THE QUOTATIVE CONSTRUCTION IN KWAZA AND ITS (DE-)GRAMMATICALISATION

Hein van der Voort
Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen/WOTRO

1. Introduction

Kwaza is spoken in Southern Rondônia, Brazil, by about 25 people, most of whom live among the Aikanã of the indigenous reserve Tubarão-Latundê.[1] Kwaza, or in the literature: Koaiá (e.g. Rodrigues 1986), is an unclassified language which has often been considered as isolated, just like its neighbours Aikanã and Kanoê. Almost all the other languages by which it is traditionally surrounded belong to the Tupi and Nambikwara linguistic stocks.

The basic grammatical categories of Kwaza are verbs, nouns and adverbs. Kwaza is a morphologically complex language. Most of the grammar of the language is contained in derivational and inflexional verbal suffixes. Categories like classifiers, directionals, valency changing suffixes and tense, modality and aspect are in Kwaza best regarded as derivational. Main word stress in Kwaza is basically on the last syllable of the (extended) root. The extended root may include derivational morphemes, but in principle no inflexional suffixes. As will be shown in Section 1.1 below, the morphological categories of subject and mood are obligatory and should be considered as inflexional. In addition to person inflexion, corresponding pronouns may be used for emphasis. Word order is relatively free, but SVO is the most frequent order.

In the present article I want to discuss the grammatical characteristics of the most common way in which speech is quoted in Kwaza. I will also discuss other modality-like constructions that show striking similarities to the quotative construction. Furthermore, I will try to provide an explanation for the origin of both the quotative construction and certain modalities. I will not discuss indirect quotation as sometimes attested in nominal argument clauses.

1.1. Argument agreement

The following examples show how the matrix verb in Kwaza sentences is obligatorily inflected for subject person, and optionally for object person or a combination. Note that the third person subject is not expressed. The default value of absent person inflex-

[1] This article is based on data from linguistic fieldwork conducted among the speakers of Kwaza during the years 1995-1998. I am especially indebted to my teacher Kyikãu Mãdɛ who is also known as Mário. I am furthermore very grateful to the inhabitants of the Área Indígena Tubarão-Latundê for their hospitality. The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) has generously financed the entire descriptive project of the Kwaza language under grant nr. 300-72-021. Finally, I want to thank Mily Crevels, Simon van de Kerke, Sérgio Meira and Pieter Muysken for their highly valued comments. It should go without saying that none of these people necessarily shares the views expressed here and that all errors are mine.

ion is either third person subject, or, in imperative sentences, second person. For convenience sake this is symbolised with a *-Ø-*. Consider these examples[2]:

(1) *ˊhã ˊkui-da-ki*
water drink-1S-DEC
'I drank/am drinking water'

(2) *ˊhã ˊkui-xa-ki*
water drink-2 -DEC
'you drank/are drinking water'

(3) *ˊžwãu ˊmɛ̃-hata-Ø-ki xyitsɛ-ˊwã*
João hit-3S2O-3-DEC you.PL-AO
'it was João who beat you'

Kwaza has no copular verbs. Instead, nouns may receive person and mood marking without any intervening morphology. In that case an operation that can be characterised as zero-verbalisation has taken place, and the result conveys the meaning "to be/to want N". Nominalised verbs, pronouns and adverbs can also be zero-verbalised.

Person marking in Kwaza is to be considered as bound inflexional morphology for the following reasons: a) there is a clear formal difference between free personal pronouns and bound person morphemes; b) bound person morphemes cannot be separated from their verbal host by either a change in the order of elements or; c), by the insertion of free forms; d) bound person morphemes are part of the word as an accentual unit; e) the presence of these bound morphemes is necessary for verb formation; f) bound person morphemes do not occur in isolation. The exceptions to criteria c), e) and f) will be discussed in Section 1.5 below. Table I represents the evidence for criterium a):

PERSON	PRONOUNS	MARKERS	USE
1	*ˊsi*	*-da-*	I
2	*ˊxyi*	*-xa-/-Ø-*	you
1+2	*txaˊna*	*-a-*	we [inclusive]
1+3	*tsiˊtsɛ*	*-a-xa-*	we [exclusive]
2+3	*xyiˊtsɛ*	*-xa-(xa)-*	you (PL)
3	*ˊĩ*	*-Ø-*	he, she, it, they
IS		*-wa-*	they, people, it

Table I: Personal pronouns and subject cross-reference

Note that there is no number marking in Kwaza. In the pronominal system there are three basic persons and two "associated" persons. According to this analysis, the distinction between first person plural inclusive and exclusive is explained by the association of a second and a third person respectively. Second person plural is represented in

[2] In the Kwaza examples in this article I have indicated main word stress by an inverted comma [ˊ] preceding the syllable that receives stress (or by a [˝] when another syllable gets secondary stress). Apart from explicit stress marking, the examples are in phonemic notation. The following symbols are used in a special way: /*a*/ represents IPA [a]; /*ɛ*/ = [ɛ]; /*y*/ = [ɨ]; /*j*/ = [j]; /*b*/ = [ɓ]; /*d*/ = [ɗ]; /*D*/ = [d]; /*x*/ = [s̲]; /*c*/ = [t̲]; /*ž*/ = [ʒ]; /~/ = [nasality].

Kwaza by a second person associated with a third person (may be singular or plural). With respect to criterium d), main word stress tends to occur on the last syllable of the root. If the root is extended with derivational morphemes, main word stress is on the last syllable of the last extension. Main word stress is never on the subject cross-reference morphemes, but it does occur on mood morphemes under specific circumstances, which will be mentioned in Section 1.2.

1.2. Matrix clauses: mood or speech acts

The examples above are all in the Declarative mood. Besides the declarative, there are seven other matrix clause moods: the Interrogative, which combines with the entire paradigm of person markers; the Imperative, Volitive and Exhortative, which combine to constitute the Persuasive mood paradigm; the Negative Imperative, Negative Exhortative and Monitory, which together form the Prohibitive mood. The following examples show the morphological expression of these moods:

(4) *ka´wɛ kui-´nã-xa-re*
coffee drink-FUT-2-INT
'will/do you want to drink coffee?'

(5) *´mũu ´kui-a-xa-mỹ*
chicha drink-1P-AS-VOL
'we're going/want to drink chicha!'

