1)

information packaging \((aka\ information\ structure,\ discourse\ function)\): the way that the meaning or semantic content is “packaged” for communication in discourse. Example: the property concept *huge* can be presented or packaged as a predication asserted of an object (*That tree is huge!*), or it can be used to modify or add information about an object (*that huge three over there*). (§1.1, 1.3)

information question \((aka\ content\ question,\ WH\ question)\ \((inf/cxn)\): an interrogative in which the unknown piece of the propositional content requested of the addressee is a semantic component of the proposition other than its polarity; and the construction expressing this function. Example: *Who is coming?* is an instance of the English information question construction, expecting an answer identifying the person(s) who is/are coming. Information questions, unlike polarity questions, contain an interrogative pronoun. (§12.3.1)

information status \((inf)\): the information status of a referent in discourse is a characterization of how the interlocutors identify an individual as the intended referent of a referring phrase. Information status represents a subdivision of the information packaging function of reference: a more fine-grained means to pick out the referent. Examples: some examples of information status categories are active, semi-active, inactive, and other categories listed in the third column of Table 3.4. (§3.2)

information structure see information packaging

ingestion event \((sem)\)/verb \((cxn)\): an event which describes the ingestion of food or drink by a person or animal, causing the food to disappear but also causing a change in the physiological state of the person/animal; and a verb that expresses such an event. Example: *Elena at a lot of veggie chips* is an instance of an ingestion event, and *eat* is an ingestion verb. (§7.4)

initiator \((sem)\): a participant role defined in terms of the participant acting on another participant in a causal chain. Example: in *The cats scratched the furniture*, the cats are the initiator of the causal chain cats \(\rightarrow\) furniture. (§6.1.1, §6.1.2)

instance see individual

instrument \((sem)\): a semantic role including participant roles for a participant that is manipulated by the agent to bring about an event. Example: in *Jack broke the window with a rock*, the agent (Jack) manipulates the rock to bring about the breaking of the window. (§6.1.2, §6.2.1)
insubordination \((str)\): the recruitment of deranked clause constructions to express a nondeclarative main clause function. Example: No smoking recruits the English Gerund Verb form in -ing in order to express an imperative. (§15.2.3)

intensifier \((sem)\): indicates a higher than normal value on a property scale. Example: in very long, very indicates a value longer than normal. (§4.1.2)

interaction event \((sem)/verb\) \((cxn)\): a event in which one participant acts on a second participant, but the change that occurs to the second participant is at least partly independent of the force transmitted by the first participant. Examples: interaction events include pursuit events, events involving two agents such as ordering someone (to do something) or supervising someone, and events involving an agent and a event, state, social institution and so on such as managing a budget, avoiding situations, or conforming to institutional standards. (§7.3)

interlinear morpheme translation \((IMT)\): a widely used method to describe the morphosyntactic structure of a language by providing a morpheme-by-morpheme translation of the object language, including abbreviations for morphemes expressing “grammatical” functions, and including notation of the morpheme type (affix, clitic, reduplication etc.). (§1.6)

internal possessor strategy \((str)\): a strategy in which an object in an ownership, body part, kinship etc. relation—that is, a relation typically expressed in a possessive modification construction—to a participant in an event (normally in the \(P\) role or sometimes the \(S\) role of the event), is expressed with a possessive modification construction, even if the object in that relation is also itself a participant in the event. Example: in Mokilese ngoah insigeh-di kijinlikkoan-oaw nih-mw ‘I wrote a letter to/for you’, nih-mw [CLF-2SG.POSS] ‘your’ is a possessive modifier of kijinlikkoan-oaw ‘a letter’, even though the addressee is also a central participant in the transfer event. This Mokilese example is also an instance of the internal recipient strategy, but the internal possessor strategy also includes the expression of objects in an ownership etc. relation that are not (necessarily) also participants in the event. The adnominal possessive strategy is also an instance of the internal possessor strategy. (§7.5.3)

internal recipient strategy \((str)\): a strategy for the ditransitive construction in which the \(T\) role and \(R\) role are co-expressed with the possessive modification construction, so that the noun denoting the participant in the \(T\) role is the head and the noun denoting the participant in the \(R\) role is the possessive modifier. Example: in Mokilese ngoah insigeh-di kijinlikkoan-oaw nih-mw ‘I wrote a letter to/for you’, nih-mw [CLF-2SG.POSS] ‘your’ is a possessive modifier of kijinlikkoan-oaw ‘a letter’. The internal recipient startegy is an instance of the internal possessor strategy. (§7.5.3)

internally headed strategy \((str)\): a strategy for the expression of the necessarily shared participant in the relative clause construction, in which the relative clause head denoting the shared participant is expressed only inside the relative clause. Example: in Imbabura Quechua [kan kwitsaman kwintuta villashka]-ka ali kwitsami ‘The girl to whom you told the story is a good girl’, the relative clause kan kwitsaman kwintuta villashka ‘you told the story to the girl’ contains the relative clause head kwitsaman ‘(to) the girl’, and the girl is not expressed in the matrix clause ... ali kwitsami ‘...is a good girl’. The internally headed relative clause as a whole functions as an argument of the matrix clause predicate and may be recruited from the complement
clause construction. The internally headed strategy is rare but fairly widely dispersed among the languages of the world. (§19.2.3)

**interrogative (aka question)** (inf/cxn): a speech act which requests information, usually of the addressee, regarding uncertain or unknown information that is part of the propositional content of the question; and the construction that expresses this speech act. Interrogatives are divided into polarity questions, information questions, and alternative questions. (§12.1, §12.3)

**interrogative complement (cxn):** a complement that expresses a proposition which contains information that is unknown. Interrogative complements commonly occur in certain types of propositional attitude complement clause constructions. Examples: in *I wonder who is going to the party* or *John wondered whether he would go to the party* and whether he would go to the party are interrogative complements. Interrogative complements are often found in the objective construal of epistemic modality. (§12.3.4, §18.3.1)

**interrogative pronoun (cxn):** pronoun that is used to ask an addressee about the identity of a referent whose identity is unknown to the speaker. Example: in *Who ate my cookie?*, *Who* is an interrogative pronoun; the identity of the cookie eater is unknown to the speaker, who is asking the hearer to provide the referent’s identity. The interrogative form may also be a modifier rather than a pronoun: in *Which book is required reading?*, *which* is an interrogative modifier denoting the missing information about the book that is required reading. (§3.4.2, §12.3.1)

**interruption (inf):** a discourse context which tends to favor a thetic construal. Something in the ambient environment of the discourse becomes salient enough to interrupt the conversational interaction. Example: *The PHONE’s ringing!* in response to that event in the context. (§11.3.1)

**intransitive construction (cxn):** the construction, or possibly set of constructions, used to express monovalent events with their single salient argument, in the S role. Example: *The boys walked* is an example of an English intransitive construction. Unlike the transitive construction and the ditransitive construction, there is no clear exemplar event for defining intransitive constructions, thanks to the existence of active alignment. (§6.1.2, §6.3.3)

**intransitive predication (inf):** a predication predicated of one salient argument. Example: in *Sarah is swimming*, swimming is an intransitive predication because it is predicated of one arguments, Sarah. (§6.1.2)

**intransitive recruitment (str):** the strategy of recruiting the intransitive construction to use as a reflexive construction or a reciprocal construction. Examples: in *Sam shaved* and *Mary and Sue met*, the English Intransitive Construction is recruited to express a reflexive event and a reciprocal event respectively. (§7.2)

**introverted event (sem)/verb (cxn):** an event typically performed on oneself or by oneself but could be performed on someone else; and a verb expressing such an event. Examples: shaving oneself vs. someone else, laying down vs. laying someone else down, or quarreling (with each other) are instances of introverted events, and *shave, lay (down)* and *quarrel* are introverted verbs. (§7.2)

**irrealis referent (inf)/pronoun (cxn):** a referent which is in the “world” or mental space representing a person’s desire, wish, command etc. Example: in *Visit me*
sometime, sometime is an irrealis pronoun expressing an irrealis referent, a time only found in the hoped-for mental space of the speaker’s offer. (§3.5)

jussive see imperative/hortative

juxtaposition (str): a strategy for encoding the relation in major propositional acts (modifier-referent, predicate-argument), in which the two elements are simply syntactically juxtaposed without any additional morpheme expressing the propositional act relation. Example: in red ball, the adjective red is simply juxtaposed to the noun ball to indicate that the referent of ball is modified by the property denoted by red. (§4.2)

killing/injuring event (sem)/verb (cxn): an event describing the injuring of an individual, including to the point that the individual dies; and the verb expressing such an event. Example: stabbing is a killing/injuring event, and stab is a killing/injuring verb. (§7.3.2)

kinship relation (sem): a relation that holds between a person and certain other persons by biological relations or social relations such as marriage and other socially-defined kin relations. Example: my mother is an instance of a possession construction expressing a kinship relation. (§4.1.4)

knowledge event (sem)/predicate (cxn): a propositional attitude event in which a positive epistemic stance towards the relevant proposition expressed is presupposed to be taken by the speaker; and the predicate expressing such an event. Example: in Sally knows that Donald won the election, Sally’s belief with respect to the proposition that Donald won the election is reported by the speaker; and in addition, a positive epistemic stance is taken by the speaker towards that proposition (i.e., the speaker believes that Donald indeed won the election). (§18.2.2)

labile (aka ambitransitive, lexical causative) (str): a strategy in which the verb expressing a noncausal event and the verb expressing its counterpart causal event are identical. Example: in English, the same verb break is used for the causal event I broke the vase and the noncausal event The vase broke. (§6.3.4)

less affected P (LAP) (sem): a function related to the function of the antipassive construction, in which the P participant is less affected than it is in the equivalent event expressed by transitive construction. Example: in The coyote chewed on the deer bone, the deer bone is a less affected P participant than in the transitive The coyote chewed the deer bone. (§8.4)

less individuated P (LIP) (sem): the basic function of the antipassive construction, in which the P participant is less individuated (indefinite, nonspecific, generic, or even simply plural), since less individuation is an indicator of lower salience. Example: in West Greenlandic inun-nik tuqut-si-vuq ‘He killed people’, the P participant ‘people’ is a plural and generic referent. (§8.4)

let alone construction (cxn): a negative sentence that expresses two propositions at different degrees of “strength” in a scalar model; the speaker asserts the most informative of the two propositions, although the less information proposition is sufficient in the communicative context. Example: in response to the question Did the kids get their breakfast on time this morning?, the sentence I barely got up in time to EAT LUNCH, let alone COOK BREAKFAST is an instance of the let alone construction: not getting up in time to cook breakfast would answer the question, but not getting up in
time to eat lunch is still more informative (indicating just how long the speaker remained in bed). (§17.4.2)

lexical causative see labile

lexicalize, lexicalization: the diachronic process by which a complex morphosyntactic structure develops an idiosyncratic meaning, and so comes to form one unit in the sense of a pairing of a form and a unitary, unanalyzable meaning. Example: the English phrase jack-in-the-pulpit has lexicalized to denote a particular species of plant. There is usually an earlier stage where the elements of the complex predicate have an identifiable meaning even if the meaning of the whole is idiosyncratic. For example red-winged blackbird describes a specific species of bird, but the phrase is partially analyzable in that the bird is mostly black but has a patch of red on its wings. A lexicalized structure may come to be fixed in the order of its elements, and altered or reduced in form, for example the farewell goodbye which originated in the phrase God be with ye (and has now been further reduced to bye). (§13.1.2, §13.4)

light verb see support verb

linguistic typology see typology

link (inf): a concept expressed in a sentence that is linked to a trigger concept previously evoked, and forms a poset with the trigger (and other potentially evoked concepts). Example: in the exchange Do you like this album? Yeah, this song I really like, the song mentioned in the second turn serves as the link to the album which is the trigger mentioned in the first turn. (§11.2.3)

linker (str): a more highly grammaticalized strategy for encoding the relation in major propositional acts (modifier-referent, predicate-argument), in which there is an invariant third morpheme that signals the relationship between two elements. Example: in English Jerry’s bicycle, the invariant genitive form -’s is a linker. (§4.5)

listing contrast (inf): a subtype of parallel contrast in which the two propositions are identical except for the contrasting parts, and the contrasting parts are construed as belonging in a set relationship, that is, they are members of a poset. Example: in He brought back all the goods, and he also brought back his kinsman Lot and his goods, the second clause is identical except for the members of the poset {all the goods, his kinsman Lot and his goods}. (§11.4.1)

location (sem): the combination of the path and the ground in a spatial figure-ground (locative) relation. Example: in The book is on the table, the location is on the table, that is, the spatial location of the figure (the book) as defined by the path relating the location of the figure to the location of the ground. (§10.4.1)

location strategy see locational possessive strategy

locational (aka verbal copula) strategy (str): the strategy of recruiting what was originally a locative predication construction for other predication constructions, both prototypical and nonprototypical predication constructions. An originally locative predication construction employs a location predicate, typically a body position verb. Example: Amele uqa me bil-i-a [he good sit-3SG-PRS] ‘He is good’ recruits the locative predication construction with the posture verb ‘sit’ for property predication. (§10.2)

locational possessive strategy (aka location strategy, goal strategy) (str): a strategy for the presentational possession construction in which the possessum is expressed in a subject phrase and the possessor in an oblique phrase which is locative or
(probably) locative in origin. *Example:* Russian *u menja mašina* [at me car] ‘I have a car’ is an instance of the locational possessive strategy. The locational possessive strategy essentially **recruits a locative clause**, in particular a **presentational locative**, to express possession. (§10.4.2)

**location clause (cxn):** clauses in which a locative relation is expressed, either **predicationally** or **presentationally**. These two types of locative clauses are **locative predication** and **presentational locative** respectively. (§10.4.1)

**locative comparative (str):** a fixed-case strategy in comparative constructions in which there is a **clause** which attributes a **gradable predicative scale** to the **comparee**, and the **standard** is expressed as an oblique argument phrase with a spatial case marker with a locative (‘on, at’) meaning. *Example:* Ubykh *yi-gune wo-gune-n ca-qasaqa-j* ‘This tree is taller than that tree’ is an instance of the locative comparative: *yi-gune ca-qasaqa-j* asserts that this tree is bigger, and *wo-gune-n* expresses the standard, that tree, with a suffix -n meaning ‘on’. (§17.2.2)

**locative modification construction (cxn):** a referring phrase that expresses a **figure-ground spatial relation** between the ground **object** functioning as the modified **modifier** and the figure functioning as the modified **referent**. *Example:* the bicycle in the garage is a locative modification construction. (§4.1.4)

**locative predication** see **predicational locative**

**locative relation** see **figure-ground spatial relation**

locative stative see **body position**

**locus of inflection of serial verbs (str):** alternative **strategies** found with **serial verb** and **auxiliary constructions**, based on where the verbal inflections are located. There are several possibilities, including: inflection on the first **verb** (or inflection on the **auxiliary**); inflection on the last verb (or inflection on the main verb in an auxiliary construction); same inflection on both/all verbs/auxiliaries; inflection split across the two verbs (or verb and auxiliary); or separate inflection (the last relevant to **basic eventive complex predicates** only). (§13.2, §13.3.2)

**logophoric construction (cxn):** the construction in a logophoric system for complement clause constructions which is used when a **participant** in the **complement event** is coreferential with the **speaker**, **addressee** or **experiencer** of a utterance, **propositional attitude**, **knowledge** or **commentative event** (the logophoric construction). *Example:* Donno Sɔ Oumar Anta inyemeñ waa be gi ‘Oumar, said that Anta had seen him,’ is an instance of the logophoric construction: the reference to Oumar in the complement clause uses a special **pronoun** form *inyemeñ*. (§18.4.2)