(6) *´hã ´kui-a-ni*
water drink-1P-EXH
'let us drink water!'

(7) *ka´wɛ kui-Ø-´ni*
coffee drink-3-EXH
'let him have coffee!'

(8) *ehỹ-´he-a-ni*
do-NEG-1P-NEE
'let's not do that!'

(9) *ay-´hỹ kui-´he-Ø-ky*
that-NOM drink-NEG-2-NEI
'don't drink that!'

(10) *kui-Ø-´tsi*
drink-3-MON
'don't let him drink!'

(11) *kui-Ø -´ra*
drink-2-IMP
'drink!'

Remember that in the (negative) imperative mood cross-reference to the second person subject is not expressed and in the other moods third person subject cross-reference is not expressed. Note that certain morphemes, such as negative *-he-* and future *-nã-*, and certain moods, such as the imperative, usually attract word stress.

1.3. Subordinated clauses: adverbial clauses

Besides mood marking in matrix clauses, there are also certain mood-like morphemes that indicate the specific adverbial status of subordinated clauses: Conditional, Concessive, Additive, Absolutive/Manner, Temporal, Nominal and Contemporative. The following example shows the expression of a concessive adverbial clause:

(12) *awy-ˊhỹ-da-lete ˊba-da-ki*
cold-NOM-1S-CONC cut-1S-DEC
'although I had become cold, I did clear a field'

The next example shows that the element *-tja* (a special variant of cosubordinative *-ta*, that will be further discussed below in Section 1.4) may also indicate that the clause functions as an absolutive/manner adverbial:

(13) *txuˊhũi-Ø-tja hũnũ-ˊdy-da-ki*
small-3-CSO scorch-CAU-1S-DEC
'I burnt the food (just) a little'

1.4. Cosubordinated clauses: medial clauses and switch reference
There is a type of clauses in Kwaza that can be linked to the matrix clause. Such clauses can form long chains and their illocutionary value is often determined by the sentence-final matrix clause. Semantically they are coordinated with the matrix clause, but formally they are subordinated to it. Such constructions are known in the literature (e.g. Foley & Van Valin 1984) as cosubordinated or medial clauses. The following examples show cosubordinated clauses that have the same subject as the matrix clauses:

(14) *biloˊtswa e-ˊhe-da-ta okja-ˊhe-da-ki*
shotgun have-NEG-1S-CSO hunt-NEG-1S-DEC
'I can't hunt because I have no shotgun'

(15) *caˊri-da-ta ˊjo-da-mỹ*
shoot-1S-CSO devour-1S-VOL
'I'm going to shoot and devour him!'

(16) *ˊtswa-wã ˊmɛ̃-Ø-ta eˊmã-Ø-ki*
man-AO beat-3-CSO cry-3-DEC
'(the woman) beat the man and (she) cried'

When the subject differs from that of the next clause in the chain this is morphologically indicated by either a different subject marker or, if the cosubordinated clause has a non-third person subject, a special switch-reference morpheme that occurs in a position normally reserved for mood inflexion. This is shown in the following examples:

(17) *eˊtay tswa-ˊwã ˊmɛ̃-dy-ta eˊmã-Ø-ki ˊtswa*
woman man-AO beat-DS-CSO cry-3-DEC man
'the woman beat the man and the man cried'

(18) *ˈkwɛ-da-si* *hoˈBɛto* *atxitxi-ˈnũ* *waˈdy-ta-Ø -ki*
enter-1S-SWR Roberto maize-porridge give-1O-3-DEC
'I entered and Roberto gave me maize porridge'

A narrative text may consist of one long chain of cosubordinated clauses, terminated by a matrix mood clause, which then functions as a marker of the end of the story.

1.5. Morphological ellipsis and typological characterisation

It is a well-known fact that different criteria for the definition of a word may not always define the same entity in a language (see e.g. Bauer 2000). In Section 1.1 a number of criteria are listed for considering person and mood marking in Kwaza as (inflexional) bound morphemes. There are, however, exceptions to criteria e) and f). Note that under certain specific circumstances verb roots can be omitted in Kwaza:

(19) [Q:] *ˈja-xa-re* [A:] *da-ˈki* [or, complete:] *ˈja-da-ki*
eat-2-INT 1S-DEC eat-1S-DEC
'are you eating?' '(yes) I am' '(yes) I'm eating'

In the small dialogue in (19), the verb root of the answer *ˈjadaki* "I'm eating" can be omitted because the (discourse) context does not leave any doubt as to which verb root is intended. In the result, *daki* "I am", the root *ja-* "to eat" is 'understood', as it were, by all speech participants. In Kwaza, not only roots can be omitted, but inflexions as well.[3] In van der Voort (2000) I have referred to these phenomena as 'morphological ellipsis'. They form exceptions to the claims that e) these bound morphemes are indispensable for verb formation and f) that bound person morphemes do not occur in isolation. Furthermore both types of ellipsis may work together to produce exceptions to criterium c); the uninterruptability of the predicate and bound inflexional suffixes. Finally, cross-linguistically speaking, criterium a) may not be tenable since there are languages such as French, which has cross-reference agreement, free anaphoric particles and free pronouns (as in e.g. *moi, je parle* vs. *toi, tu parles*), and languages such as Karo (Tupi-Ramarama), which has both cross-reference clitics and free pronouns (see Gabas Jr. 1999).

This means that there are at least three morphological criteria on the basis of which one could claim that rather than bound inflexional suffixes, Kwaza has free morphemes that function as auxiliary verbs, particles or clitics. Nevertheless, on the basis of the other criteria mentioned in Section 1.1 one could maintain that Kwaza person and mood are bound morphemes. In the latter analysis, Kwaza is a morphologically complex (largely agglutinative) synthetic language and in the former analysis, Kwaza is a morphologically simple, isolating language. At the present, both analyses seem to be possible.

[3] Kwaza is unlike the neighbouring Tupi languages in that it does not have a special closed category of particle verbs that cannot be inflected (see Moore 2002).