**logophoric system (str):** a **system** found with certain **complement clause constructions** where one **strategy** is used when a **participant** in the **complement event** is coreferential with the **speaker**, **addressee** or **experiencer** of a utterance, **propositional attitude**, **knowledge** or **commentative event** (the logophoric construction) and a different strategy is used when there is no such coreference relation. *Example:* in Donno Sɔ Oumar Anta inyemeñ waa be gi ‘Oumar, said that Anta had seen him,’ the reference to Oumar in the complement clause uses a special **pronoun** form *inyemeñ*, but in *Oumar Anta woñ waa be gi* ‘Oumar, said that Anta had seen him,’ the referent in the complement is not Oumar, and so the ordinary **third person anaphoric pronoun** woñ is used. (§18.4.2)
long-distance reflexive (str): a strategy in which a reflexive pronoun is used where the referring phrase denoting the referent with which the reflexive pronoun is coreferential does not occur in the same clause (more or less; the precise definition of ‘local’ uses of the reflexive pronoun varies). In particular, in the context of this textbook, a reflexive pronoun is used in a logophoric construction. Example: in Japanese Takasi wa Taroo ni Yosiko ga zibun o nikundeiru koto o hanasita ‘Takasi told Taroo that Yosiko hated him’, the reflexive pronoun zibun in the utterance complement Yosiko ga zibun o nikundeiru koto o is coreferential with the speaker participant Takasi in the matrix clause. It appears that use of a long-distance reflexive in a logophoric construction is part of a larger range of uses of long-distance reflexives, and may not represent a true logophoric system. (§18.4.2)

main clause (cxn): a clause that is pragmatically asserted, typically in the context of identifying the pragmatically asserted clause in a complex sentence construction. Example: in Jerry played the guitar while Phil played the bass, the clause Jerry played the guitar is the main clause, whereas while Phil played the bass is a subordinate clause. Main clauses are generally matrix clauses, but matrix clauses need not be main clauses, and dependent clauses may be pragmatically asserted, i.e. function as main clause. (§15.1.2)

maintain position see body position

major propositional act see propositional act

major propositional act see propositional act

maleficiary (sem): a semantic role including participant roles for a participant that is negatively affected by the outcome of the event. Example: in My car broke down on me, I am a maleficiary: I am negatively affected by the outcome of the event. (§6.1.2)

manipulative event (sem)/predicate (cxn): an event where an agent acts to bring about the event expressed by the complement; and the predicate expressing such an event. Example: in Bruce convinced Greg to take him to San Rafael, convinced denotes a manipulative event. Manipulative events include causative and permissive events, and manipulative complement clause constructions overlap with causative constructions. The complement event of manipulative events has dependent time reference. (§18.2.2)

manner adverb see manner complex predicate

manner complex predicate (aka manner adverb, manner) (cxn): a stative complex predicate in which the stative component of the complex predicate describes a state that holds of the event denoted by the main predicate. Hence the state holds at the same time as the event. Manner complex predicates are event-oriented. Example: in English We crawled down the slope slowly, crawl...slowly is a manner complex predicate, and slowly describes a property of the crawling event. (§14.1)

manner event (sem)/verb (cxn): an event that is described in terms of the manner by which the process progresses (or is brought about by an external cause). Example: in She smeared jam on the toast, the event is described in terms of the manner by which the jam is applied to the toast. (§7.3.2)

manner of motion event (sem)/verb (cxn): an event that describes motion of a figure in terms of how the figure travels; and the verb expressing such an event. Example: in Sam strode into the room, stride is a manner of motion verb expressing a manner of motion event. (§7.3.1, §14.2)
masdars see deranked

**material term** (aka substance term) (cxn): a modifier expressing a concept describing the material or substance out of which an object is made. *Example: wood(en) and metal* are English material terms. (§4.1.2)

**matrix clause** (cxn): the clause in a complex sentence construction that also contains a dependent clause; the dependent clause is a dependent of the matrix clause. *Example: in She watered the plants before she ate lunch, She watered the plants* is an instance of a matrix clause; *before she ate lunch* is a dependent clause. A matrix clause is often, but not always a main clause; it may be a subordinate clause that is itself dependent on another matrix clause.

**meaning** (aka semantic content, information content): the information content that is conventionally conveyed by a construction. *Example: a word such as square has the meaning of a particular shape.* (§1.1)

**means** (aka positive circumstantial) (sem): the semantic relation between two events where one event accompanies the other event and further characterizes the other event in some way. *Example: He got into the army by lying about his age is a figure-ground construal of the simultaneous relation in an adverbial clause construction, and He lied about his age and got into the army is a complex figure construal of the relation in a coordinate clause construction. In the figure-ground construal, the accompanying event is construed as the ground.* (§15.3.1)

**measure term** (cxn): a mensural term that selects a measured amount of an uncountable referent. *Example: in six gallons of wine, gallon(s) is a measure term.* (§4.1.3)

**measurement** (cxn): indicates a calibratable value on a property scale. *Example: in three feet long, three feet measures the value of length for the object in question.* (§4.1.2)

**medial verb construction** see coordinate clause construction

**mensural classifier** (str): a strategy used for the mensural construction that is morphosyntactically similar to the (sortal) classifier strategy used in the language. *Example: in Cantonese léuhng wún faahn ‘two bowls of rice’, wún ‘bowl’ is a mensural classifier that recruits the same construction used for sortal classifiers in the language.* (§5.2.2).

**mensural construction** (cxn): a non-anchoring construction that has a mensural term as the object modifier and a (semantic) head referent that is only type identifiable. *Example: a piece of cake* is a mensural construction in that the object modifier denotes only the type ‘cake’. Two strategies for mensural constructions are mensural classifiers and the pseudo-partitive. (§5.2.2)

**mensural term** (cxn): a term that measures out a quantity or unit of a referent. Mensural terms are classified in different ways; this textbook divides measure terms into measure terms, container terms, form terms, group terms, piece terms, and species terms. (§4.1.3)

**mental space** (sem): a context of belief, desire, or another mental state of a person which includes propositions that are taken to be true in that context, and entities that are taken to exist in that context. *Example: in Harry thinks that a mountain lion is in the pine tree, the proposition that there is a mountain lion in the pine tree, and the
existence of that particular mountain lion, is in the mental space of Harry’s beliefs. (§17.3.1, §18.2.2)

**merged argument structure strategy (str):** a strategy found in complement clause constructions in which there is a single argument structure construction associated with the combination of the complement-taking predicate and the complement predicate. Example: French *J’ai fait manger le pain par le chat* ‘I made the cat eat the bread’ has a single argument structure for the participants of the combined event of ‘making eat’: the *causer J* ‘I’ is the Subject, the *causee/agent par le chat* ‘(by) the cat’ is an Oblique, and the *patient of the eating event le pain* ‘the bread’ is the Object. A merged argument structure strategy is essentially a simple argument structure construction that is found with a biclausal complement clause construction, **balanced** or **deranked**. (§18.4.1)

**metalanguage:** the language used for the free translation of an object language example. The free translation is intended to express the meaning of the object language example. However, in the absence of a theoretical language to describe the components of sentence meaning, linguists use another language, the language of the text (in our case, English), as the metalanguage. (§1.6)

**microrole see participant role**

**middle voice (str):** a strategy for the intransitive construction that recruits a reflexive or reciprocal construction, for the expression of a subset of monovalent events. Example: Classical Greek *pete-sthai* ‘fly’ is an example of a middle voice form, using the suffix -*sthai*. The middle voice construction may be a more grammaticalized form of the original construction. (§7.2)

**mimetics see ideophones**

**mirative (sem):** a speaker attitude of surprise towards the propositional content in the speaker’s utterance. Example: Lhasa Tibetan has a distinct construction for expressing the mirative function with the form ‘*dug nga-rdngul tog=tsam ’dug* ‘I have some money’ expresses not only that the speaker has money, but that she is surprised to find this out. (§12.1, §12.5.2)

**modality (sem):** a category that represents a situation in terms of its reality status with respect to the speaker or another conceiver, including degree of certainty that the situation holds in reality (epistemic modality) and (un)desirability or intention to bring about a not currently true situation (deontic modality). (§12.1)

**modification (inf):** provides additional information about the referent and enriches the specification of the referent for the hearer. Example: in *a furry cat*, the speaker enriches the specification of the referent in the cat category by the property of being furry. In the file metaphor for describing propositional acts, modification enriches the discourse file; the information it adds to the discourse file is secondary in comparison to predication. (§1.3, §2.1)

**modification construction (aka referent modification construction) (cxn):** a construction that consists of the referent expression and an attributive phrase (or phrases) that are dependent on that referent expression. Example: the referring phrase *my mother’s book* is an instance of an English modification construction made up of the referent expression (*book*) plus the Possessive attributive phrase *my mother’s*. (§2.2.4, chapters 4-5).
modification-predication continuum: a continuum of information packaging functions from prototypical modification, that is, restrictive modification, to prototypical predication. The intermediate functions in this continuum are identified as (roughly from most modifier-like to most predicate-like) appositive, complementative, depictive, resultative and manner. (§14.3)

modification-reference continuum: a continuum of modification from anchoring nominal modifier constructions, to non-anchoring nominal modifier constructions, to property modification and selecting modification, to a unitary referent expression (such as a binominal lexeme) formed etymologically from distinct modifying and referring concepts. (§5.2.4)

modifier (cxn): the head of an attributive phrase. Example: in nearly fifty trees, fifty is a modifier. A prototypical modifier, a property concept, is an adjective. (§2.2.4)

monoclausal applicative strategy (aka simple predicate applicative strategy) (str): a strategy for the applicative construction in which the event including the participant expressed as the applicative object is expressed in a single clause with a simple predicate (not a complex predicate). Example: Nomatsiguenga na-manantë-ne-ro kayeta [I-buy-BEN.APPL.-her cracker] ‘I bought crackers for her’ is an example of the monoclausal/simple predicate applicative strategy, with a single verb na-manantë-ne-ro. (§9.3)

monoclausal causative strategy (aka simple predicate causative strategy, morphological causative) (str): a strategy for the causative construction in which the causative event is expressed in a single clause with a simple predicate (not a complex predicate). Example: in Hungarian Köhögtettem a gyerek-et ‘I made the boy cough’ is an instance of the monoclausal causative strategy; there is only a single verb köhögtettem [cough:CAUS:1SG.PST] ‘made cough’. (§9.2)

monoclausal transitive reciprocal strategy (str): the strategy of recruiting the transitive construction to use as a reciprocal construction but with only one ‘direction’ of the reciprocal event directly expressed. Example: the Tonga sentence Joni ba-la-yand-ana amukaintu wakwe ‘John and his wife love each other’ is literally ‘John mutually-loves his wife’, with amukaintu wakwe ‘his wife’ as Direct Object and also an overt Reciprocal suffix -ana on the verb. (§7.2)

monosyndetic (str): a strategy used in syndetic coordination where there are fewer coordinands than coordinants. Example: the simplest example, which gives rise to the term, is one coordinator in a construction with two or more coordinands, as in Iraqw and English or Jerry, Bobby and Phil. The term has been extended to coordination with multiple coordinands and one less coordinator than coordinand, as in Iraqw Kwermuhl nee Tlawi nee Dongobesh nee Haydom nee Daudi ‘Kwermuhl, Tlawi, Dongobesh, Haydom and Daudi [place names]’. (§15.2.2)

monotransitive construction see transitive construction

monovalent event (sem): an event with a valency of one, that is, with one central participant role. Example: sleeping is a monovalent event. (§6.1.2)

morphological causative see monoclausal causative strategy

morphology: the analysis of the internal structure of words. Example: in walk-ed, the word has been analyzed into the verb root walk and the past tense suffix -ed. (§1.1)

morphosyntax: the analysis of the internal structure of utterances, both above the word level and below it. Example: three tree-s is analyzed as the numeral modifier three
combined with the head tree-s, which is made of the root tree and the plural suffix -s. (§1.1)

**motion event (sem)/verb (cxn):** a monovalent event involving motion of an participant from one place to another (translational motion); and the verb expressing that event. *Examples:* fly and go express motion events. Motion events contrast with bodily motion events: motion events involve movement from one location to another, whereas bodily motion events involve internal motion of a body part. Motion events may express path of motion or manner of motion, or both. Motion events may be divided into departure, passing and arrival phases of the path of motion. (§7.2, §7.3.1, §14.4)

**necessary participant sharing (sem):** in a complement clause construction, this is the semantic property that the meaning of the complement-taking predicate requires that one or more participants of the complement event is shared with the event denoted by the complement-taking predicate. *Example:* in I told Fred to bring me a screwdriver, the agent of the complement bringing event is necessarily also the causee of the manipulative event of telling. (§18.2.2)

**negation construction (cxn):** a construction that expresses negative polarity. Negation constructions include declarative negation, existential negation, and the prohibitive. (§12.2, §12.4.1)

**negative (polarity) (sem):** indicates that the situation expressed in the utterance is false. *Example:* Kit didn’t find his glasses expresses that Kit finding his glasses is false. This is the prototypical use of negative polarity. Negative polarity may be used to reject other aspects of the construal of the situation expressed in the utterance, as in Kit didn’t like the movie—he loved it! (where the degree expressed by like is the information rejected). (§12.1)

**negative circumstantial (sem):** the semantic relation between two events where one event does not accompany the other event and further characterizes the other event in some way. In this respect, the negative circumstantial relation is a “negative” version of the means or positive circumstantial relation. *Example:* She carried the punch into the living room without spilling a drop is a figure-ground construal of the negative circumstantial relation in an adverbial clause construction, and She carried the punch into the living room, and she didn’t spill a drop! is a complex figure construal of the relation in a coordinate clause construction. In the figure-ground construal, the non-accompanying event is construed as the ground. (§15.3.1)

**negative epistemic stance (sem):** a negative commitment on the part of the speaker to the actuality of a proposition expressed in a clause. *Example:* in If you had pressed this button, the door would have opened, the speaker has expressed a commitment to the proposition that you didn’t press the button. (§17.3.1)

**neutral alignment system (str):** a system in which all three of the A, P and S roles are expressed with the same form. *Example:* English argument phrases use the same (zero) case marker for A, P and S roles: Jack [A] broke the window [P] and Jack [S] died. (§6.3.1)

**neutral ditransitive alignment system (aka double object) (str):** a system in which all three of the P, T and R roles are expressed with the same form. *Example:* The English Double Object Construction, as in Carol sent the landlord the check, expresses the T and R roles (the check and the landlord respectively) in the same way
as the P role in *Carol wrote the check*, namely as postverbal **argument phrases** without a **case marker**. (§7.5.2)

**neutral epistemic stance** (**sem**): no commitment on the part of the speaker to the actuality of a **proposition** expressed in a **clause**. Example: in *If you press this button, the door will open*, the speaker does not have a commitment to either your pressing the button or your not pressing the button. (§17.3.1)

**nominal modification** (**cxn**): a **construction** in which an **object concept** is used as a **modifier** of a **referent expression**. Examples: the English Possessive Construction, as in *the boy’s bicycle*, is an instance of a nominal modification construction. (§2.2.5, §4.1.4)

**nominal phrase** (**cxn**): a **referring phrase** whose **head** denotes an **object concept**. **Example**: a large balloon is a nominal phrase; the head balloon denotes an object concept. A nominal phrase is the prototypical referring phrase, and its head is a **noun**. (§2.2.3)

**nominal strategy** (**str**): either the **nonverbal copula strategy** or the **zero strategy** for **predication constructions**. These two strategies are grouped together because both strategies appear to originate in **equational constructions**, are first recruited by object predication constructions, and then are recruited by other predication constructions. (§10.2)

nominalization **see** action nominal, deranked

**nominalizer** (**str**): a form that signals that a word is being used to refer, typically pertaining to a referent from a nonprototypical **semantic class** for **reference**. **Example**: the suffix -ness in oddness and the suffix -ment in movement are used when a **property** concept like ‘odd’ or an **action** concept like ‘move’ are being referred to. (§3.4.2)

**nominative category** (**str**): the morphosyntactic category in the **accusative alignment** **system** that **co-expresses** both A and S roles. **Example**: English verbs use the same index in the Present Tense (3rd Person Singular -s, otherwise zero) for both A and S roles (*Emily sing-s, Emily play-s the piano*), hence the -s/-Ø index is a nominative index. (§6.3.1)

non-anchooring **see** typifying

**non-exhaustive list coordination** (**aka** representative conjunction) (**cxn**): a type of **coordination construction** that does not express all of the relevant entities that are understood to be coordinated (i.e. does not express all of the relevant entities on the list). **Example**: *In the window were cookies, cakes, chocolates and everything* are instances of non-exhaustive list coordination with objects. Non-exhaustive list coordination can include **inclusive disjunction**. (§15.2.1)

non-factive **see** hypothetical

**non-indexed** (**str**): a **strategy** in which the **stative predicate** in a **stative complex predicate construction** does not **index** an **argument** of the other (**dynamic**) predicate in the construction. (§14.2)

**nonanaphoric (definite) article** (**cxn**): an **article** that is used for an **inactive** or **inferrable** **referent**. (§3.3.1)

**nonbasic voice construction** (**cxn**): an **argument structure construction** that does not conform to the prototypical parallel ranking of **participant role** and **argument salience**. **Example**: *The salmon were eaten by grizzlies* is an instance of a nonbasic
voice construction. Nonbasic voice constructions include the passive-inverse voice construction, the antipassive construction, the causative construction and the applicative construction. (§8.1)

**noncausal event (sem):** an event that has a participant that undergoes some sort of change, possibly brought about by an external cause participant; but the external cause participant is not conceptualized as a central participant in the event. 