For the time being, I have chosen for a synthetic approach. One of the reasons for this choice is that it results in a relatively transparent and consistent analysis of the language. The present article deals precisely with phenomena that are exceptional in synthetic languages. Furthermore, exceptions to criteria such as e) and f) are not impossible in other, well-established synthetic languages either, such as the Tarramiut dialect of Eastern Canadian Inuktitut (see Allen 1996: 15; 27 n.13; 153 n.12). Finally, my provisional impression is that if the Kwaza person and mood combination were considered as a free particle, the entire grammar of Kwaza would have to be regarded as syntax rather than as morphology. In such an approach, many derivational morphemes should also be seen as free morphemes, and stress placement and word order rules would be greatly complicated. However, for a thorough understanding of the consequences of an isolating approach more research is required.

2. Quoted speech

Kwaza syntax is relatively simple. Word order is rather free, and there are neither conjunctions nor complementisers. Not even quotation of speech involves such grammatical devices. In Kwaza, speech is quoted by repeating literally what was said. The quoted utterance is then embedded in an extra layer of person and mood inflexions that refer to the quoting subject. Compare the following two examples:

(20) *kukui´hỹ-da-ki*
ill-1S-DEC
'I am ill'

(21) *kukuihỹ-da-´ki-da-ki*
ill-1S-DEC-1S-DEC
'I said I am ill'

The Portuguese translation offered by the informants is usually in the form of an indirect speech quotation. However, when analysing the construction, its literal meaning represents a quotation of direct speech. This suggests that in Kwaza, no formal distinction is made between direct and indirect speech. Note the following examples:

(22) *kukuihỹ-da-´ki-Ø-tsɛ*[4]
ill-1S-DEC-3-DEC
'she$_i$ says she$_i$ is ill' (lit. 'she says 'I'm ill'')

[4] Note that the alternative form of the declarative mood marker, *-tsɛ* instead of *-ki*, seems to occur only in the third person and because of independent reasons. These reasons, however, are not well understood and speculations about the alternative occurrence of the two forms are beyond the scope of this article.

(23) *kukuihỹ-Ø-ˊki-Ø-tsɛ*
ill-3-DEC-3-DEC
'she$_i$ says she$_j$ is ill' (lit. 'she says 'she is ill'')

(24) *magaˊriDa* *kukuihỹ-xa-ˊki-Ø-tsɛ*
Margarida ill-2-DEC-3-DEC
'Margarida says you're ill'

(25) *magaˊriDa* *kukuihỹ-Ø-ˊki-xa-ki*
Margarida ill-3-DEC-2-DEC
'you say Margarida is ill'

With respect to the notion 'quotative construction', the following remark is in order. It will appear from many examples in the rest of the article that this construction does not strictly express quotation of (direct or indirect) speech. In fact, with the term 'quotative construction' I refer first and foremost to a specific morphological construction in Kwaza in which a predicate occurs with double person marking.

2.1. Analysis of the structure of quotations

The following example represents an analysis of the structure of the verb in example (25). It shows how extra inflexions are attached to a verb that is already inflected for the same categories (i.e. person and mood):

(26) [[*kukuihỹ-Ø-ˊki*] *-xa-ki*]
[[ill -3-DEC] -2-DEC]
[[quoted utterance] event of quoting]
[[predicate subject: 'he'] matrix subject: 'you']
lit: [' ['he is ill'] you say']
'you say he is ill'

As we have seen in the above examples, the layer of inflexions that is closest to the verb root, the primary layer, cross-refers to the subject of the quoted utterance. The secondary layer of inflexions, i.e. the one that follows the primary layer, cross-refers to the subject of the event of quoting. Compare the structural analyses of (24) and (25), in the first of which *magariDa* is the quoting subject (24b), and in the second of which *magariDa* is the quoted subject (25b):

(24) b [*magaˊriDa* [*kukuihỹ-xa-ˊki*] *-Ø-tsɛ*]
[Margarida [ill -2-DEC] -3-DEC]
[[quoted utterance] event of quoting]
[[predicate subject: 'you'] matrix subject: 'Margarida']
lit: ['Margarida ['you're ill'] she says']
'Margarida says you're ill'

(25) b [[*magaˊriDa kukuihỹ-Ø-ˊki*] *-xa-ki*]
[[Margarida ill -3-DEC] -2-DEC]
[[quoted utterance] event of quoting]
[[predicate subject: 'Margarida'] matrix subject: 'you']
lit: [' ['Margarida is ill'] you say']
'you say Margarida is ill'

One could argue that the attachment of an extra layer of inflexions has come about through cliticisation. In that case, one may just as well argue that both layers of inflexions are cliticised, which would require a less synthetic analysis of Kwaza (see 1.5). This is because these inflexional layers are represented by the normal inflexional morphemes of Kwaza, rather than by special clitic elements. In the first place, the forms in the primary and secondary layers of inflexions are identical, i.e. the very same person and mood markers are employed. In the second place, in quotative constructions main word stress is on the last syllable of the primary layer of inflexions. This can be seen in all relevant examples. It suggests that, from the perspective of the secondary layer of inflexions, the primary layer is to be considered as part of the extended root of the verb. In the light of the observations that follow example (3) in Section 1.1, it may be best to suppose that the inflected verb inside a quotative construction is zero-derived as a verbal stem.

2.2. Other moods in the quotative construction

The quoted speech construction is fully productive in Kwaza. It can occur with all different persons and in all existing moods. In fact, entire discourse units can be quoted. In the following example an exhortative utterance is quoted:

(27) *kui-a-ˊni-Ø-tsɛ*
drink-1P-EXH-3-DEC
'he wants us to drink together' (lit.: 'he says 'let's drink!'')[5]

Example (28) shows that quoted utterances can be embedded in cosubordinated clauses:

(28) *pɛ̃rɛ̃ˊjã-tja-a-ˊni-da-ta* *ojaˊnỹ-da-ki*
speak-TRA-1P-EXH-1S-CSO arrive-1S-DEC
'I came for us to talk' (lit.: 'I arrive, me saying: 'let's talk!'')

The illocutionary status of the quoting event can vary. In the next example it is imperative. The utterance does not report on something that was said, but it orders something to be said:

[5] The first person plural has a default interpretation of inclusive. If it were exclusive this would have been marked formally by the associated person marker *-xa-*.

(29) *kwɛ-da-ˊmỹ-ca-Ø -ra*
enter-1S-VOL-EMP-2-IMP
'say 'I will enter'!'

Note that in this example, the emphatic imperative element *-ca-* should not be seen as forming a part of the quoted utterance. It belongs to the secondary layer of morphemes.

3. A possible origin of the quotative construction

We have seen that the quotative construction is characterised by the attachment of a secondary layer of inflexions to (an already inflected) quoted utterance. One of the possible origins of this secondary layer is that it has remained after omission of the root of a verb of speech. The following examples consist of a quoted utterance embedded in a matrix clause headed by a verb of speech:

(30) *uˊte-Ø-ta* *kukuiˊhỹ-xa-ki* *ˊta-ta-Ø-ki*[6]
notify-3-CSO ill-2-DEC talk-1O-3-DEC
'she said (to me) that I am ill' (lit.: ''you are ill', she talked to me, notifying')

(31) *ˊta* *otoˊrɛ-le* *tsũˊhũ* *xareˊja-xa-ˊre* *ta-Ø -ta*
CSO toad-only what search-2-INT talk-3-CSO
'then the toad said 'what are you looking for?''

However, the juxtaposition of several matrix clause moods within one sentence is very rare in Kwaza and makes sense probably only when speech is quoted. I assume that if the root of the verb of speech *ta-* "talk" is omitted[7] in these examples, the remaining combination of person and mood inflexions could become cliticised to the previous word. The result could be a quotative construction of the kind we have seen in the previous sections. However, it is not at all certain that the quotative construction necessarily emerged from the omission of *ta-* "to say". Since there are no constructions in Kwaza that have exactly the same form and the same function as the quotative construction, a verb with double layers of inflexions could probably be considered as a quotative construction by default.

4. The special use of the quoted interrogative

Even though the quotative construction does not seem to be created for anything else in Kwaza than to quote speech, it can be used in a different way that seems to be metaphorically related to its normal function. Note that the interpretation of the examples (27) and (28) is not strictly quotative. Their literal reading may be quotative, but they have a desiderative or purposive connotation. The purposive sense of (28) is partly an independent property which is inherent to the cosubordination of clauses. However, the

[6] Note that the preceding cosubordinated clause is not part of the quoted utterance.
[7] The omission of verb roots was discussed in Section 1.5.

desiderative connotation of (27) and (28) may result from a merger of semantic and pragmatic aspects of the exhortative morpheme and the event of quoting.

Because the pragmatic differences at this level, if they they can be investigated at all, are rather subtle, it may be helpful to look at somewhat clearer cases of metaphorical use of the quotative construction. The following example concerns the quotation of an interrogative utterance:

(32) *(ku´kui) ja-xa-´re-da-hỹ-ki*
wow! eat-2-INT-1S-NOM-DEC
'my, did you eat much!' / 'I say, you did eat!'

The literal meaning of *´jaxare* "did you eat?" is interrogative. However, (32) has an exclamative connotation of surprise, or of being impressed. It is true that the interrogative itself can be used in a non-interrogative and emphatic manner, as in:

(33) *kawa´pe ku´kui nỹ-´hỹ-re*
cockroach wow! big-NOM-INT
'my, that cockroach is big!'

But in such expressions, the expletive element *ku´kui* "wow!", "gosh!", "damned!" is required, whereas it is optional in (32). So it seems that in (32) the quotative nature of the utterance is used as an additional strategy for emphasis. Its alternative translation shows that Kwaza is not the only language that can use a 'verb' of speech to create emphasis.

From the contrast between the following examples it appears that the quoted interrogative may also have a reflective or ruminative connotation:

(34) *warañỹ-´e-da-tsy-re*
work-again-1S-POT-INT
'am I (going) to work again?'

(35) *warañỹ-e-da-tsy-´re-da-ki*
work-again-1S-POT-INT-1S-DEC
'I think I'm going to work again' (lit.: 'I say 'am I going to work again?'')

One could suppose on the one hand that the origin of this 'reflective' construction does not involve the hypothetical omission of a verb of speech, but rather of some other verb of cognition, say, "to think". However, Kwaza does not have a verb "to think", and the verb which approaches the sense of "to think" most closely is the verb *tutunita´hỹ-* "to worry". Therefore it may be better to regard the quotative construction as being quotative, but then only in a symbolic way. Since this construction appears to have other uses besides quotation and since it does not involve an overt verb of speech one could probably also say that an 'abstract' verb of cognition is 'understood'. This may become an

even more likely analysis for the phenomena discussed in the following section. The fact that the verb *ta-* "to say" cannot be used to refer to other mental processes[8] further corroborates this approach. This fact suggests that it is not the actual verb *ta-* "to say" that was omitted, or gets 'zero' expression in the quotative construction, but something more abstract. It may be, however, that the most probable analysis of these constructions does not involve the omission of anything at all. Such an analysis was already hinted at at the end of Section 3.

5. Non-quotative use of the quotative construction

There are two derivational modal morphemes in Kwaza that require double person marking: purposive *-te-* and desiderative *-heta-*. Consider the following examples and their translations:

(36) *tso´roi-da-''te-da-ki*
run-1S-PURP-1S-DEC
'I'm determined to run'

(37) *tso´roi-da-''te-Ø-tsy-hỹ-ki*
run-1S-PURP-3-POT-NOM-DEC
'he is supposed to run'

The purposive morpheme is preceded and followed by a person marker. However, there is no formal relation of the element *-te-* with one of the aforementioned mood markers. It is probably derivational because it adds a semantic value of purposive modality to the predicate. Furthermore, it occurs exclusively in this position inside the predicate, and cannot take the verb-final position of a normal mood marker in the matrix sentence. The following expression was not attested[9]:

(38) **tsoroi-da-te*
run-1S-PURP

Nevertheless, the utterances in (36) and (37) obey the structure of the quotative construction as if *-te-* were an embedded mood marker. When compared with the respec-

[8] Such a phenomenon is reported to exist in several Andean languages by Adelaar (1990) and in Papuan languages by de Vries (1990) where an explicit quotative element is used to refer not only to actual speech but also to thoughts, wishes, intentions and other kinds of "inner speech". In certain African languages, such as Shona (Bantu), the use of the quotative element *-ti-* is not even limited to "inner speech" (Güldemann t.a.). In Kwaza, such an element does not exist, but the absence (or zero-expression) of such an element in the characteristic 'quotative construction' could be regarded as having a similar function. If one would analyse Kwaza alternatively as an isolating language with auxiliary verbs, these could be regarded as semantically relatively abstract. Then the meaning of *daki* would depending on its context range between "I do", "I am", "I want", "I say" and "I think". Karo (Tupi-Ramarama, see Gabas Jr. 1999) has an auxiliary verbal root *-ʔe-* that could be translated as "to do", "to say". In Kwaza, however, the auxiliary verb would not have an identifiable root.