*Example:* a window breaking is an example of a noncausal event. Noncausal events are contrasted with causal events. (§6.3.4)

noncontaining inferrable see inactive (referent)

**nonperson indexation (str):** an indexical strategy in which certain categories, typically number and gender/class, but not the category of person, are encoded in the index.

*Example:* in Russian molod-aja sosna ‘young pine’, the suffix -aja on molod- ‘young’ indexes its referent, also referred to by sosna ‘pine’, by number and gender (Feminine Singular); as well as serving as a Nominative case marker. (§4.4.2)

**nonpredicational clauses (cxn):** clauses that are defined by functions other than the topic-comment (predication) function, i.e. clauses that express the thetic or identificational functions. Examples: examples of nonpredicational clauses are There’s a jaguar! (thetics) and Sally is the winner (identificational). (§10.1.2)

**nonprototypical construction (cxn):** a construction that expresses less common or “disfavored” (see §2.4) combinations of information packaging and semantic content. Example: (Sam) is a barber is an instance of a nonprototypical predication construction: it expresses predication of an object category. This is not the most common or “favored” type of predication; action predication is the prototypical predication construction. (§2.2.5)

**nonprototypical predication (aka nonverbal predication) (cxn):** the predication of concepts other than action concepts. The types of nonprototypical predication most commonly described include predication of object concepts, property concepts, location and possession. Example: Frieda is an engineer, an instance of object predication, is an example of nonprototypical predication. (§10.1.1)

**nonrelational (sem):** a concept that does not inherently make reference to another entity: a property is a property of something, an action is performed by someone or something, but most members of the object class just “are” without making reference to another entity. Example: a brick is a nonrelational entity: its existence is not dependent on another entity in the way that the color of the brick is dependent on the existence of the brick. (§2.1)

nonrestrictive see appositive

**nonspecific referent (inf)/article, pronoun (cxn):** the information status of a referent whose identity cannot be known to the speaker and the hearer because the referent is only type identifiable. Example: in A student came to my office, the hearer does not know the identity of the student and hence that referent is nonspecific. (§3.5)

**nonverbal contrast (inf):** a subtype of parallel contrast in which the verbs (or more generally, predicates) are identical or virtually synonymous, and there are at least two sets of parallel nonverbal components that are members of posets. Example: in and Joseph called the name of the elder [of his two sons] Manasseh...and he called the name of the second Ephraim, the verbs ‘call’ are identical, and there are two sets
of parallel nonverbal components that differ and form posets: \{the name of the elder son, the name of the second son\} and \{Manasseh, Ephraim\}. (§11.4.1)

**nonverbal copula strategy (str):** the strategy for nonprototypical predication that employs an uninflecting copula, typically derived from a personal or demonstrative pronoun, topic marker or focus marker. *Example:* Nakainai *eia la taua sesele* ‘he is truly a spirit’ uses the demonstrative form *la* for object predication. (§10.2)

**nonverbal predication**

**noun (cxn):** the head of a nominal phrase, that is, referring phrase, that denotes an object. *Example:* the word *violin* in the referring phrase *an old violin* is a noun: it is an object concept that is the head of the referring phrase. (§2.2.3, §3.1)

**noun complement (cxn):** the modifying clause in a noun complement clause construction. *Example:* in the fact that the student bought the book, the student bought the book is the noun complement. (§19.2.4)

**noun complement clause construction (cxn):** a construction in which a noun complement (a dependent clause) modifies a noun head. The noun head is not necessarily a (salient) participant in the event denoted by the noun complement. *Example:* the fact that the student bought the book is an example of a noun complement clause construction: that the student bought the book is the noun complement, and the fact is the head noun. The noun complement clause construction also includes examples such as Japanese *[dareka ga doa o tataku] oto* ‘the sound of someone knocking on the door’, where the head noun oto ‘sound’ is modified by the noun complement *dareka ga doa o tataku* ‘someone is knocking on the door’. (§19.2.4)

**noun incorporation (str):** a strategy used for a range of functions but mostly for the antipassive construction function, in which the noun expressing the P participant is morphologically reduced and compounded with the verb. *Example:* in *He is off mountain-climbing*, the P participant, the mountain, is expressed by the noun *mountain* compounded with the verb form *climbing*. (§8.4)

**noun-modifying clause strategy (str):** the strategy of employing the same morphosyntactic structure for both the noun complement clause construction and the relative clause construction. *Example:* Japanese uses the noun-modifying clause strategy: the same externally headed strategy is used for both the relative clause construction ([gakusei ga katta] *hon* ‘the book that the student bought’) and the noun complement clause construction ([gakusei ga hon o katta] *zizitu* ‘the fact that the student bought the book’). (§19.2.4)

**null anaphora** see zero anaphora

**null anaphoric head** see headless

**number (sem):** a semantic category that is often (though not always) expressed as an inflectional category, that denotes the cardinality of a referent. Typical values for number inflections are singular, plural and dual, although there are other rarer values. **Indexation** frequently indicates the number of the referent. (§4.4)

**numeral (sem):** a word that specifies the precise cardinality of a set of referents. Numerals most typically are packaged as modifiers. Two common types of numerals are cardinal numerals and ordinal numerals (there are other types not discussed here); see also vague numerals. *Example:* in *three women, three* is a cardinal numeral functioning as a modifier of *women*. (§4.1.3)
O role see P role

**object argument (inf):** a core argument that is less salient that the subject argument of the same predication. Example: In Sally threw the letter into the wastebasket, the letter is a core argument but it is less salient than Sally. (§6.1.1, §6.3.2)

**object concept (sem):** concepts belonging to a semantic class including persons, animals and physical objects of various kinds. Example: both boys and dogs as well as dishes are examples of object concepts. (§2.1, §3.1.2 which includes an enumeration of types of object concepts)

**object identity (cxn):** a complex sentence construction in which the object referents in the two clauses are coreferential. Example: Sumie patted and Norio hit the dog is an instance of an object identity coordinate clause construction: the object referent for both clauses is the dog. (§16.5)

**object language:** in an example presented with an interlinear morpheme translation, the language that is the object of grammatical analysis, and hence the language of the example being analyzed. (§1.6)

**object phrase (cxn):** the argument phrase expressing the second most salient core argument in a transitive construction. Example: in Emily read the paper, the paper is the object. (§6.1.1, §6.3.2)

**object predication see predicate nominal**

**objective (sem):** describing a entity from an “outside”, explicit perspective on the entity, in contrast to a subjective construal. Example: in the objective epistemic modal construction Jim thought that Wendy was in Santa Fe, the attitude about whether Wendy being in Santa Fe is true is that of Jim, not the speaker, and in the past, not at the time of the speech event; both of these pieces of information are explicitly expressed in the sentence (Jim and thought). It is also possible to construe speaker attitude at the speech event time as objective, as in I think that Wendy was in Santa Fe, where speaker (I) and speaker attitude (think) are explicitly expressed. (§12.3.4)

**oblique P strategy (str):** a strategy of the antipassive construction in which the P participant is expressed with an oblique case marker. Example: in West Greenlandic inun-nik tuqt-si-vuq ‘He killed people’, the P participant is encoded with the oblique Instrumental Case suffix -nik. (§8.4)

**oblique phrase (cxn):** the argument phrase expressing the (less salient) arguments expressing peripheral participants in an argument structure construction. Example: in Emily viewed the hawk with binoculars, with binoculars is an oblique argument phrase. (§6.1.1, §6.3.2)

**omitted P strategy (str):** a strategy of the antipassive construction in which the P participant is unexpressed. Example: in She ate, the P participant (the food eaten) is left unexpressed. (§8.4)

**ontological categories (sem):** very broad semantic categories that play a role in distinguishing different types of pronouns and determiners. Examples: the ontological categories include: person, thing, place, time, quantity and manner (this is not an exhaustive list). (§3.1.3)

**ontology (sem):** a classification of concepts into their semantic classes or categories. (§2.1)

**ordered strategy (str):** the strategy for comparative (and possibly equative) constructions which metaphorically expresses the comparison of the comparee and
the standard on the gradable predicative scale as a spatial path between the comparee (as spatial figure) and the standard (as the ground). In comparative constructions, the ordered strategy recruits a different subject, absolutely deranked, simultaneous or consecutive temporal complex sentence construction to express comparison. The separative, allative and locative comparatives are examples of the ordered strategy. (§17.2.3)

**ordinal numeral (cnm):** a set-member term for a member in an ordered set, based on the precise position of the member in the ordering of the set. Example: in the second tree, second is an ordinal numeral. (§4.1.3)

**overlap** see simultaneous

**overt (coding) strategy (str):** a strategy in which the function of the construction is expressed by an overt form in the construction. Example: in the English Predicate Nominal Construction illustrated by She is a professor, be overtly codes the predication function for the object concept denoted by professor. (§2.4)

**overtly coded voice strategy (str):** a strategy with any of the different kinds of voice constructions in which there is overt coding of the function of the voice construction on the verb. Example: Hungarian János be-ültette a kerte-t fák-kal ‘John planted the garden with trees.’ is an applicative construction with the overt applicative prefix be- on the verb ültette ‘planted’. (§9.4)

**overtly headed strategy (str):** a strategy for the anaphoric-head construction in which there is an overt morpheme that functions as the head. Example: in I took a red candy and Greg took a green one, a green one is an example of the overtly headed strategy for the anaphoric-head construction, because one serves as an anaphoric head (with respect to type identity) in the construction. (§5.4)

**ownership (sem):** a culturally sanctioned relation of control between a person and a physical object, such as an artifact, foodstuff or shelter, or a more abstract object of value such as shares in a company. Example: in a common interpretation of Sally’s truck, Sally owns the truck. (§4.1.4)

**P role (aka O role) (sem):** the patient or patient-like central participant role in the prototypical bivalent event (that is, a breaking event). Example: in Jack broke the window, the window plays the P role in the breaking event. (§6.3.1)

**parallel contrast (inf):** a type of contrast that involves two propositions that exhibit some sort of parallelism in their structure, and there is a difference in semantic components in parallel positions that is construed as a salient contrast. Three subtypes of parallel contrast are listing contrast, verbal contrast and nonverbal contrast. (§11.4.1)

**parametric concessive conditional strategy (str):** a strategy for expressing a concessive conditional construction where the protasis, which specifies the set of conditions for the concessive conditional, quantifies over all the alternatives possible in the scalar model: the apodosis expresses that the outcome is the same under all conditions. Example: However much advice you give him, he does exactly what he wants to do uses the parametric concessive conditional strategy: the protasis quantifies over all amounts of advice that you could give him, and the apodosis asserts that he does exactly what he wants to do under any of those conditions. (§17.3.3)
part-whole relation (sem): a relation between an object, particularly an inanimate object, and a part of that object. Example: a drawer of the desk is a possession construction expressing a part-whole relation. The part-whole relation is a generalization of the body part relation. (§4.1.4)

partially-merged argument structure strategy (str): a strategy found in complement clause constructions in which the argument structure construction associated with the complement-taking predicate is only partially distinct from the argument structure construction associated with the complement predicate. Example: in I made him cook dinner, the CTP made and the complement predicate cook each has its own Object (him and dinner respectively), indicating that the argument structure constructions are at least partially distinct; but the necessarily shared participant him is expressed only once, as the Object of the CTP. A partially-merged argument structure strategy is typically but not always associated with a deranked complement clause construction. A partially-merged argument structure strategy always involves the expression of a participant in the complement as an argument phrase dependent on the matrix clause predicate—or, eventually, the complex predicate made up of the former matrix clause and complement clause predicates. (§6.1.1, §6.1.2)

participant (sem): entities that play a role in an event. Example: in Janet set the books on the floor, Janet, the books and the floor are participants in the setting event. (§6.1.1)

participant role (aka microrole, Frame Element) (sem): the role that a particular participant performs in an event, specifically, what the participant does, or has done to them, in the course of the event. Example: in the eating event, there is an ‘eater’ participant role and a ‘food’ participant role, and different things happen with the ‘eater’ and the ‘food’ in the eating event. (§6.1.1, §6.1.2)

participant-oriented (sem): a stative element in a stative complex predicate that describes a state of one of the participants in the event denoted by the complex predicate. Example: in English I ate the carrots raw, raw is a property of the carrots, not the event of eating. Contrasts with event-oriented. (§14.1)

participial strategy (str): a strategy used in the stative complex predicate construction in which the manner (more generally, stative) component is packaged as a separate primary predication coordinated with the event predication using a deranked complex sentence strategy (str). In addition, the stative predicate is predicated of, and ideally indexes, (one of) its argument(s). Example: in Sanuma opi-i a kali-palo-ma ‘He worked slowly’ [lit. ‘being slow, he worked’] opi-i ‘be slow’ is in a deranked form with suffix -i; the suffix however indicates that slow has the same subject as kali-palo-ma ‘worked’, namely ‘he’. (§14.2)

participle (str): a deranked relative clause predicate. Example: in The car almost hit the roadrunner [eating a grasshopper], eating is a participle in the relative clause eating a grasshopper. (§19.2.1)

particle comparative (str): a derived-case comparative strategy that consists of two clauses which assert that the gradable predicative scale applies to the comparee and the standard, but the second clause uses the zero predicate identity strategy, and the conjunction is a particle with diverse etymological origins. Example: Randy is older than Tom (is) is an instance of the particle strategy: the clause Randy is older is
followed by the particle *than* which introduces the standard phrase *Tom* without its own predicate (only an optional auxiliary *is*). (§17.2.2)

**particle equative (str):** a derived-case strategy for equative constructions which consists of a matrix clause which expresses that the gradable predicative scale applies to the comparee, and a dependent clause expressing that the same scale applies to the standard. The dependent clause is in the form of a particle acting as a conjunction, and the argument phrase expressing the standard; the zero strategy is used for predicate identity. Example: Chechen aha dōšu as sanna ‘You read like I [do]’ is an instance of the particle equative strategy: the matrix clause aha dōšu ‘You read’ predicates the scale of the comparee; the particle sanna ‘like’ introduces the standard as ‘I’, which is in the same case as the comparee (the ergative). (§17.2.4)

**partitive construction (cxn):** an anchoring construction that has a piece noun as the head referent and an anchor as the modifier. Example: a piece of the cake is a partitive construction in that the object modifier is a particular individual and hence functions as an anchor. (§5.2.2)

**passing (sem):** the intermediate phase of the path in a motion event. Example: in the Lao serial verb construction man⁵ lèèn¹ qòòk² caak³ hùòòt⁵ thaang⁵ hòòt⁵ kòòn⁴-hiim⁵ ‘He ran (exited) from the house, followed the path, reached the rock’, thaang³ ‘follow’ denotes the passing phase of the motion event. (§14.4)

**passive-inverse voice construction (cxn):** a type of nonbasic voice construction that expresses a situation where the P participant has a higher discourse salience than the A participant. Example: the English Passive Construction, as in *The boys were followed by a mountain lion*, is an instance of the passive-inverse voice construction. (§6.3.4, §8.3)

**path (of motion) event (sem)/verb (cxn):** an event that describes motion of a figure along a spatial path relative to a ground; and the verb expressing such an event. Example: in *The guests entered the reception hall, enter* is a path of motion verb expressing a path of motion event. (§7.3.1, §14.2)