[9] But see the remarks concerning examples (46) and (47).

tive quotative examples (21) and (22) above, it is clear that (36) and (37) display the same productive cross-reference properties. It is almost as if the omission of an abstract verb of cognition has led to this construction. Another explanation could be that the purposive construction is modelled after the quotative construction by analogy. One could imagine the quotative and purposive examples to share this structure:

(39) verb.stem-PERSON-MOOD/MODALITY (zero.verb.of.cognition)-PERSON-MOOD

For the following purposive examples, a literal translation involving an omitted verb of speech can be contrived:

(40) *eromũtsa-da-ˊte-xa-ta ˊnãi-xa-re*[10]
wrist-1S-PURP-2-CSO like-2-INT
'is it for you to wear on your wrist?'
(lit.: 'is it for you$_i$ to (say) 'I$_i$ wear it on the wrist'?')

(41) *eromũtsa-xa-ˊte-xa-ta ˊnãi-xa-re*
wrist-2-PURP-2-CSO like-2-INT
'is it for you to put on my wrist?'
(lit.: 'is it for you$_i$ to (say) 'you$_j$ wear it on the wrist'?')

The same observations can be made with respect to the morpheme *-heta-*, which is like *-te-* also considered as derivational on grounds of its distributional properties. Consider the following examples:

(42) *cari-da-heˊta-da-ki*
shoot-1S-DESI-1S-DEC
'I wanted to kill' (lit.: 'I$_i$ want 'I$_i$ kill'')

(43) *ˊĩ cari-da-heˊta-Ø-tsɛ*
he shoot-1S-DESI-3-DEC
'he wanted to kill' (lit.: 'he$_i$ want 'I$_i$ kill'')

(44) *ˊtxa kui-da-heˊta-xa-re*
tea drink-1S-DESI-2-INT
'would you like to drink tea?' (lit.: 'do you$_i$ want 'I$_i$ drink tea'?')

[10] Note that the construction itself is embedded as a cosubordinated clause under a dummy matrix predicate *nãi-* "to be like". Constructions involving *nãi-* usually have an explicative value and cosubordination itself may add up to the purposive meaning of the sentence. However, the following example (created by myself, but based on similar examples) would convey more or less the same meaning as (40):

(40) b *eromũtsa-da-ˊte-xa-ki* *(HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE)*
wrist-1S-PURP-2-DEC
'(it is) for you to put on your wrist'

(45) *pɛ̃rɛ̃jã-Ø-he´ta-da-(le)-ki*
speak-3-DESI-1S-FRUST-DEC
'I would like him to talk' (lit.: 'I_i want 'he_j talk'')

Again, the structure is typically quotative, and the embedded person markers remain productive. The alternative person marking in (40) vs. (41) and in (44) vs. (45) go with a predictable change of perspective. Both in example (40) and (44) the first person marker *-da-* and the second person marker *-xa-* refer to the same subject. The situation is reversed in example (41) where the double marking of second person *-xa-* cross-refers literally to different subjects. Unfortunately, a double second person version of (44), which would represent a desiderative structural equivalent of (41), was not recorded.[11] The change of perspective in (45) is especially clear when it is placed contrast with (43).

Neither *-te-* nor *-heta-* can occur in any other position than in between person markers inside the predicate. The only attested exceptions to this were elliptic (see Section 1.5):

(46) *wa´dy-hata-Ø-heta*
give-3S2O-3-DESI
'would he gave to you!', 'if only he gave (it) to you'

(47) *dilɛ-´wã oi´tsi-da-heta*
who-AO sex-1S-DESI
'(I) would like to make love with someone'

Although a purposive utterance like example (38) was never attested, I suppose that it may in principle occur as a result of morphological ellipsis. Just as in the case of (46) and (47) it will be interpretable in an appropriate context, in this case: "(I'm/you're/he is) determined to run".

So in spite of the quotative structures, the quotative interpretations of the purposive and desiderative modalities are somewhat contrived. If omission of a verb root of cognition led to these constructions, it is unclear which root. It seems more likely that the morphemes *-te-* and *-heta-* are inserted via a process of analogy into a grammaticalised and fixed quotative template.

6. The development of new modality morphemes out of mood inflexions

It was explained in Section 2 that the productive quotative construction in Kwaza involves a double layer of person and mood inflexions. Its semantic content is also quotative. In Section 5, the purposive and desiderative modality morphemes were shown to

[11] It would certainly be grammatical:

(44) b *´txa kui-xa-he´ta-xa-re* *(HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE)*
tea drink-2-DESI-2-INT
'would you like me to drink tea?' (lit.: 'do you_i want 'you_j drink tea'?')

occur in a very similar construction. The difference, however, is that a quotative interpretation is hardly possible and that the purposive and desiderative elements should probably not be regarded as inflexions.

Apart from these two types of 'quotative' constructions, there is a third kind of construction which holds a position somewhere in between. It involves derivational modal elements which have apparently developed from person and mood inflexions. It does not involve, however, productive word-internal person inflexion. Compare the following example to example (7) above:

(48) *ʹja* *kui-ʹnĩ-da-ki*
already drink-CAUS-1S-DEC
'I already let (him) drink' (lit., ±: 'I already said: 'let him drink!'')