**patient (sem):** a semantic role including participant roles for a participant that undergoes a significant change as a result of the event occurring. Example: in *Jack broke the window*, the window is broken as a result of the breaking event. (§6.1.2)

**patientive** see inactive category

**perception event (sem)/verb (cxn)/complement-taking predicate (cxn):** an experiential event involving one (or more) of the sensory modalities and directed towards a stimulus. The stimulus may be either an object or an event. A perception verb is a verb that expresses the event of perceiving an object. Example: *Tim heard the macaw* is an example of a perception event, and *hear* is the perception verb. (§7.4) A perception complement-taking predicate is a predicate that expresses the event of perceiving an event, which is the complement event of the predicate. Example: in *We watched the elk graze in the caldera*, watched denotes a perception
event. The complement event has dependent time reference; the complement event must be occurring at the same time as the perceiving event (although modern media allowing watching a prior event via a recording). (§18.2.2)

**perception verb strategy** (str): a strategy for the presentational construction in which the referring phrase introducing the referent is expressed as the stimulus of a perception event. Example: an English example from the Pear Stories narrative is *and um then you see this little girl. Coming on a bicycle in the opposition direction,*... More grammaticalized versions of this strategy include French *Voici un coffre...Voilà un autre coffre* ‘Here is a treasure chest...There is another treasure chest’. (§10.4.3)

**peripheral participant** (sem): certain participants are considered to be less central to the event, in particular those that do not initiate the event and those that are not strongly affected by the action. Example: in an eating event, the utensils used by the eater and the plate on which the food was located are peripheral participants in the event. Peripheral participants are quite diverse. (§6.1.1)

periphrastic causative strategy see complex predicate causative strategy

**person** (sem): a semantic category found in personal pronouns and indexation, specifying the referent with respect to their role in the speech act situation. The basic values are first person, second person and third person. (§3.1.1)

**person indexation** (str): an indexical strategy in which the category of person is encoded in the index. Other categories, typically number and gender, may also be encoded in the index. Example: in Mam *t-kamb’meeb’a ‘the orphan’s prize’, the third person prefix t- on kamb’ ‘prize’ indexes the possessor, who is also referred to by mee b’a ‘orphan’. (§4.4.1)

**personal pronoun** (cxn): a linguistic form used to refer contextually to a person in terms of their role in the speech act event. Example: I is a pronoun that refers to a person in terms of their role as speaker in a speech event. (§3.1)

**phrasal aspect** (sem): a type of aspect that expresses the phases of an event: beginning, continuing, terminating or completion. Phrasal aspect is often, but not always, expressed by a complement-taking predicate in a complement clause construction. Example: in *Bill started to play the piano, started* expresses phrasal aspect, namely the beginning phase of the complement event of playing the piano. (§18.2.2)

**phenomime** (str): the ideophone strategy used to express a property of movement, visual appearance or light emission, texture or taste. Example: *Siwu wūrūfū ‘fluffy’ is a phenomime; it describes the texture of an object using an ideophone. (§14.4)

**phonomime** (str): the ideophone strategy used to express a property of sound emission. Example: Japanese *potapota potapota ‘dripping’ is a phonomime; it describes the sound of dripping using an ideophone. (§14.4)

**phrase** (cxn): a construction used for reference or modification (of a referent). Example: *the furry kitten* is an instance of a phrasal construction. (§1.3)

**physical property term** (cxn): a modifier expressing a physical property (apart from shape; see shape term). Examples: *soft and smooth* are English physical property terms. (§4.1.2)

**piece term** (cxn): a mensural term that selects an amount of a referent which is a usually separated, arbitrary part of the object. Example: *in a slice of meat, slice* is a piece term. (§4.1.3)
polarity \((sem)\): a category that describes the truth/falsity of the situation expressed in the utterance. Polarity is either **positive** or **negative**. \((\S 12.1)\)

polarity focus construction \((aka\ truth-value\ focus\ construction)\) \((cxn)\): an **identificational construction** whose **focus** is the polarity of the **proposition** (that is, whether it is true or false). \(Example: \) In English, \(\text{I DID finish my assignment!}\) is an instance of a polarity focus construction, whose focus is the positive polarity (accented \textit{DID}) of the proposition ‘I finished my assignment’. \((\S 11.4.1)\)

polarity question \((aka\ yes/no\ question,\ Y/N\ question)\) \((inf/cxn)\), an **interrogative** in which the unknown piece of the **propositional content** requested of the addressee is the **polarity** (positive or negative) of the proposition; and the construction expressing this function. \(Example: \) \textit{Are you coming?} is an instance of the English polarity question construction, expecting a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. \((\S 12.3.1)\)

polarity response \((inf/cxn)\): the **answer** to a **polarity question**, and the **construction** that expresses that answer. \(Example: \) the polarity response to \textit{Do you have any money?} in English is \textit{Yes (I do)} or \textit{No (I don’t)}. (This is excluding other less cooperative responses such as \textit{I don’t know} or \textit{It’s none of your business.}) \((\S 12.3.3)\)

poset \((inf)\): a partially ordered set of discourse entities. The partial ordering is defined by some sort of semantic relation such as part-whole or type-subtype. \(Example: \) in the exchange \textit{Do you like this album? Yeah, this song I really like}, the album mentioned in the first turn and the song mentioned in the second turn are members of a poset which is defined by a part-whole relation (the album is the whole, and the song is a part of the album). \((\S 11.2.3)\)

positive (polarity) \((sem)\): indicates that the situation expressed in the utterance is true. \(Example: \) Kit found his glasses expresses that Kit finding his glasses is true. In the vast majority of languages, positive polarity is **zero coded**, as in this example. \((\S 12.1)\)

positive circumstantial **see means**

positive epistemic stance \((sem)\): a positive commitment on the part of the speaker to the actuality of a proposition expressed in a clause. \(Example: \) \textit{in Since you pressed the button, the door opened}, the speaker has expressed a commitment to the proposition that you did press the button. \((\S 17.3.1)\)

possessed role **see possessum role**

possessee role **see possessum role**

possession clause \((cxn)\): clauses in which a **possession relation** is expressed, either **predicationally** or **presentationally**. These two types of possession clauses are **predicational possession** and **presentational possession** respectively. \((\S 10.4.2)\)

possession relation \((sem)\): a semantic relation between two objects, prototypically **ownership**, but also including weaker relations such as temporary ownership and physical contiguity. \(Example: \) in \textit{I have a pen}, there is a possession relation between myself and the pen—I am the **possessor** and the pen is the **possessum**. This possession relation could be full ownership, temporary ownership (someone lent it to me) or physical contiguity (I have a pen at hand). Other object-object relations, such as **body parts**, part-whole and kinship are generally also included under possession relations. \((\S 10.4.2)\)

possessive (modification) \((aka\ attributive\ possession)\) **construction** \((cxn)\): the **nominal modifier construction** that expresses a **possession relation** such that the **possessor** is the **modifier** and the **possessum** is the **head** \(i.e.\ is\ the\ referent\ expression\).
Example: Sally’s calendar is an instance of possession: the calendar could be a one that she owns, one that she gave me, one that she is holding in a photo of people with calendars, one that she designed or made, one with photos of her, and so on. Many languages have two possessive modification constructions, an alienable possession construction and an inalienable possession construction (or constructions). (§4.1.4)

possessive locative strategy (str): a strategy for the presentational construction in which the referring phrase introducing the referent is expressed as the possesseum in a presentational possession construction. Example: Swahili ku na mgeni nyumba-ni [LOC.CLF with stranger home-at] ‘There is a stranger at home’, uses the with possessive strategy of the presentational possessive construction to express the stranger as the possesseum; the location at home is expressed by a locative phrase. (§10.4.3)

possessor role (sem): the person who has control over the possesseum in a possession relation. Example: in I have a car, I am the possessor. The possessor may also serve as the modifier in a possessive modification construction. (§4.1.4, §10.4.2)

possessum role (aka possessed role, possessee role) (sem): the object that is controlled by the possessor in a possession relation. Example: in I have a car, the car is the possesseum. The possessor may also serve as the head in a possessive modification construction. (§4.1.4, §10.4.2)

posterior (sem): a temporal sequential relation between two events such that the preceding event serves as the reference point for the following event. Example: in He drove to the party after washing the car, driving to the party has a posterior temporal relation with respect to washing the car. Used to describe a sequential temporal relation between events in a figure-ground information packaging. (§15.1.3)

posterior deranking (str): the variant of a deranking strategy in which the deranked clauses follow the clause that is expressed like a simple main clause. Example: Big Nambas a-ən talei ka-vruh ka-vmi’i arna pitha ‘So they left their knives and ran away and climbed over the hill…’ is an instance of posterior deranking: the prefix ka-on ka-vruh ‘run away’ and ka-vmi’i ‘go over’ indicates that the posterior predicates are deranked. (§15.2.3)

postnominal strategy (str): a word order strategy for externally headed relative clause constructions in which the relative clause follows the relative clause head. Example: in I ate the cheesecake [that Carol baked], that Carol baked is postnominal because it follows the cheesecake. The postnominal strategy is much more common that the prenominal strategy. (§19.2.2)

postposition (str): an adposition which occurs after the head of the referring phrase. Example: in Urarina nii banaao asae ‘under that leaf shelter’, asae ‘under’ follows nii banaao ‘that leaf shelter.’ (§4.3)

pragmatic assertion (inf) (§13.2.1, §15.1.2): the information added to the discourse context when a sentence is uttered, or more precisely, ‘the proposition expressed by a sentence which the hearer is expected to know or take for granted as a result of hearing the sentence uttered’ (Lambrecht 1994:52). Example: in Alarms ringing, the burglar fled, the clause the burglar fled is pragmatically asserted. The criteria typically used for pragmatic assertion are the content of a sentence that can be
negated or questioned, though other criteria are sometimes used, such as hedging. (§13.2.1, §15.1.2)

**pragmatic presupposition (inf):** the set of propositions evoked by the constructions in a sentence ‘which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows or is ready to take for granted at the time the sentence is uttered’ (Lambrecht 1994:52). *Example:* in I’m grateful that you finished cleaning the house, the proposition that you finished cleaning the house is presupposed, while the proposition that I am grateful about it is asserted. (§11.4.1)

**pragmatically nonspecific (but semantically specific) (indefinite) referent** (*inf*/article (cxn)): a referent introduced into the discourse by the speaker that is not normally referred to again in subsequent discourse. The term ‘semantically specific’ indicates that the referent is not in a nonreal context, that is, they are not nonspecific referents. We will use the shorter term ‘pragmatically nonspecific’ and assume that such referents are also semantically specific. (§3.4.1)

**pragmatically specific (indefinite) referent (inf)/article (cxn):** a referent introduced into the discourse by the speaker that is normally referred to again in subsequent discourse. We will use the shorter term ‘pragmatically specific’. (§3.4.1)

**predicate (cxn):** the head of a clause, which is not necessarily an action. *Example:* in The dog is old, (is) old is the predicate. (§2.2.4)

**predicate adjectival (aka property predication) construction (cxn):** a clause construction defined by the function of predicating a property concept of a referent, that is, asserting that a property applies to the referent. *Example:* Sarah is intelligent is an example of an English predicate adjectival construction: it predicates intelligence of Sarah. (§1.5, §2.2.5, §10.3)

**predicate identity (cxn):** a complex sentence construction in which the events denoted by the predicate in the two clauses are of the same type. *Example:* Sumie saw the dog and Norie the cat is an instance of a predicate identity coordinate clause construction: the event denoted by the predicate in both clauses is seeing. (§16.5)

**predicate nominal (aka object predication) construction (cxn):** a clause construction defined by the function of predicating an object concept of a referent, that is, asserting what object category the referent belongs to. *Example:* Ira is a writer is an example of an English predicate nominal construction; it predicates that the referent of Ira belongs to the category of writer. The predicational construction is another term for a predicate nominal construction. Sometimes ‘predicate nominal’ is used to cover predicational, presentational and equational constructions; we will use it in the narrow sense only. (§1.4, §2.2.5, §10.3)

**predication (inf):** what the speaker is asserting about the referents in a particular utterance. *Example:* in Masha is nice, the speaker is predicating the property of being nice to the referent Masha. In the file metaphor for describing propositional acts, predication adds information to a referent’s discourse file. The predication is the comment in topic-comment information packaging. (§1.3, §2.1)

**predicational (inf/cxn):** the subtype of topic-comment or predication information packaging in which membership in an object category is what is being predicated; and the construction that expresses that information packaging. *Example:* in Bill is a teacher, what is being predicated of Bill is that he is a member of the object category
of teacher. In other words, ‘predicational’ is synonymous with object predication. (§10.1.2)

**predicational location** *(aka locative predication)* *(inf/cxn)*: a spatial location situation with a predicational *(topic-comment)* information packaging, such that the figure in the spatial relation is the topic and its location *(including the ground)* is the comment; and the construction expressing that function. Example: *The pot is on the table* is an instance of the predicational locative construction. (§10.4.1)

**predicational locative strategy** *(str)*: a strategy for the presentational location construction *(and presentational constructions in general)* which recruits the predicational locative construction. The predicational locative strategy has a fixed-order subtype, where the word order of figure phrase and locative phrase remains the same. Example: Welsh *mae car yma* ‘There is a car here’ has the same word order as the predicational locative *Mae'r car yma* ‘The car is here.’ The predicational locative strategy also has a reverse-order subtype, where the word order is reversed so that the locative phrase precedes the figure phrase. Example: *On the table was a large bowl* has the same structure as *The large bowl is on the table* except that the order of *on the table* and *a/the large bowl* are reversed. More grammaticalized versions of this strategy include English *There’s a snake in the back yard.* (§10.4.3)

**predicational possession** *(aka belong possession)* *(cxn)*: a possession clause in which ownership of the possessum by the possessor is predicated of the possessum. Example: in *That laptop belongs to Kerry*, ownership of the laptop by Kerry is predicated of the laptop. *That laptop is Kerry’s* is also treated as an instance of a predicational possession construction, recruiting a nominal strategy; but it might be better analyzed as having equational information packaging. (§10.4.2)

**predicational strategy** *(str)*: a strategy used in the stative complex predicate construction in which the manner *(and possibly other stative)* component is packaged as the sole predication, and the event is packaged as the subject argument of the manner predication. Example: in Mokilese *ah kijou dahr* ‘He runs fast’ [lit. ‘his running is fast’], the speed is predicated of the event. (§14.2)

predicative complement see complementative

**predicative scale** see gradable predicative scale

**predicativization possessive strategy** *(str)*: a strategy for the presentational possession construction in which the possessum is incorporated as part of the possessive predicate. Examples: Tundra Yukaghir *märqa-n lāme-n’-ŋi* [one dog-with-3PL.INTR] ‘They had one dog’ is an instance of the flexional *(inflected)* subtype of the predicativization possessive strategy, and Pitjantjatjara *ngankulukula-tjara* [I spear-PROPRIETIVE] ‘I have a spear’ [lit. ‘I am spear-having’] is an instance of the copular/zero *(uninflected)* subtype of the strategy. (§10.4.2)

**preferred argument structure**: the universal that the participant in the A role is, on average, higher on the Accessibility Hierarchy than the participant in the P role in a bivalent event, and in fact, the participant in the A role is usually active. (§8.1)

**Prenominal Integration**: the typological phenomenon that prenominal modifiers are more tightly integrated into the noun phrase than postnominal modifiers. (§5.3)

**prenominal strategy** *(str)*: a word order strategy for externally headed relative clause constructions in which the relative clause precedes the relative clause head. Example: in Turkish *[Hasann Sinana ver-diğ-i] patatesi yedim* ‘I ate the potato that
Hasan gave to Sinan’, the *Hasan Sinana ver-diğ-i* ‘[that] Hasan gave to Sinan’ is prenominal because it precedes the relative clause head *patatesi* ‘potato’. The prenominal strategy is much less common than the *postnominal* strategy, and is strongly correlated with object-verb word order. (§19.2.2)

**preposition (str):** an *adposition* which occurs before the *head* of the referring phrase. *Example:* in *on the table*, *on* is an adposition that precedes the *table.* (§4.3)

**presentational (inf/cxn):** a type of *entity-central thetic information packaging* that introduces a *referent* into the discourse, in order to make the identity of the referent known to the hearer; and the *construction* that expresses that information packaging. *Example:* *There’s my bicycle* and *In the corner sat a mouse* are sentences that express the presentational information packaging function. Subtypes of the presentational construction are the *presentational locative* and the *presentational possession constructions* (§10.1.2, §10.4)

**presentational location (inf/cxn):** a *presentational information packaging* of the spatial location relation in which the *figure* in the locative relation is introduced in the discourse, *anchored* by the *ground object*; and the *construction* expressing this function. *Example:* in *In the room was a request for breakfast*, the request for breakfast is being introduced into the discourse, anchored by its spatial relation to the room. (§10.4.1, §10.4.3)

**presentational possession (aka have possession) (cxn):** a *possession clause* in which a *possessum* is introduced into the discourse, *anchored* by the *possessor*. *Example:* in *Kerry has a laptop*, the laptop is introduced into the discourse, but anchored to Kerry by the *possession relation* that holds between Kerry and the laptop. More grammaticalized versions of this strategy include Spanish *Había muchas chicas de mi edad y más jóvenes* ‘There were many girls of my age and younger.’ (§10.4.2)

**presupposed open proposition (POP) (inf):** in *identificational information packaging*, the proposition with an unknown part (hence “open” proposition) which is already part of the shared knowledge of the speaker and hearer (that is, a presupposed). *Example:* in *It was Jack who stole my cookies!*, the presupposed open proposition is ‘X stole my cookies’; in the appropriate discourse context, it is already known that someone stole my cookies. (§11.4.1)

**presupposition** see pragmatic presupposition

**pretence event (sem)/predicate (cxn):** a *propositional attitude event* in which the speaker, or the *experiencer* of the pretence event, presents the *proposition* expressed by the *complement* as true in an alternative reality or *mental space*; and a *predicate* expressing such an event. *Example:* in *Ira pretended that the guests had already left*, the proposition that the guests had already left is presented as true in an alternative reality from the shared beliefs of the interlocutors (or for that matter, Ira). There is a strong implicature that the proposition does not hold in reality (that is, the shared beliefs of the interlocutors). (§18.2.2)

**primary object category (str):** the morphosyntactic category in the *secundative alignment system* that *co-expresses* both *R* and *P* roles. *Example:* in Huichol *nee uuki uukari ne-wa-puuzeiyastia* ‘I showed the man to the girls’, the *index* *wa*-‘3Pl’ is the same used to index *tiiiri* ‘children’ in *uukaraawiciizi tiiiri me-wa-zeiya* ‘The women see the children’, and hence represents the primary object category. (§7.5.2)
prohibitive (*inf/cxn*): a negative imperative-hortative speech act, and the
construction that expresses that speech act. Example: English Don’t be a fool! is an
instance of a prohibitive; the construction uses a special prohibitive morpheme Don’t
to express prohibitive function. (§12.4.1)

pronominal argument complex predicate (*cxn*): an argument complex predicate in
which the argument is a pronoun rather than a common noun. Example: in English
I’m losing it (meaning ‘lose one’s mind’), losing it is a pronominal argument complex
predicate, containing the pronoun it. (§13.6)

pronoun (*cxn*): a linguistic form that refers to an individual via some contextual
factor in the speech act context. Example: I is a pronoun because it refers to a person via the
role she is playing in the speech event (namely, speaker). (§3.1.1)

pronoun-retention strategy (*str*): a strategy for the expression of the necessarily
shared participant in the relative clause of an externally headed relative clause
construction, in which the participant is in the relative clause by an anaphoric
pronoun. Example: the Modern Hebrew construction illustrated by hasarim [she-ha-
nasi shalax otam la mitzraim] ‘the ministers that the President sent to Egypt’, uses the
pronoun-retention strategy: the anaphoric pronoun otam ‘them’ occurs in the relative
clause she-ha-nasi shalax otam la mitzraim ‘that the President sent them to Egypt’, and
refers to the external relative clause head hasarim ‘the ministers’. (§19.2.2)

prop (*inf*): a supporting entity that plays a role in the actions reported in the discourse.
Props are almost always nonhuman, usually are referred to only once, and are rarely
introduced by special constructions. (§3.4.1)

proper name see proper noun

proper noun (aka proper name) (*cxn*): a linguistic form that refers to an individual
directly, that is, it names an individual rather than a category. The term ‘proper
name’ is also used; we will consider these two terms to be synonymous. Example:
Bill Croft refers to a particular individual. Note that being a proper noun is a function
of a form; one can use the form Bill Croft as a common noun, for example to refer to
a category of all persons named ‘Bill Croft’. (§3.1.1)

properties see word class

property (concept) (*sem*): a concept belonging to a semantic class of relational, one-
dimensional, usually scalar, and usually stable concepts. Examples: age, height, shape
and so on are property concepts: they are defined on a one-dimensional scale, and
many of them are stable properties of the object they apply to. (§2.1, §4.1.1 which
includes an enumeration of types of property concepts)

property predication see predicate adjectival

proportional quantifier (*cxn*): a form that specifies the set of instances as a proportion
of the whole set of individuals/tokens of the type, or at least the contextually relevant
whole set. Example: in few children, few is a proportional quantifier indicating a
lesser proportion of the contextually relevant set of children. (§4.1.3)

proposition (*sem*): a concept that denotes an event (with its attendant participants,
tense, aspect, modality and polarity) that has a truth value in a particular context,
that is, it may be true or false in that context. Example: in John believes that Mary
took the car to the repair shop, Mary took the car to the repair shop is a proposition;
it has a truth value in the context of John’s beliefs. An assertion expresses a
proposition that is taken to be true in the speaker’s beliefs. (§11.1, §18.2.2)
propositional act (aka major propositional act) (inf): the basic information packaging functions that structure phrases and clauses; the propositional acts are reference, predication and modification. (§1.3)

propositional attitude event (sem)/predicate (cxn): an event of thinking, believing and so on that expresses an attitude of the experiencer towards the truth of the proposition expressed by the complement; and the predicate expressing such an event. Example: in Aram thought that the pianist was very good, the complement-taking predicate thought denotes a propositional attitude event. Special cases of propositional attitude events are knowledge events and pretence events. (§18.2.2)

propositional content (sem): the semantic content of a clause separately from whether it is packaged as topic-comment, thetic or identifiable. Propositional content corresponds basically to ‘who did what to whom’. Example: In There’s a coyote running down the street!, It’s a coyote that’s running down the street, and The coyote is running down the street, the propositional content shared by the thetic, identifiable and topic-comment constructions respectively is the current running event with a coyote as the runner and the street as the location of the running. (§11.1)

protasis (aka antecedent) (sem/cxn): the clause expressing the causally antecedent proposition in a causal, conditional, concessive, concessive conditional or comparative conditional construction; or the proposition or event denoted by the clause. Example: in If you press this button, the door will open, If you press this button is the protasis; the door will open is the apodosis. Since the conditional relations are defined both in terms of logical implication and causal relation, the semantic use of ‘protasis’ can be distinguished as ‘protasis proposition’ or ‘protasis event’. (§17.3.1)

prototypical construction (cxn): a construction that expresses the most common or “favored” (see §2.4) combinations of information packaging and semantic content. Example: an old violin is an instance of a prototypical referring construction: it expresses reference to an object, the most common or “favored” type of referent. (§2.2.3)

proximal (deixis) (sem): a contextual category of deixis defined as near the location of the speaker in the speech event. (§3.1.1)

pseudo-partitive (str): a strategy for mensural constructions in which a possessive modification construction is recruited (or was recruited, as the pseudo-partitive often differs from the counterpart modification construction) to express the mensural relation. (§5.2.2)

psychomime (str): the ideophone strategy used to express an experiential property such as bodily sensation or emotion. Example: Japanese kurakura ‘dizzy’ is a psychomime; it describes a physiological sensation (dizziness) using an ideophone. (§14.4)

punctual (sem): an event that is construed as taking place in an “instant” of time. Example: The balloon popped is a punctual event. (§6.2.1)

purpose (sem): the semantic relation between two events where one event serves as the intended outcome as a result of bringing about the other event. Example: I will grab a stick to defend myself is a figure-ground construal of the simultaneous relation in an adverbial clause construction, and I will grab a stick and defend myself is a complex figure construal of the relation in a coordinate clause construction. In the figure-
ground construal, the intended event is construed as the ground. The intended event is unrealized, which disfavors a complex figure construal (this problem is avoided in the example here because both events are future events). (§15.3.1)

**pursuit event (sem)/verb (cxn):** events in which one participant’s motion or location is directed towards another participant; and the verb expressing such an event.

*Examples:* pursuit events include following, chasing, searching for something and waiting for someone/something; and *follow, chase, search* (for), and *wait* (for) are pursuit verbs. (§7.3.3)

**quantifier (cxn):** forms that describe the quantity of the instances of a type, where the precise cardinality of the set is not specified. Quantifiers include numerals, vague numerals, amount terms, proportional quantifiers and distributive quantifiers. (§4.1.3)

**question referent (inf)/pronoun (cxn):** an unspecified referent in the scope of interrogation, especially polar interrogatives. *Example:* in *Can you hear anything?*, *anything* is a question pronoun expressing a referent that only “exists” in a hypothetical world, the possibility of whose existence is being entertained by the questioner. (§3.5)

**question see interrogative**

**quotative marker (str):** a complementizer used with direct reports. *Example:* in *Kobon ban nôp hagôp [yad ram arabin] a gôp ‘Who said to you, “I am going home”?*, *a* is a quotative marker used with the direct report *utterance complement yad ram arabin ‘I am going home’.* Like the direct report *strategy* it accompanies, quotative markers originate with utterance *complement clause constructions* but are extended to other complement clause constructions lower in the *Binding Hierarchy.* (§18.3.2)

**R role (aka G role) (sem):** the recipient central participant role in a transfer event, that is, the participant that receives the theme (*T*) from the agent. *Example:* in *Randy gave the car to his daughter*, Randy’s daughter is in the R role. (§7.5.2)

**recipient (sem):** a semantic role including participant roles for a participant that receives an entity from another participant. *Example:* in *I sent the forms to the accountant*, the accountant is the recipient of the forms sent. (§6.1.2)

**reciprocal event (sem)/construction (cxn):** an event type in which one participant acts upon another participant, and the second participant acts on the first in the same way; and the construction expressing such an event. That is, each participant is both the initiator and endpoint of *transmission of force* for the same type of action.

*Example:* in *Mary and Sue praised each other*, Mary praises Sue and Sue praises Mary. (§7.2)

recognitional see semi-active

recoverability see explicitness

**recruitment strategy:** a strategy for a construction that uses the same morphosyntactic form that is used for another construction. *Example:* in English the expression of an illness (*Jane has pneumonia/a cold*) recruits the same strategy used for the predication of possession (*Jane has a convertible*). (§1.4)

**reference point (sem):** a point on the scale for a property that indicates a “normal” value for the property concept word. *Example:* in regard to height of a person, *tall/short* means ‘taller/shorter than a “normal” height’. The reference point is relative: tall for a
person is short for a tree. The reference point can be expressed overtly, as in She’s kind of short for a basketball player. The term ‘reference point’ is also used as a synonym for ‘anchor’; we will avoid that use in this book. (§4.1.2)

**reference tracking (cxn):** a construction that indicates coreference or lack thereof with respect to a referent occurring elsewhere in the discourse, including one occurring elsewhere in the same construction, such as a complex sentence construction. Coreference may be indicated by zero anaphora as well as by an overt expression. Example: in the discourse passage and there’s a man at the top of the ladder, you can’t see him yet..., the pronoun him serves to track the referent as recurrence of the man in the second reported event. (§16.1)

**reference, referent (inf):** what the speaker is talking about. Example: in Masha is nice, the speaker is referring to a person named Masha, and Masha is the referent. In the file metaphor for describing propositional acts, reference opens or accesses a discourse file for the referent. (§1.3, §2.1)

**referent expression (cxn):** the head of a referring phrase, which is not necessarily an object. Example: in Hiking in the desert is wonderful, hiking is a referent expression. (§2.2.4)

**referent modification construction** see modification construction

**Referentiality Hierarchy** see Extended Animacy Hierarchy

**referring phrase (cxn):** a construction that performs the act of reference. Example: the blue mailboxes is a referring phrase that refers to a group of mailboxes. (§2.2.2, §3.1)

**reflexive event (sem)/construction (cxn):** an event type in which a participant acts upon oneself, that is, the participant is both the initiator and endpoint of transmission of force; and the construction expressing such an event. Examples: reflexive events may be direct, when there is no other participant, as in I saw myself; or indirect, when there is another participant in an intermediate position in the causal chain, as in Sally baked a cake for herself, whose causal structure is Sally → cake → Sally. (§7.2)

**rejecting (inf):** a subtype of counterpresuppositional contrast in which the sentence simply rejects a component of a prior assertion without offering a replacement. Example: in the exchange John bought apples. No, he didn’t buy APPLES, the speaker rejects the assertion of what John bought, but without asserting what John bought. (§11.4.1)

**relational (sem):** a concept that inherently makes reference to another entity. Example: a property such as ‘smooth’ is a property of something, an action such as ‘run’ is performed by someone or something. (§2.1)

**relational strategy (str):** a strategy for encoding the relation in major propositional acts (modifier-referent, predicate-argument), in which there is a third morpheme that encodes the semantic relation between the two concepts. Examples of relational strategies include adpositions and case affixes. (§4.3)

**relative clause (cxn):** the dependent clause in a relative clause construction. The relative clause denotes the event that is used to modify the relative clause head referent. Example: in I ate the cheesecake [that Carol baked], that Carol baked is the relative clause. (§19.1)

**relative clause construction (cxn):** a construction defined by the function of modifying a referent with an action concept. Example: I ate the cheesecake [that Carol baked]
is an instance of a relative clause construction: that Carol baked is the relative clause (indicated by brackets), the cheesecake is the relative clause head, and I ate the cheesecake is the matrix clause. There are a wide variety of strategies used for relative clauses, including participles, externally headed, internally headed, adjoined, correlative, noun-modifying clause and verb-coding. (§2.2.5, §19.1)

relative clause head (cxn): the referring phrase that denotes the necessarily shared participant in a relative clause construction, that is, the participant that plays a semantic role in both the event denoted by the relative clause and the event denoted by the matrix clause. Example: in I ate the cheesecake [that Carol baked], the cheesecake is the relative clause head. The relative clause head is an argument of the matrix clause predicate, and is modified by the relative clause. (§19.1)

relative equal equative (str): a strategy for equative constructions which combines two predicates, one expressing equality the comparee on the gradable predicative scale, similar to the equal equative, and the other expressing the standard in a structure similar to the relative-based equative. Like the relative-based equative but unlike the equal equative, the relative equal equative is a derived-case strategy.