The causational[12] element *-nĩ-* in example (48) bears a strong phonetic resemblance to the exhortative mood marker *-ni* and is probably derived from it. I suppose it could have emerged from a process of change of grammatical status of the exhortative element embedded in a quotative construction. With only a little effort, (48) can be read as a quoted exhortative. This, however, is less easy in the following examples:

(49) *kuraku ʹra* *ja-ʹdy-da-ki* *ũi-ʹnĩ-da-ta*
chicken eat-CAU-1S-DEC lie-CAUS-1S-CSO
'I feed the chickens so that they can go to sleep'

(50) *hadai-ʹnĩ-da-ki*
hack-CAUS-1S-DEC
'I cut myself (by accident)'[13]

Whereas (48) is still somewhat quotative, (49) and (50) can hardly be interpreted as quotative on semantic grounds. These latter two examples suggest that the original inflexional element *-ni* is on its way to become a new derivational element *-nĩ-*. Of course the possibility cannot be excluded that both elements are not etymologically related at all, and that their near homophonousness is a matter of coincidence. However, the derivational causational is not the only modality suffix that has a similar (both formally and semantically) inflexional mood counterpart in Kwaza. Compare the following example to the monitory example (10) in the introduction:

(51) *a-ʹwy* *wotsu-ʹtsi-da-ta*
Ø-time skinny-MON-1S-CSO
'I do it (feeding the cattle) before they become emaciated'

[12] The causational modality is different from the valency-increasing causative morpheme *-dy-*.
[13] This example is not reflexive. In the reflexive version of (50) the morpheme *-nỹ-* would have occurred in the place of the causational morpheme, and the subject would have cut himself on purpose.

Here a quotative reading is difficult to conceive. It may be that a derivational modal morpheme with a 'preventive' semantic content, "lest", is developing from the monitory mood inflexion.

The volitive mood seems to have made it even further down the road to 'lexicalisation'. In a fossilised combination with the first person singular cross-reference marker *-da-*, the volitive mood morpheme *-mỹ* is attested as a derivational morpheme and a verb root (-)*damỹ-,* meaning "to want". Compare the following examples:

(52)	*ɛ-da-ˊmỹ*[14]	vs.	*ˊɛ-da-ki*
	go-1S-VOL		go-1S-DEC
	'I'm going!'		'I went', 'I am going'
(53)	*ɛ-da-ˊmỹ-xa-re*	vs.	*ˊɛ-xa-re*
	go-1S-VOL-2-INT		go-2-INT
	'are you going?'		'are you going?'

The first example in (53) could still be regarded as a quoted speech construction in which the volitive and the first person morphemes work together to produce the predictable literal meaning of: "do you$_i$ say 'I'm$_i$ going!'?". In the following example, no such quotative reading is likely anymore:

(54)	*tãlo-daˊmỹ-Ø-tsɛ*	or:	*tãlo-ˊnã-Ø-tsɛ*
	angry-want-3-DEC		angry-FUT-3-DEC
	'it is becoming angry!' (so watch out for that dog)		

If (54) is to be interpreted quotatively, it would be interesting to know more about the linguistic abilities of the dog, at least if the example is supposed to contain direct speech. But also an indirect quotation of speech would be difficult to conceive. An interpretation that involves an (omitted) semantically abstract verb of cognition would then be more likely: "it$_i$ thinks/feels/growls 'I$_i$ will become angry!'". Now consider the following example:

(55)	*bwa-daˊmỹ-Ø-tsɛ*
	finish-want-3-DEC
	'it is about to run out' (the gas of the cigarette lighter)

In example (55) a strictly quotative interpretation is impossible. But even a more abstract cognitive interpretation would not make sense. Maybe these examples involve quotation in a metaphorical manner. This is also attested in other languages, where inanimate beings may be said to 'say' something if they are likely to produce a sound. In colloquial Dutch, for example, a firecracker may 'say 'bang''. In (55), however, there is

[14] Note that the stress pattern *ˊɛdamỹ* "I'm going!" was also attested.

no auditive connotation at all. Furthermore, the volitive mood morpheme can only be applied to 'controlled' verbs. This means that the volitive mood *-mỹ* is anomalous on verbs where the subject has no 'control' over the event, such as e.g. the event of getting a fever. This restriction does not apply, however, to the petrified volitional combination *-damỹ*, as is also shown by example (55). So it is perhaps better to say that the first person singular volitive set of inflexions *-da-mỹ* has developed into a different, derivational morpheme that has a general meaning that ranges over intentional or volitional modality and ingressive aspect.[15] An additional reason to see *-damỹ* as a separate, new morpheme is that the first person marker that it contains is fossilised. In the word-internal positions in which it occurs in the above examples, *-da-* could never be substituted for another person marker, whereas it can in its normal matrix clause use, as illustrated by example (5) in the introduction. The next examples show that *damỹ-* is even used as a lexeme, a verb root that means "to want, to intend, to be going to" or a particle that means "yes! (I will)":

(56) *da´mỹ-xa-xa-ki*
want-2-AS-DEC
'you (pl) are going to do (it)'

(57) *da´mỹ-Ø-tsɛ*
want-3-DEC
'he is going (or wanting) to do (it)', 'he says 'yes (I will)!''

The latter example can still be seen as quotative. According to that interpretation, as many as two verb roots may have been 'omitted': a verb of speech and another verb root that is 'understood' from the specific discourse context of the utterance, as in (19).

7. Comparable developments in Quechua and Eskimo

The phenomenon of inflexional morphemes developing into derivational morphemes as sketched in Section 6 may not be unique to Kwaza. According to Muysken (1977:105-107) a similar process is likely to have led to new aspectual morphemes in Ecuadorian Quechua. The following example contrasts an older pattern, involving a nominalised verb and an inflected auxiliary verb, with a more recent construction, involving a (derivational) morpheme:

(58)	*miku-k*	*ri-ni*	>	*miku-gri-ni*
	eat-NOM	go-1SG		eat-INC-1SG
	'I am going to eat'			'I am going to eat'

[15] Note that in many languages of the world, the expression of future or ingressive aspect of inanimate and non-controlled events may involve cognitive modal verbs or suffixes with a meaning like "to want". In languages as diverse as Indo-European, Eskimo-Aleut (see Johns 1999 for Inuktitut) and Kwaza one can say things like "it wants to rain". The peculiar fact of Kwaza is that this modal element includes a fossilised first person marker.

Muysken assumes that the word boundary between the two verbs has disappeared, and that the (inflexional) nominaliser *-k* of the first word has merged with the root *ri-* "to go" of the second word, which has led to a new inchoative morpheme *-gri-*. One of the motivations for this historical development could have been the necessity to differentiate between emphatic and non-emphatic forms.