Example: Spanish Douglas y Pedro son igual de altos que María ‘Douglas and Pedro are as tall as María’ is an instance of the relative equal equative; the matrix predicate is son igual ‘[they] are equal’ and the deranked de altos describes the scale. (§17.2.4)

relative pronoun (cxn): a pronoun form that is unique to the relative clause construction, and is found in the externally headed relative clause construction using the relative pronoun strategy. Example: in He stole the emerald [which he gave to his wife], which is the relative pronoun. (§19.2.2)

relative pronoun strategy (str): a strategy for the expression of the necessarily shared participant in the relative clause of an externally headed relative clause construction, in which the participant in the relative clause is expressed by a relative pronoun unique to the relative clause construction. Example: in He stole the emerald [which he gave to his wife], the relative clause is introduced by the relative pronoun which, which refers to the emerald, which is also expressed by the external relative clause head the emerald. The relative pronoun strategy is rare cross-linguistically, and largely restricted to the European area. (§19.2.2)

relative strategy (str): the strategy for comparative (and possibly equative) constructions which directly expresses two of the propositions that form the meaning of the comparative: that the gradable predicative scale applies to the comparee and that the comparee exceeds the standard on the scale. That is to say, the relative strategy recruits a same subject, conditionally deranked, usually simultaneous temporal complex sentence construction to express comparison. The exceed comparative is an example of the relative strategy; the conjoined exceed strategy appears to be a related type. (§17.2.3)

relative-based equative (str): a derived-case strategy for equative constructions which consists of a relative clause-like construction where the matrix clause expresses that the gradable predicative scale applies to the comparee and a relative clause expressing that the same scale applies to the standard. The relative clause is reduced to a relativizer and an argument phrase expressing the standard; the zero strategy is used for predicate identity. Example: Lithuanian Štandien taip šalta kaip vakar ‘Today it is as cold as yesterday’ is an instance of the relative-based equative
strategy: Štandien taip šalta ‘today [is] so cold’ is the matrix clause, with the degree marker taip ‘so’, and kaip vakar ‘how yesterday’ is the relative-based clause, with the pronoun kaip ‘how’, the standard, yesterday, and a zero predicate. Typically the relative-based equative recruits a correlative relative clause, with a free (indefinite head) relative or interrogative-based relative pronoun. (§17.2.4)

relativizer (str): a form that signals that an action is being used as a modifier, that is, it signals a relative clause. Example: in I ate the cheesecake [that Carol baked], that is the relativizer. A relativizer makes a relative clause construction syndetic. (§19.2.1)

removal event (sem)/verb (cxn): an event describing removal of an object from another object; and the verb expressing such an event. Example: scrubbing is a removal event, and scrub is a removal verb. (§7.3.2)

repeater (str): a sortal classifier that is identical in form to the noun it modifies. Example: in Lao hang2 sip2 hang2 [nest two CLF] ‘two nests’, the sortal classifier hang2 is identical to the noun hang2 ‘nest’. (§4.4.3)

replacing (inf): a subtype of counterpresuppositional contrast in which the sentence rejects a component of a prior assertion by offering a replacement for the rejected information. Example: in the exchange John bought apples. No, he bought PEACHES, the speaker rejects the assertion that what John bought was apples and replaces it with peaches. (§11.4.1)

representative conjunction see non-exhaustive list coordination

response (inf/cxn): the answer to an interrogative (question) speech act; and the construction expressing the answer. Like interrogatives, responses are divided into polarity responses and information (question) responses.

restricting (inf): a subtype of counterpresuppositional contrast in which the sentence rejects a component of a prior assertion by excluding part of the rejected component rather than simply replacing it. Example: in the exchange John bought apples and peaches. No, he only bought PEACHES, the speaker rejects that what John bought was both apples and peaches, and restricts what John bought to just peaches. Only is a restrictive (focus) operator. (§11.4.1)

restrictive (focus) operator (aka exclusive focus operator) (cxn): a focus operator that indicates that the focus is the restricted information in a restricting counterpresuppositional contrast. Example: in the exchange John bought apples and peaches. No, he only bought PEACHES, only is a restrictive operator. (§11.4.1)

restrictive modification (inf): the prototypical type of modification information packaging function in which the modifying stative concept narrows or restricts the set of possible referents of the object concept it modifies in a referring phrase. Example: in The tall trees block the view, tall restrictively modifies trees in the context where there are tall trees and short trees. (§14.3)

result event (sem)/verb (cxn): an event that is described in terms of reaching a result state, often by means of a scalar change (directed change), and the verb expressing such an event. Example: in Peter broke the window, the event is described in terms of the result state that is reached (a broken window). (§7.3.2)

resultative (complex predicate) (aka resultative secondary predicate) (cxn): a stative complex predicate in which the stative component of the complex predicate describes a state that results from the performance of the event denoted by the main predicate. Hence the stative event temporally follows the main predicate event. A
resultative complex predicate is **participant-oriented**. **Example:** in English *We painted the door red, painted...red* is a resultative complex predicate, and *red* describes the result state of a participant, the door, after the painting event is done. (§14.1)

resultative secondary predicate see **resultative (complex predicate)**

**role** (aka slot, function): a **construction** consists of **elements** each of which describes a role that expresses a particular **function** in a construction. **Example:** in the English Predicate Adjective Construction `[SBJ be PREDADJ]`, illustrated by *She is intelligent*, the label SBJ describes a role referring to an **object**, and PREDADJ describes a role occurring after *be* that **predicates a property** of the object referred to in the Subject role. (§1.1)

**S role** (**sem**): the one **central participant role** in a **monovalent event**. **Example:** in *Jack ran* or *Jack died*, Jack plays the **S role** in the running and dying events respectively. It is not entirely clear what event best serves as the prototypical monovalent event for defining the S role (§6.3.1, §6.3.3)

**salience** (aka **topicality**) (**inf**): the degree of attention directed to a **referent** by the interlocutors at a given point in the discourse. **Example:** it is generally the case that in a sentence like *He ate the cookies*, the **subject** referent is more salient than the **object** referent in discourse. Salience is also considered to vary across different **object concepts**, other things being equal: people are more interested in other people, somewhat less so in **animate** objects, and less still in **inanimate** objects. Salience is the motivation for the **Animacy Hierarchy** and the **Extended Animacy Hierarchy**. (§6.1.1)

**same-subject** (aka **SS**) (**inf**): in **complex sentence constructions** that express **reference tracking**, the situation where the **salient participant** in the current **clause** is indicated to be **coreferential** with the salient participant in another clause in the construction. The salient participant is typically but not always encoded as the **subject** of the **predicate**. **Example:** in *Having finished the chapter, Bill went to bed*, the zero anaphora in *Having finished the chapter* signals that the subject referent of finishing the chapter is coreferential with the subject referent of the **matrix clause**, namely Bill. (§16.1)

**satellite** (**str**): a **strategy** for expressing a semantic component of an **event** (such as a **motion event**) in an element of the **clause** other than the **verb**. **Example:** in *Sam strode into the room*, the path of motion is expressed not by the verb (*stride*), but by the **oblique case marker** *into (the room)*. (§7.3.1, §14.2)

**satellite-framing strategy** (**str**): a **strategy** for expressing **events** such that the manner of how the event comes about is expressed by a **manner verb**, and the **result state** (including also paths of motion) is expressed in a **satellite**. **Example:** *Sam strode into the room* uses the satellite-framing strategy: *stride* is a manner of motion verb, and the path of motion is expressed by the oblique phrase *into the room*. (§7.3.1)

**scalar concessive conditional strategy** (**str**): a strategy for expressing a **concessive conditional construction** where the protasis, which specifies the set of conditions for the concessive conditional, invokes the most informative or “strongest” condition in the **scalar model**; the apodosis expresses the unexpected opposite of the expected causal relation between the most extreme condition and the outcome, and so implies the same outcome under the less extreme conditions. **Example:** *Even if you drink*
(only) a little, your boss will fire you uses the scalar concessive conditional strategy: drinking only a little is the least likely condition (in the scalar model of drinking to various degrees) to lead to your boss firing you, and yet it will lead to your boss firing you. (§17.3.3)

**scalar model (sem):** a range of situations that can be ranked from “weakest” to “strongest”, that is, least informative to most informative, on some relevant scale for the meaning of a sentence. *Example: He won’t eat shrimp, let alone squid* makes sense by invoking a scalar model of “things that you would not expect someone to be willing to eat”, such that being unwilling to eat shrimp is at the “strong”, more informative, end of the scalar model, and being unwilling to eat squid is at the “weak”, less informative end of the scalar model (in a culture where eating squid is considered more repulsive than eating shrimp). (§17.3.3)

**second person pronoun (cxn):** a personal pronoun used to refer contextually to a person in their role as addressee. The term is conventionally used also to refer to a group of persons, one of whom is the addressee, as long as the group does not also include the speaker; if the speaker is included, then the pronoun is a **first person pronoun.** *Example: you* is a second person pronoun, referring to the addressee or a group including the addressee but not the speaker. (§3.1.1)

**secondary object category (str):** the morphosyntactic category in the indirective alignment system that exclusively expresses the **T role.** *Example: in Huichol nee uuki uukari ne-wa-puuzeiyastia ‘I showed the man to the girls’, uuki ‘man’ is exclusively expressed by the absence of indexation on the verb form ne-wa-puuzeiyastia ‘I showed them’. (§7.5.2)

Secondary predicate see **depictive complex predicate, resultative complex predicate**

**secundative (ditransitive) alignment (str):** a system in which the P and R roles are expressed with the same form, but the T role is expressed with a different form. *Example: in Huichol nee uuki uukari ne-wa-puuzeiyastia ‘I showed the man to the girls’, the index wa- ‘3PL’ is the same used to index tiiri ‘children’ in uukaraawiciizi tiiri me-wa-zeiya ‘The women see the children’*. (§7.5.2)

**selecting (inf):** a subtype of modification that picks out the **instance** or set of instances of the type that the speaker intends to refer to. Usually performed by **numerals** and **quantifiers**, as well other related concepts. (Dik 1997 uses this term for choosing.) (§4.1.1, §4.1.3)

**semantic classes:** a category of concepts. *Example: humans are a semantic class.* (§1.2.2)

**semantic content see meaning**

**semantic information packaging (IP) strategy (str):** a strategy found with nonprototypical construction types, such as predicate nominal constructions which express predication of an object concept. The prototypical IP strategy is to recruit the strategy used for the prototypical information packaging function of the (actual) information packaging in the nonprototypical construction. *Example: in the*
English Predicate Nominal Construction exemplified by *Rich is an excellent violinist*, the semantic object concept *violinist* that is being predicted recruits the construction used for object reference, the prototypical object construction: it is preceded by the article *an* and the adjective *excellent*. The semantic IP strategy contrasts with the actual IP strategy and the hybrid IP strategy. (§2.4)

**semantic map model**: a model for representing of semantic relationships among functions that are co-expressed across the world’s languages. The semantic relationships form a conceptual space that is represented in a network (in mathematical terms, a graph). The co-expression of functions by a particular language form is represented by a semantic map encircling the nodes of the graph/network that represent the co-expressed functions. (§3.5)

**semantic map**: a representation of the set of functions in a conceptual space that are co-expressed by a particular form in a particular language, usually by a line encircling the set of functions in the conceptual space. A semantic map represents a language-specific morphosyntactic category. It is part of the semantic map model. (§3.5)

**semantic role (aka thematic role) (sem)**: a generalization across participant roles that are semantically similar from one event class to another. Example: many events involve a person who volitionally initiates the event, and this more general role is typically called the ‘agent’ role. (§6.1.1)

**semantically specific**: see pragmatically nonspecific (but semantically specific) (indefinite)

**semi-active (aka accessible, tracking) (inf)**: a referent whose discourse file has been activated (i.e. it is in short-term memory), but is not at the center of the hearer’s consciousness at the current point in the discourse. The term ‘recognition’ is used for a referent so peripheral to the hearer’s consciousness that the speaker is unsure if the hearer remembers it. (§3.3.1)

**sensation event (sem)/verb (cxn)**: an experiential event involving an internal bodily or physiological sensation; and a verb that expresses such an event. Example: *My head aches* is an example of a sensation event, and *ache* is the sensation verb. (§7.4)

**separative comparative (str)**: a fixed-case strategy in comparative constructions in which there is a clause which attributes a gradable predicative scale to the comparee, and the standard is expressed as an oblique argument phrase with a spatial case marker with an ablative (‘from’) meaning. Example: Mundari sadom-ete hati mananga-i ‘The elephant is bigger than the horse’ is an instance of the separative comparative: *hati mananga-i* asserts that the elephant is big, and *sadom-ete* expresses the standard, the horse, with a suffix -ete meaning ‘from’. (§17.2.2)

**serial verb strategy (str)**: a strategy for expressing an eventive complex predicate with two (or more) elements, each expressing an event, without overt coding of the relation between the two elements via a third linking morpheme. The serial verb strategy, that is, expression of an eventive complex predicate without an overt linking morpheme, combines with strategies for expressing the two event elements involving contiguity, incorporation and locus of inflection. Example: Sranan Kofi naki Amba kiri ‘Kofi killed [lit. hit kill] Amba’ contains two event elements, *naki* ‘hit’ and *kiri* ‘kill’, without any linking morpheme. (§13.2.2)

**set-member term (cxn)**: a form that specifies a member or members of a designated set, usually previously presented in the discourse or inferable from it, which has some
sort of ordering. Example: in the next question, next is a set-member term. Other set-member terms include last, another, (the) other, and the ordinal numerals. (§4.1.3)

setting (inf): the place where the actors and props are located and the predicated action(s) take place, and the times at which the actions take place. Settings are not typically referred to multiple times, but they play an important role in organizing discourse, especially narratives. (§3.4.1)

shape term (cxn): a modifier expressing a concept of physical shape or form. Example: round is an English shape term. (§4.1.2)

simple contrast (sem): a semantic relation between two events in which there is only a simple contrast, or a construal of a simple contrast, between the two. Simple contrast is considered the prototype for adversative coordination. Example: Ponapean i laid ah e meir [I fish conj he sleep] ‘I fished, but he slept’, is an instance of simple contrast. (§15.2.1)

simple predicate applicative strategy see monoclausal applicative strategy

simple predicate causative strategy see monoclausal causative strategy

simple strategy (str): a strategy for encoding the relation in major propositional acts (modifier-referent, predicate-argument), that does not involve the presence of a third morpheme. Simple strategies include juxtaposition, compounding and affixation. (§4.2)

simultaneous (aka overlap) (sem): the semantic relation between two events where two events temporally coincide or overlap. Example: He sang while she played the banjo is a figure-ground construal of the simultaneous relation in an adverbial clause construction, and He sang and she played the banjo is a complex figure construal of the relation in a coordinate clause construction. (§15.3.1)

situating (inf): a subtype of modification that picks out a particular referent by situating it in physical space (deixis) or in the (knowledge/belief) mental space of the interlocutors (information status). (§4.1.1)

situation see event

situational see deixis

slot see role

SOA see event

sociative causation (sem): a causative event in which the relationship between the causer and the causee is more symmetrical, so that the two agents are performing the action more jointly. Example: I helped the students fill out the questionnaire is an instance of sociative causation. (§9.2)

sortal classifier (str): the third morpheme in a classifier strategy. Example: in Chrau du tong aq ‘one crossbow’, tong is a sortal classifier for long objects that refers to the crossbow (aq) and combines with the modifier du ‘one’. A sortal classifier contrasts with a mensural classifier in that it does not measure out an amount of the object (crossbow), it simply classifies it by its type or sort. A repeater is a special type of sortal classifier. (§5.2.2)

special form (str): a highly grammaticalized strategy for encoding the relation in major propositional acts (modifier-referent, predicate-argument), in which one of the two elements is in a morphologically distinct form. Example: in Syrian Arabic ḥazz-zaλame ‘that fellow’s story’, the Construct Form ḥazz ‘story’ is an example of a special form used in this nominal modifier construction. (§4.5)
special P strategy (*str*): a strategy of the passive-inverse voice construction in which the P participant is encoded by a form that is not found for either the A participant or the P participant in the basic voice construction. Example: in Upriver Halkomelem ᾶs-l-ɬəm ṭûk’a ṭɔ swiyoqə ‘She was bumped into by the man’, the P participant (the woman referred to by ‘she’) is indexed by the suffix -əm, which is distinct from the expression of A or P participants in the basic voice construction. (§8.3)

specialized transitive recruitment (*str*): the strategy of recruiting the transitive construction to use as a reflexive construction or a reciprocal construction but with a special form functioning as the object argument phrase. Examples: English I saw myself and Mary and Sue praised each other recruit the English Transitive Construction with special object forms myself and each other to express reflexive events and reciprocal events respectively. (§7.2)

species term (*cxn*): a mensural term that selects an subtype or variety of the referent category. Example: in many flavors of ice cream, flavor(s) is a species term. (§4.1.3)

specific known referent (*inf/pronoun*): a real-world referent whose identity is known to the speaker but not the hearer. Example: if Masha met with someone near the university is used in a context where the speaker knows the identity of the person Masha met, then someone is a specific known pronoun expressing a specific known referent. (§3.5)