Also in the Eskimo languages, comparable developments seem to have taken place. In Kalaallisut, the polysynthetic suffixing language of the West Greenlandic Inuit, nominal oblique case markers may have developed into verbal directional morphemes.[16] Consider the following ablative example (from Olsen & Hertling 1988:38):

(59)	*Nuum-mit*	vs.	*Nuum-meer-poq*
	Nuuk-SG.ABL		Nuuk-be.from-IND.3SG
	'from Godthåb'		'he comes from Godthåb'

In this type of construction inflexional aspects such as person and number marking remain productive, as is shown by the following allative and prosecutive examples (from Kristoffersen 1991:16 and Bergsland 1955:92):

(60)	*illu-anut*	vs.	*illu-anu-kar-poq*
	house-3SG.POS.ALL		house-3SG.POS.ALL-go.to-IND.3SG
	'to her house'		'he went to her house'

(61) *nuna-p ilu-atigu-le-raa-ngatta*
land-REL.SG inner-3SG.POS.PROS-start-every.time-CAU.1PL
'always when we start to go through the land'

These constructions form an exception to the standard approach of Greenlandic as a suffixing language, according to which obligatory word structure and morpheme order is root-derivation-inflexion. The elements that follow the case marker in the above examples are not considered as clitics, but as derivations, that are followed again by obligatory inflexions. This phenomenon occurs also in the Canadian, Alaskan and Siberian Eskimo languages, and it is usually referred to as 'postinflectional morphology' (e.g. De Reuse 1994:170-230; Sadock 1991:174-175).[17]

In Eskimo, postinflexional constructions based on inflected verbs are also attested, however seldomly. The following Central Alaskan Yupik example from Sadock (1991:175) involves the "very rare postinflexional clitic-like affix" *-Vr-* "to say":

[16] See the following entries in Fortescue et al. (1994:403;411;412 respectively): *-k(k)u(C)ar-* "go via", *-mᵊtᵊ-* "be in or at", *-muaq-* "go to(wards)".

[17] In the Danish literature it may be known as *indre bøjning* "internal inflexion", (Berthelsen et al. 1998:128).

(62) *Liisaq-una* *tai-gu-ur-tuq*
Lisa(ABS)-this.one(ABS) come-IND.3SG-say-IND.3SG
'Lisa said this one is coming'

The same affix is attested in West Greenlandic, where it has the connotation of "to shout". Consider the following example from Schultz-Lorentzen (1967:350):

(63) *palasi agger-po-or-pata*
priest come-IND.3SG-say-COND.3PL
'when they shout 'the priest is coming!''

The contrast between the following Greenlandic examples, from Fortescue (1984:3) and Kristoffersen (p.c.) respectively, clearly demonstrates productive internal plural inflexion:

(64) *umiar-sua-ar-poq* vs. *umiar-sue-er-put*
boat-big-say-IND.3SG boat-big.PL-say-IND.3PL
'he shouted 'a ship!'' 'they shouted 'ships!''

According to its treatment in Fortescue et al. (1994:423), the morpheme *-Vr-* "to say" is considered as a bound derivational morpheme. Because it is obligatorily followed by inflexional suffixes it does not belong to the category of clitic affixes in Eskimo, even though its attachment behaviour is similar.

8. Conclusion

In this article I have described the quotative construction in Kwaza as a specific grammatical construction that is characterized by word-internal person inflexion. It has a limited and very specific use in Kwaza and does not occur elsewhere in the language. The following table summarises the different appearances and semantic values ("functions") of the quotative construction. The parameter 'quotativity' concerns the possibility of a quotative interpretation:

SECTION	STRUCTURES AND FORMS	FUNCTIONS	QUOTATIVITY	EXAMPLES
2	*-person-mood-person-mood*	quotation	yes	(21)
5	*-person-te-person-mood*	purpose	no	(40)
5	*-person-heta-person-mood*	wish	no	(44)
6	*-1S.volitional-person-mood*	intention	yes/no	(55)
6	*-causational-person-mood*	causation	yes/no	(50)
6	*-preventive-person-mood*	warning	yes/no	(51)

Table II: The different functions and forms of the quotative construction

Do the phenomena described and discussed here represent a kind of lexicalisation or grammaticalisation? When a morpheme becomes lexicalised, it turns into a lexeme or it

becomes a fossilised part of another morpheme or lexeme. This seems to be indeed the case in *damỹ-*, at least as a new lexical verb root "to want", in which the first person marker *-da-* has become petrified together with the volitive marker *-mỹ*, has lost its original first person sense and cannot be substituted for another person marker. But lexicalisation is not the only process of grammatical change in Kwaza. It seems also that certain inflexional elements have become derivational. This was also shown in Section 6.

The phenomenon that grammatical elements may develop out of lexical (or content) words is called grammaticalisation. As pointed out in Hopper and Traugott (1993:7), most linguists agree that such developments in a language are subject to a 'cline of grammaticality' that goes in the following direction:

content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflexional affix

It is a much recurring phenomenon in grammaticalisation changes that the original form, on which a certain grammaticalised form is based, does not disappear, but continues to exist with (traces of) its original meaning. The new form does not make the old one obsolete. Rather, new distributional possibilities are opened for the original form. This characteristic of grammaticalisation is referred to as 'divergence' by Hopper and Traugott (1993:117). If Kwaza were to be analysed as a language that is syntactically complex rather than morphologically complex one could regard the person and mood combination as an independent auxiliary verb. Such auxiliaries are then grammaticalised in the 'quotative construction', where they are cliticised. As explained in Section 1.5, I have chosen not to adopt this approach.

Only a few linguists assume the existence of processes that go in the opposite direction of the cline of grammaticalisation. In Norde (1997, 2001) data from Swedish are presented to argue for the existence of such counterdirectional developments. Norde considers the change of certain inflexional morphemes into derivational morphemes in the historical development of Swedish as an instance of 'degrammaticalisation'. Unlike Hopper and Traugott (1993), she and several other linguists assume that derivational morphology has a lower grammatical status than inflexion, and that it should be placed to its left on the cline of grammaticality. An important aspect of the definition as employed by Norde is that degrammaticalisation differs from lexicalisation in that the former is a gradual phenomenon. Furthermore, degrammaticalisation cannot be regarded as the reverse of grammaticalisation; it is a phenomenon of linguistic change in its own right. Finally Norde appears to assume that 'deflexion' is a prerequisite of degrammaticalisation, i.e. degrammaticalisation crucially involves loss of original grammatical categories.

In the present analysis of Kwaza as a morphologically complex language, counterdirectional developments can be argued to have taken place. The data presented here call for an analysis in terms of degrammaticalisation. A conspicuous aspect of degrammaticalisation in Kwaza is that the original inflexional elements, from which deriva-

tional and lexical elements have derived, did not undergo 'deflexion' themselves. That is, the volitive, exhortative and monitory moods are still productive inflexional morphemes, in spite of the fact that volitional, causational and preventive derivational morphemes seem to have developed from them. Contrary to what the Swedish data may suggest, the data from Kwaza indicate that the abovementioned phenomenon of 'divergence' can also be observed in degrammaticalisation changes. With respect to purposive *-te-* and desiderative *-heta-*, deflexion may have taken place. It is a pity, however, that no earlier stages of the language have been documented.

The true quotative expressions in Section 2 are not considered as degrammaticalised in Kwaza. They are completely transparent and productive, and in this they resemble the Eskimo constructions with word-internal inflexion. The difference is that in Eskimo the embedded number, possessor and oblique case inflexions and the embedded person and mood inflexions are followed by an overt derivational morpheme. They are not zero-derived as in Kwaza.

References

Adelaar, Willem F.H.
1990 'The role of quotations in Andean discourse', in: Pinkster & Genee (eds.), pp 1-12.

Allen, Shanley E.M.
1996 *Aspects of argument structure in Inuktitut*, Language aquisition & language disorders vol. 13, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bauer, Laurie
2000 'Word', in: Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, Joachim Mugdan et al. (eds.), *Morphologie: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung*, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft vol 17.1, Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 247-257.

Bergsland, Knut
1955 *A grammatical outline of the Eskimo language of West Greenland*, [typoscript], Oslo: Skrivemaskinstua.

Berthelsen, C., B. Jacobsen, R. Petersen, I. Kleivan & J. Rischel (eds.)
1998 *Oqaatsinut Tapiliussaq / Oqaatsit Supplementsbind*. Nuuk: Atuakkiorfik Ilinniusiorfik.

Foley, William A. and Robert D. Van Valin
1984 *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 38, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fortescue, Michael
1984 *West Greenlandic*, London etc.: Croom Helm.

Fortescue, Michael, Steven Jacobson & Lawrence Kaplan
1994 *Comparative Eskimo dictionary, with Aleut cognates*, Fairbanks: Alaska Native Language Center.

Gabas Junior, Nilson
1999 *A grammar of Karo, Tupí (Brazil)*, [PhD thesis], Santa Barbara: University of California.
Güldemann, Tom
t.a. 'When 'say' is not *say*: The functional versatility of the Bantu quotative marker *ti* with special reference to Shona', in: Tom Güldemann & Manfred von Roncador (eds.), *Reported discourse as a meeting ground for different linguistic domains*, Typological studies in language, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott
1993 *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Johns, Alana
1999 'On the lexical semantics of affixal 'want' in Inuktitut', in: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 65/2:176-200.
Kristoffersen, Lars
1991 *Verbal derivation and inflection in a functional grammar of West Greenlandic*, [master's dissertation], Copenhagen: Københavns Universitet.
Moore, Denny
2002 'Verbos sem flexão', to appear in: *Atas do I encontro internacional do Grupo de Trabalho de Linguas Indígenas*, Brazil.
Muysken, Pieter
1977 *Syntactic developments in the verb phrase of Ecuadorian Quechua*, [doctoral dissertation], Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.
Norde, Muriel
1997 *The history of the genitive in Swedish: A case study in degrammaticalization*, [doctoral dissertation], Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Vakgroep Skandinavische Taal- en Letterkunde.
2001 'Deflexion as a counterdirectional factor in grammatical change', in: *Language Sciences*, [special issue edited by Lyle Campbell: *Grammaticalization: a critical assessment*], 23: 231-264.
Olsen, Lise Lennert & Birgitte Hertling
1988 *Grønlandsk tilhængsliste*, Pilersuiffik.
Pinkster, Harm & Inge Genee (eds.)
1990 *Unity in Diversity: Papers presented to Simon Dik on his 50th birthday*, Dordrecht/Providence R.I.: Foris Publications.
Reuse, Willem J. de
1994 *Siberian Yupik Eskimo: The language and its contacts with Chukchi*, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
Rodrigues, Aryon Dall´Igna
1986 *Línguas Brasileiras: Para o Conhecimento das Línguas Indígenas*, São Paulo: Edições Loyola.

Sadock, Jerrold
1991 *Autolexical syntax: A theory of parallel grammatical representations*, Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
Schultz-Lorentzen, Christian W.
1967 *Den grønlandske Ordbog: Grønlandsk - Dansk*, [facsimile edition of 1926], S.L. Møller.
Voort, Hein van der
2000 *A grammar of Kwaza: A description of an endangered and unclassified indigenous language of Southern Rondônia, Brazil*, [doctoral dissertation], Leiden: Universiteit Leiden.
Vries, Lourens J. de
1990 'Some remarks on direct quotation in Kombai', in: Pinkster & Genee (eds.), pp. 291-309.

Abbreviations

A:	answer	NEG	negative
ABL	ablative case	NOM	nominaliser
ABS	absolutive case	PL	plural
ALL	allative case	POS	possessive
AO	animate object	POT	potential
AS	associated person	PROS	prosecutive case
C	consonant	PURP	purposive
CAU	causative (a mood in Eskimo examples)	Q:	question
		REL	relative/genitive case
CAUS	causational	SG	singular
CONC	concessive	SWR	switch reference mood
COND	conditional mood	TRA	transitiviser
CSO	cosubordinating mood	V	vowel
DEC	declarative mood	VOL	volitive mood
DESI	desiderative	1O	1st person object
DS	different subject	1P	1st person plural
EMP	emphatic	1PL	1st person plural
EXH	exhortative mood	1S	1st person singular
FRUST	frustrative	2	2nd person singular
FUT	future	3	3rd person
IMP	imperative mood	3SG	3rd person singular
INC	inchoative	3S2O	3rd person subject, 2nd person object
IND	indicative mood		
INT	interrogative mood	-	morphemic boundary
IS	indefinite subject	.	separates semantic units in a portmanteau morpheme
MON	monitory mood		
NEE	negative exhortative	=	composition or clitic boundary
NEI	negative imperative		