specific unknown referent (*inf/pronoun*): a real-world referent whose identity is known neither to the speaker nor the hearer. Example: if Masha met with somebody near the university is used in a context where the speaker does not know the identity of the person Masha met, then somebody is a specific unknown pronoun expressing a specific unknown referent. (§3.5)

speech act causal relation (*sem/construction*): the semantic relation in a conditional, causal, concessive or conditional concessive construction that expresses a relation between a condition on performing a speech act and the performance of that speech act; and the construction expressing that relation. Example: in Since you asked, ten isn’t a prime number, there is a speech act causal relation between the request of the speaker whether ten is a prime number, and the performance of the speech act asserting that ten isn’t a prime number. A speech act causal relation contrasts with a content causal relation and an epistemic causal relation. (§17.3.1)

speech act situation: the context in which speaking occurs. The speech act situation includes the roles of speaker and hearer; their spatial location; the time of the speech event; the shared knowledge of the speaker and hearer; and the social roles of the speaker and hearer and their social relation to each other. Many linguistic constructions have their meanings defined in whole or part by elements of the speech act situation, in particular contextual referring expressions. (§3.1.1)

speech acts (*inf/cxn*): speech acts package the propositional content of the utterance in such a way that the speaker wants or requires an explicit response from the addressee with respect to the propositional content; and the constructions used to express this function. The speech acts that are most likely to be expressed as distinct constructions are the declarative, the interrogative, the imperative-hortative and its negative the prohibitive, and the exclamative. (§12.1)
split argument structure strategy (str): a strategy found in complement clause constructions in which the argument structure construction associated with the complement-taking predicate is completely distinct from the argument structure construction associated with the complement predicate. Example: the sentence Terry believes that the company will give her a raise next month uses a split argument structure strategy: the CTP believes has its own Subject (Terry) and Object (the complement clause), and the complement predicate will give has its own Subject (the company), Objects (her and a raise), and Oblique (next month). (§18.4.1)

split structure (str): a strategy found for the expression of thetic constructions. In a split structure, the information normally expressed as the comment or predicate in a topic-comment construction may be expressed in a different form, usually some sort of subordinate clause-like form. The information normally expressed as the topic in the topic-comment construction may be expressed in a different form, usually with a presentational construction; or both types of information are expressed differently. Example: in French Voilà la sirène qui hurle [lit. ‘There’s a siren that’s wailing’] ‘The SIREN is wailing’, the interruption thetic construction expresses the participant (the siren) in a presentational construction, and expresses the event in a relative clause construction. (§11.3.2)

spontaneous event (sem)/verb (cxn): a monovalent event involving a participant that undergoes a change without an external cause; and the verb expressing that event. Examples: dying and melting are spontaneous events and die and melt are spontaneous event verbs. (§6.3.4, §7.2)

SS see same-subject

stable (sem): a concept that describes something that persists over time, and is construed be a relatively inherent characteristic of the object over its lifetime. Example: being smart or being heavy (of a stone slab) are stable states. The stability of states is a matter of construal; a state construed as stable may change, for example, a tall tree whose top is broken off. (§2.1)

STAMP strategy (str): a strategy found with auxiliary constructions in which the auxiliary element expressing TAMP is morphologically combined with the subject phrase, usually a subject pronoun, rather than with the verb of the auxiliary construction. Example: English I’ll think about it, the future auxiliary will is reduced and combined morphologically with the subject pronoun I. (§13.4)

standard (sem): in a comparative construction or equative construction, the referent whose position on the gradable predicative scale serves as the reference point for the position of the comparee on the predicative scale. Example: in Your cat is bigger than my dog, the dog serves the standard for the position of the cat on the scale of size: it is asserted that the cat exceeds the dog on that scale. (§17.2.1)

state (sem): a concept which is relational and stative but transitory. Example: being sick or being happy are examples of states: they are stative but the states come and go of the object they apply to. (§2.1)

state of affairs see event

stative (sem): a concept construed as not involving change over the time course of the event. Example: being tall does not involve any change over the time course being described. (§2.1, §6.2.1)

stative category see inactive category
stative complex predicate (cxn): a complex predicate in which one element of the complex predicate denotes a process but the other element of the complex predicate denotes a state somehow associated with the process. Stative complex predicates are divided into resultative complex predicates, depictive complex predicates and manner complex predicates; manner complex predicates include ideophones when they are a part of a complex predicate. (§13.1.2, §14.1)

stimulus (sem): the participant in an experiential event which stimulates the internal mental or bodily experience in the experiencer. Example: in Freddy saw the bear, the bear is the stimulus. (§6.1.2, §7.4)

stimulus-oriented (aka experencer-object) strategy (str): a strategy for an experiential construction in which the stimulus argument phrase is co-expressed with the subject argument phrase of a transitive or intransitive construction. Example: the argument structure construction found in Dogs frighten me, with the stimulus argument phrase Dogs co-expressed with the prototypical subject in English, is an instance of the stimulus-oriented strategy. (§7.4)

strategy: a construction in a language (or any language), used to express a particular combination of semantic content and information packaging, that is further distinguished by certain characteristics of morphosyntactic form that can be defined in a crosslinguistically consistent fashion. Example: the English Predicate Nominal Construction, illustrated by Sam is a bloodhound, uses the inflecting copula strategy, a particular type of morphosyntactic structure, to express the predicate nominal construction. (§1.4)

structural coding: the number of morphemes used to express the function of a construction. Example: in Harry’s car, the clitic -’s express the function of modification by an object concept, and so is an example of structural coding of modification by one morpheme. (§2.5)

subcategorizing (inf): a subtype of modification supporting the basic categorizing function of common nouns. Usually performed by property concepts. (§4.1.1, 4.1.2)

subject argument (inf): the most salient argument (and hence core argument) of a predication. Example: in Emily slept and Emily read the paper, Emily is the subject (core) argument. (§6.1.1, §6.3.2)

subject identity (cxn): a complex sentence construction in which the subject refers to the two clauses are coreferential. Example: Sumie patted the dog and hit the cat is an instance of a subject identity coordinate clause construction: the subject referent for both patted the dog and hit the cat is Sumie. (§16.5)

subject phrase (cxn): the argument phrase expressing the most salient core argument in an argument structure construction. Example: in Emily slept and Emily read the paper, Emily is the subject. §6.1.1, §6.3.2)

subject-oblique strategy (aka extended intransitive) (str): an argument structure strategy that co-expresses the first participant role of the event with the subject of the transitive construction, but does not co-express the second participant role with the object of the transitive construction; that is, the second participant role is expressed by an oblique phrase. Example: She walked towards the tree is an instance of the subject-oblique strategy for the motion event expressed by walked: the figure participant She is expressed as a subject phrase, and the ground participant the tree is expressed as an oblique phrase. (§7.3.1)
subjective \(\text{(sem)}\): describing a entity from the implicit perspective of the speaker and the speech event, e.g. the speech event time. Example: in the subjective epistemic modal construction Wendy might be in Santa Fe, the uncertainty about Wendy being in Santa Fe is that of the speaker at the time of the speech event, although neither of these pieces of information (the speaker or the time of the speech event) are explicitly expressed in the sentence. (§12.3.4)

subordinate clause \(\text{(cxn)}\): a clause that is not pragmatically asserted, in contrast to a main clause. Example: in She watered the plants before she ate lunch, the clause before she ate lunch is a subordinate clause. A subordinate clause is typically also a dependent clause, but a matrix clause may be a subordinate clause (for example, if it is dependent on a third clause), and a dependent clause may be pragmatically asserted, i.e. function as a main clause. (§15.1.2).

subsequent role \(\text{(sem)}\): a participant role that is subsequent to the participant role expressed as object in the causal chain/causal structure of an event. Example: in Terry made lunch for Sandy, Sandy is subsequent to the lunch in the foodmaking causal chain (Terry → lunch → Sandy), and the lunch is expressed as object. (§6.1.2)

substance term see material term

substitutive \(\text{(sem)}\): the semantic relation between two events where one event is characterized by the substitution of a second event that is not normally a part of the first event. Example: We barbecued chicken at home instead of going out to eat is a figure-ground construal of the simultaneous relation in an adverbial clause construction, and We didn’t go out to eat, and barbecued chicken at home (instead) is a complex figure construal of the relation in a coordinate clause construction. In the figure-ground construal, the substituted event is construed as the ground. (§15.3.1)

subtractive \(\text{(sem)}\): the semantic relation between two events where one event is additionally characterized by the absence of a second event that is normally a part of the first event. In this respect, the subtractive relation is somewhat like a “negative” version of the additive relation. Example: He did all the problems correctly except (that) he missed the proof on the last one is a figure-ground construal of the simultaneous relation in an adverbial clause construction, and He did all the problems correctly but he missed the proof on the last one is a complex figure construal of the relation in a coordinate clause construction. In the figure-ground construal, the absent event is construed as the ground. (§15.3.1)

summarizer \(\text{(str)}\): a form used as part of an exhaustive coordination construction that indicates that the list is exhaustive. Example: in Classical Tibetan lus ḋag yid gsum [body speech mind three] ‘body, speech and mind’, the numeral functions as a summarizer for the exhaustive list. (§15.2.2)

summary conjunction see exhaustive list coordination

superlative form \(\text{(cxn)}\): indicates the most extreme value on a property scale for the relevant referents. Example: in most expensive, most indicates the highest value on the expensiveness scale for the relevant set of objects. (§4.1.2)

support verb \(\text{(aka light verb, coverb)}\) construction \(\text{(cxn)}\): an eventive complex predicate in which one of the elements, the support verb, has undergone semantic change, specifically semantic generalization, such that it makes a minimal semantic contribution to the meaning of the whole complex predicate. This element no longer
denotes a separate subevent of the whole event, unlike in basic eventive complex predicates. The verb forms in a support verb construction are also in a relatively idiosyncratic semantic relationship. Example: in English Frances Patterson underwent an operation at RMH today, underwent an operation is an instance of a support verb construction. The element other than the support verb is often in a nominalized or other form that is unlike the form of a simple (predicated) verb. (§13.5)

support verb (cxn): the element in a support verb construction that has undergone semantic change, specifically semantic generalization, such that it makes a minimal semantic contribution to the meaning of the whole complex predicate. Example: in English They had a drink, had is the support verb in the support verb construction had a drink. Copulas are analyzed as a subtype of a support verb. (§13.5)

switch-reference system (str): an absolute deranking system where the same-subject and different-subject reference-tracking constructions systematically use different deranked constructions. Example: in Tauya nono imai-te-pa ai mene-a-te pai a/ate-pa… ‘She carried the child and came and stayed, they hit [=killed] the pigs and…’ imai-te-pa [(3SG)-carry-get-SS] is a deranked predicate form with the same-subject deranking morpheme -pa since the following subject is also ‘she’, and mene-a-te [stay-3sg-DS] is a deranked predicate from with the different-subject deranking morpheme -te since the following subject switches to ‘they’. (§16.4)

symmetric see complex figure

syndetic (str): the combination of clauses in complex sentence constructions, and of coordinands in coordinate constructions (whether the coordinands are clauses or not), by an overt free or clitic morpheme. Example: She picked up the pieces and dumped them in the wastebasket is an instance of syndetic clause coordination, due to the presence of the coordinator and. Syndetic coordination may be monosyndetic or bisyndetic. (§15.2.2)

syntax: the analysis of the internal structure of utterances/sentences, more specifically, how words are put together. Example: the stolen succulents is analyzed as a referring expression consisting of the head succulents, a preposed modifier stolen and the initial definite article the. (§1.1)

system (str): a set of two or more different strategies for different though closely related constructions that are defined by sets of morphosyntactic similarities (especially co-expression) and differences between the strategies for the different constructions. Example: switch-reference systems represent a set of strategies for same-subject and different-subject reference-tracking constructions. (§1.4)

T role (sem): the theme central participant role in a transfer event, that is, the participant that is transferred from the agent (A) to the recipient (R). Example: in Randy gave the car to his daughter, the car is in the T role. (§7.5.2)

tag (str): a strategy for polarity question constructions which consists of a word or phrase added to the clause functioning to signal that the clause expresses a polarity question. Example: in the Russian polarity question Ty ego slyšal, pravda? [lit. ‘You heard him, true?’] pravda ‘true?’ is the tag. Tags typically make the polarity question into a biased question, unlike a simple interrogative marker. (§12.3.2)

TAMP (sem): an abbreviation for the set of semantic categories of tense, aspect, modality and polarity, which primarily describe certain semantic characteristic of
the event denoted by a predicate. TAMP is morphosyntactically generally associated with the predicate, typically as a predicate inflection or expressed in an auxiliary construction. (§13.1.2)

target (str): in a construction using the indexation strategy, the element of the construction with which the index is combined, usually as an affix. Example: in Spanish los libros rojos ‘the red books’, the target is the modifier rojos ‘red’, which has the Masculine Plural index –os suffixed to it. (§4.4)

telic (sem): an event in which the relevant participant ends up in a “natural” result state. Example: in I crossed the street, the natural result state is reaching the other side of the street, and the event is telic. (§6.2.1)

temporary state (sem)/predicate (cxn): the event class of stative properties that are temporary and thus have come about through some process; and the predicates that express events in this class. Example: being sick is a temporary state, and (be) sick is a temporary state predicate. (§6.3.3)

tense (sem): a grammatical category, typically an inflectional category, that expresses the location of an event in time, usually with respect to the time of the speech act situation. In this textbook, tense is discussed primarily with respect to the expression of TAMP categories. (§6.2.1, §13.4)

tense iconicity (str): a strategy in which the temporal sequence of the clauses in a sentence necessarily mirrors the consecutive temporal relation of the events denoted by the clauses. Example: in He washed the car and drove to the party, the temporal order of the clauses He washed the car and drove to the party mirrors the consecutive temporal relation of the events. (§15.1.3)

tests (for word classes and other grammatical categories) see construction

thecy metaphor (inf): a metaphor used to describe the information status of referents in discourse, especially narrative discourse. The theater metaphor divides referents into three categories: actors, props and settings. (§3.4.1)

thematic role see semantic role

theme (sem): a semantic role including participant roles for a participant that is the transferred entity in a transfer event. Example: in I sent the forms to the accountant, the forms is the entity transferred. The term ‘theme’ is also used for the participant functioning as the figure in motion, application, removal and other events involving the movement of the participant. (§6.1.2)

thetic (aka all new) (inf/cxn): information packaging that does not split the information into a topic and a comment, as is done in the topic-comment information packaging; and the construction that expresses that information packaging. Instead, the information is presented as a single whole, hence the alternative name ‘all new’. Example: in TRUMP was elected! (with accent on Trump), uttered on November 9, 2016, is thetric, in that this information is expressed as all new, in this case because it was unexpected at the time. (§10.1.2, §11.1, §11.3.1)

third person pronoun (cxn): a personal pronoun used to refer contextually to a person that is neither the speaker nor an addressee, or group of persons that does not include the speaker or addressee. Example: they is a third person pronoun, referring to a group none of whom are the speaker or the addressee. (§3.1.1)

time-stability (sem): a scale of semantic event types that combines the two aspectual features of stative/dynamic and persisting/transitory. The scale, from most time-
stable to least time-stable, is: stative & stable > stative & transitory > dynamic & transitory. (§10.2)

**Token frequency**: the frequency of occurrence of specific constructions (morphemes, words, larger units) in language use, usually measured operationally as the frequency of occurrence in a particular corpus. (§2.5)

**Token identity (sem)**: two referents are the same individual. Example: in I picked up a red candy and gave it to Greg, the referent of it is the same individual as the referent of a red candy. Contrasts with **type identity**. (§5.4)

**Token see individual**

**Topic (inf)**: in a **topic-comment information packaging**, the topic is the **referent** that the **comment** is **predicated** about. Example: in Bill is a teacher, being a teacher is predicated about the referent Bill. A topic is a referent; arguably, all referents are topics, although some referents are more topical and others are less topical. (§10.1.2)

**Topic continuity** see **accessibility**

**Topic phrase (cxn)**: a **referring phrase** that refers to the **topic**, usually applied to a phrase that is distinct in form and **role** from the subject phrase. Example: in Japanese Nihon wa syuto ga sumiyoi ‘As for Japan, its capital is a good place to live’, Nihon wa [Japan TOP] is a topic phrase marked by the topic marker wa.

**Topic (aka double subject, distributed subject) possessive strategy (str)**: a strategy for the **presentational possession construction** in which the **possessor** is expressed as a **topic phrase**, and the **possessum** is expressed in a **subject phrase**, usually the subject of a **verb** glossed as ‘exist’. Example: Cupeño neʔ ne-mixen ?iket miyexwe [I my net is] ‘I have a net’ is an instance of the topic possessive strategy, with ‘I’ expressed in a topic phrase and ‘my net’ in a subject phrase. (§10.4.2)

**Topic-comment (aka categorical) (inf/cxn)**: the **information packaging** in which one concept (the **comment**) is **predicated** of another concept which is **referred** to (the **topic**); and the **construction** that expresses that information packaging. Example: The bus stopped is an instance of a topic-comment construction in which **stopped** is the comment and **The bus** is the topic. Topic-comment information packaging is basically synonymous with **predication**; the term ‘topic-comment’ highlights the fact that a predication is a predication about a **referent**. (§2.2.2., §10.1.2, §11.1, §11.2.1)

**Topic-locational hybrid possessive strategy (str)**: a strategy for the **presentational possession construction** in which the **possessum** is expressed in a **subject phrase**, usually the subject of a **verb** glossed as ‘exist’, and the **possessor** is expressed both as a **topic phrase** and as a **locative argument phrase** (like the **locational possessive strategy**) **coreferential** with the topic phrase. Example: Eastern Tarafit lyula ttuya yr-es idž n wozeuq [ogress was at-her one of little_donkey] ‘The ogress had a little donkey’ is an instance of the topic-locational hybris possessive strategy: the ogress is expressed as both a topic phrase lyula and as a coreferential locative argument phrase yr-es ‘at her’. (§10.4.2)

**Topicality (inf)** see **salience**

tracking see **semi-active**

**Transfer event (sem)/verb (cxn)**: a **trivalent event** involving physical transfer, usually also extended to “mental transfer”, that is used in defining the **ditransitive**
construction; and a verb that expresses such an event. *Examples:* giving and sending are physical transfer events (and *give* and *send* are transfer verbs), and showing and telling are “mental transfer” events (and *show* and *tell* are “mental transfer” verbs). (§7.5.1)

**transitive construction** (aka monotransitive construction) *(cxn):* the *construction* used to express the *agent* *(A role)* and the *patient* *(P role)* of the *predicated bivalent* breaking event when the agent is more *salient* than the patient and the breaking event is a single, completed event. *Example:* Jack broke the window is an instance of the exemplar (the single “most prototypical” example) of the transitive construction. (§6.1.2, §6.2.1, §7.3.3)

**transitive predication** *(inf):* a *predication* predicated of two *salient* arguments.  
*Example:* in *Sarah was writing a letter*, writing is a transitive predication because it is predicated of two arguments, Sarah and the letter. (§6.1.2)

**transitive recruitment** *(str):* the *strategy* of recruiting the *transitive construction* to use as a *reflexive construction* or a *reciprocal construction*. *Examples:* the Sàfverborm *ir-ben-ir [3DU-shoot-3DU] ‘They shoot them/they shoot themselves/they shoot each other’ uses the transitive construction (‘They shoot them’) to express either a *reflexive event* (‘The shoot themselves’) or a *reciprocal event* (‘They shoot each other’). (§7.2)

**Transitivity Hierarchy:** a ranking of *events* by their likelihood to be expressed by the *transitive construction* (the “more transitive” end of the hierarchy) or a *subject-oblique construction* (the “less transitive” end of the hierarchy). (§7.3.3)

**transitivity-based causative strategies** *(str):* *monoclausal strategies* for the *causative construction* in which the *causee* in the *causative event* is coded differently depending on the *valency* of the corresponding *base event*. *Example:* in Turkish, the causee in a causative event is encoded in the Accusative Case if the base event is *monovalent* (*Ali Hasan-t öl-dür-dü ‘Ali killed Hasan [ACC]’*), and in the Dative Case if the base event is *bivalent* (*Dişçi mektub-u müdür-e imzala-t-ti ‘The dentist got the director [DAT] to sign the letter’*). (§9.2)

**transitory** *(sem):* a concept that describes something that “comes and goes” over time. 
*Example:* being cold is a state that may be true of a person at some point in time but not true at another point in time.

**translation:** in an example presented with an *interlinear morpheme translation*, the meaning of an example from the language being analyzed, expressed in the *metalanguage* being used in the text. (§1.6)

**transmission of force** *(sem): see causal chain*

**trigger** *(inf):* a concept evoked or inferrable in the prior discourse that is a member of a *poset* that also includes the *link*. *Example:* in the exchange *Do you like this album? Yeah, this song I really like*, the album mentioned in the first turn is the trigger that generates a poset together with the song mentioned in the second turn; the latter serves as the link to the trigger. (§11.2.3)

**tripartite alignment** *(str):* a *co-expression strategy* in which all three of the A, P and S roles are expressed with different forms. Tripartite alignment is extremely rare. (§6.3.1)

**trivalent event** *(sem):* an event with a *valency* of three, that is, with three central participant roles. *Example:* giving is a trivalent event. (§6.1.2)
truth-value focus construction see polarity focus construction

**type (sem):** a general concept that generally subsumes multiple instances (individuals).

*Example:* the category of tables is a type. (§3.1.1)

**type identifiable (inf):** a referent in nonreal “world” or mental space (desire, hypothetical, negative etc.) whose individual identity is unknown to speaker and hearer; all that is known about the nonreal referent is its type, as provided by the common noun and any modifiers in the referring phrase. *Example:* in *An undergraduate student may take this course*, all that is known about the possible referent is that he or she belongs to the type ‘undergraduate student’. (§3.5)

**type identity (sem):** two referents are of the same type but is not the same individual.

*Example:* in *I took a red candy and Greg took a green one*, the referent of *green one* is the same type as the referent of *red candy*, but is a different individual. (§5.4)

**typifying (aka non-anchoring) construction (cxn):** a nominal modification construction that is not an anchoring construction, in that the object modifier is only type identifiable, the modifier-head combination refers to a subclass of a broader class, and the head cannot be identified via its relation to the modifier. *Example:* women’s magazine is an instance of a typifying construction: women does not refer to a specific set of women; the phrase as a whole denotes a particular subclass of magazines; and the referent of magazine cannot be identified by the modifier women’s. (§5.2.1)

**typifying (inf):** the information-packaging function whereby an object modifier subclassifies the object concept of the head noun that it modifies. *Example:* in women’s magazine, the object modifier expressed by women’s subclassifies the type of magazine that the referring phrase as a whole refers to. Typifying is the object modifying variant of the subcategorizing function.

**typology:** an approach to the study of language that starts from the diversity of grammatical structures across the languages of the world, and derives general patterns found in that diversity. (§1.1)

**uncontrolled activity (sem)/predicate (cxn):** the event class of activities not under the control of an agent (apart from uncontrolled bodily actions and change of state); and the predicates that express events in this class. *Example:* dying is an uncontrolled activity, and die is an uncontrolled activity predicate. (§6.3.3)

undergoer see inactive category

**undirected change (sem):** an event in which the change that a participant undergoes in the course of an event is not in any particular “direction”. *Example:* in *The ball was bouncing in the playpen* the ball does not undergo an incremental or “directed” change in either vertical or horizontal direction: the vertical motion is up and down, and the horizontal motion goes in any direction. (§6.2.1)

**unexpected cooccurrence (sem):** a semantic relation between two events in which two events are juxtaposed and the second event is unexpected. Unexpected cooccurrence is often expressed with adversative coordination. *Example:* Russian *Vanja prostudilsja, no poshël v shkolu* [Vanja caught_cold CONJ went to school] ‘Vanja caught a cold, but went to school’ is an instance of the unexpected occurrence relation, using a coordinator no which is distinct from the coordinator a which is used for simple contrast. (§15.2.1)
universal pronoun (cxn): universal pronouns express when the predication applies to all referents in a set determined by the type description provided by the pronoun. Example: Everyone left the room predicates of all members of a contextually determined set of people (indicated by -one) that they left the room. (§3.5)

utterance event (sem)/predicate (cxn): an event of saying in which one participant is the speaker of the utterance and another participant is the utterance itself; and the predicate expressing such an event. Example: in Sandy said, “I’m buying the house”, said denotes the utterance event. Some predicates denoting utterance events include the addressee as an argument, as in Sandy told me that she’s buying the house. (§18.2.2)

vague numeral (cxn): a form used to select a set of countable entities, but not by their precise cardinality. Example: in several ravens, several is a vague numeral. (§4.1.3)

valency, valency class, (sem): a class of events based on the number of central participant roles in the event, also described as the valency of an event. Events are divided into three valency classes: monovalent events, bivalent events, and trivalent events. (§6.1.2)

value term (cxn): a modifier expressing a concept of value or quality. Examples: good and bad are English value terms. (§4.1.2)

verb (cxn): the head of a verbal clause, that is, a clause that denotes an action. Example: the word jumped in the clause She jumped, is a verb: it is an action word that is the head of the clause and is predicative of She. (§2.2.3, §6.1.1)

verb-coding strategy (str): a strategy for the expression of the semantic role of the necessarily shared participant in the event denoted by relative clause of an externally headed relative clause construction, in which the predicate of the relative clause uses different voice forms in order to specify the semantic role of the shared participant in the relative clause event. Example: in Luganda ekiso [John kye yattisa enkoko] ‘the knife with which John killed the chicken’, the predicate kye yattisa ‘killed’ contains the instrumental applicative suffix -is that indicates that the relative clause head ekiso ‘knife’ denotes the instrument participant in the killing event. Comrie (2003) restricts verb-coding strategies to languages which use voice forms that are exclusively found in relative clause constructions (and thus would exclude the Luganda example); we follow the broader definition introduced in Keenan (1972). (§19.3)

verb-framing strategy (str): a strategy for expressing motion events such that the path of motion is expressed by a path verb. Example: The guests entered the reception hall uses the verb-framing strategy: the path verb enter describes a path of motion event. (§7.3.1)

verbal clause (cxn): a clause whose head denotes an action concept. Example: She popped the balloon is a verbal clause; the head popped denotes an action concept. A verbal clause is the prototypical clause, and its head is a verb. (§2.2.3)

verbal contrast (inf): a subtype of parallel contrast in which the predicates in the two propositions have opposite meanings, while other parallel components of the proposition are members of posets. Example: in We will give our daughters to you and we will take your daughters for ourselves, the verbs ‘give’ and ‘take’ have opposite meanings, and the other parallel parts of the two propositions that differ form the posets {our daughters, your daughters} and {you, ourselves}. (§11.4.1)
verbal copula (str): a strategy used for nonprototypical predication, that uses a morpheme different from the object concept word, the copula, which is inflected for at least some of the categories that prototypical predication constructions in the language—that is, predication constructions headed by a verb—also inflect for. Example: in the English Predicate Nominal Construction, illustrated by Sam is a bloodhound, is is a copula that inflects for person, number and tense like English Verbs do. (§1.4, §10.2).

verbal noun see deranked

verbal strategy (str): the strategy of recruiting what was originally the action predication construction for nonprototypical predication. It is presumed that an originally action predication construction lacks an auxiliary, and it expresses certain grammatical categories, in particular person indexation and negation. Example: Nahuatl ni-ti:citl [1sg-doctor] ‘I am a doctor’ recruits the action predication construction for object predication; cf. ni-cho:ca [1sg-cry] ‘I am crying’. (§10.2)

verbalization (of experience): a model of how experiences are expressed in language developed by Chafe (1977 and later publications) and elaborated in Croft (2007a). In this book, one part of this model, particularizing, is described with respect to the structure of referring phrases. (§4.1.1)

voice construction (cxn): an argument structure construction that expresses the relationship between the participant roles of an event expressed in a clause and their relative salience (topicality). Examples: The grizzlies ate the salmon and The salmon were eaten by the grizzlies are instances of contrasting voice constructions, the basic voice construction and the nonbasic voice construction (specifically, the passive-inverse construction), which are appropriate in different discourse contexts depending on whether the grizzlies or the salmon is the more salient participant at that point in the discourse. (§6.1.1)

weather (sem): a situation type describing the weather that is typically construed as thetic. Examples: It’s raining and The wind is blowing are expressions of weather. Weather is sometimes described as an event without any (salient) participants. Its tendency to be construed as thetic is attributed to the fact that weather is difficult to divide into a topic and a comment and be construed as topic-comment information packaging. (§11.3.1, §11.3.3)

WH question see information question

wishing event (sem)/predicate (cxn): an evaluative event in which a positive evaluative judgement about a proposition expressed by the complement of the wishing event is made, and there is a negative epistemic stance by the speaker towards the proposition; and the predicate expressing such an event. Example: in Jill wishes that Joe had won the election, the wishing predicate is glad expresses Jill’s evaluation of Joe’s winning the election, and also presupposes that the speaker believes that Joe didn’t win the election. (§18.2.2)

with-possessive strategy (aka companion strategy) (str): a strategy for the presentational possession construction in which the possessor is expressed in a subject phrase, and the possessum is expressed in a comitative phrase. Example: Amele ija sigin ca [I knife with] ‘I have a knife, lit. I am with a knife’ is an instance of the with-possessive strategy. (§10.4.2)
**word class**: the set of words defined by their occurrence in a particular **role** in a **construction**. *Example*: in the English Predicate Adjective Construction [Sbj be PredAdj], illustrated by *She is intelligent*, the PredAdj role defines a word class consisting of all the words that can occur in that role in that construction (happy, tall, asleep, etc.). Word classes are defined by a set of constructions that the words occur in (*aka* distribution, behavior, properties). (§1.2.1) Word classes are **language-specific**. (§1.2.3)

**word order** (*str*): the relative order of two elements in a **construction**. *Example*: in English *red book*, the **adjective** *red* precedes the **noun** *book*; but in Spanish *libro rojo*, the adjective *rojo* ‘red’ follows the noun *libro* ‘book’. (§4.2, §5.3, §6.2.2)

Y/N question see **polarity question**

**yes/no alignment strategy** (*str*): an **alignment strategy** for the **polarity response construction** in which the answer to a negative **polarity question** aligns the polarity of the answer, not the polarity of the speaker’s question. *Example*: in English, the answer to the negative polarity question *Do you not have any money?* where the addressee does not have any money is *No*; the polarity of the response matches the polarity of the answer (that the addressee does not have any money). (§12.3.3)

yes/no see **polarity question**

**yes/no/disagree alignment strategy** (*str*): an **alignment strategy** for the **polarity response construction** in which the answer to a negative **polarity question** aligns the polarity of the answer when the answer is negative, but uses a special disagreeing form when the answer is positive. *Example*: in French, when the question is ‘*Do you not have any money?*’, the answer *non* ‘no’ indicates that the respondent has no money, but the answer *si* (different from the positive answer *oui* ‘yes’) indicates that the respondent disagrees with the speaker and indeed does have money. (§12.3.3)

**zero (coded) strategy** (*str*): a **strategy** in which there is no overt form in the **construction** that encodes the relevant **function** of the construction. *Example*: in the English Adjectival Modification Construction illustrated by *tall trees*, there is no overt form that codes the **modification** function of the **property concept** denoted by *tall*. (§2.4)

**zero anaphora** (*aka* definite null instantiation, DNI, null anaphora) (*cxn*): the absence of a **referring phrase** for a **referent** in a construction. Zero anaphora is frequently used when the referent is **active**. (§3.3.1)

**zero coded voice strategy** (*str*): a **strategy** with any of the different kinds of **voice constructions** in which there is zero **coding** of the **function** of the voice construction on the **verb**. *Example*: *John planted the garden with trees* is an applicative construction without any overt coding of the applicative function on the verb *planted*. (§9.4)

**zero strategy** (*str*): the **strategy** of **recruiting** a **construction** without any overt coding of predication (i.e. no copula), and without any inflection, for different types of **predication**. *Example*: *Tiwi purukupa.lili ma.tina* ‘Purukuparli is boss’ simply juxtaposes the referring phrases for ‘Purukuparli’ and ‘boss’. (§10.2)