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Abstract

Previous studies in Kavalan (Hsin 1996; Li 1997; and Lee 1997) treat both of the enclitic =ay and the suffix –an as nominalizers. Chang & Lee (2002) argue that the enclitic =ay is added to form a headless relative clause; and they identify qena-, -an, or qena--an as the nominalization constructions in Kavalan. Chang & Lee treat the =ay construction and the –an (or qena--an) construction as two essentially different constructions in terms of their morphological markings, syntactic distributions, and semantic/pragmatic functions.

Chang & Lee’s paper is insightful; nevertheless, there exist some rudimental problems in their analysis. In this chapter, we will demonstrate the –an construction is not lexical nominalization at all; nor are the =ay construction and the –an construction essentially distinct in terms of morpho-syntax and semantic and pragmatic functions. The most important of all is that Chang & Lee does not specify the relation between the derived form and the source verb. As pointed out by Zucchi (1993:2), the main task of a theory of nominalization is “to describe the relation between nouns and verbs, or more generally between nominal elements and their verbal counterparts.” By re-investigating the nominalization and relativization constructions in Kavalan, we hope to shed some light in this regard.
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0. Introduction

Previous studies in Kavalan (Hsin 1996; Li 1997; and Lee 1997) treat both of the enclitic =ay and the suffix –an as nominalizers. Chang & Lee (2002) argue that the enclitic =ay is added to form a headless relative clause; and they identify gena-, -an, or gena-…-an as the nominalization constructions in Kavalan. Chang & Lee treat the =ay construction and the –an (or gena-…-an) construction as two essentially different constructions in terms of their morphological markings, syntactic distributions, and semantic/pragmatic functions. In terms of the semantic/pragmatic function, relativization, i.e. =ay construction, is to create a modifier, whereas that of nominalization, i.e. (gena-)…-an construction, is to generate an argument. In terms of morpho-syntactic aspects, relativization is marked by the enclitic =ay and nominalization by the suffix –an; “enclitic =ay serves as a complementizer and turns its host into a modifier, while suffixed –an turns its host into an argument; a verb in a relative clause may take an object noun phrase as its complement, while a verb that undergoes nominalization cannot” (Chang & Lee 2002:355).

Chang & Lee’s paper is insightful; nevertheless, there exist some rudimental problems in their analysis. In this chapter, we will demonstrate the –an construction is not lexical nominalization at all; nor are the =ay construction and the –an construction essentially distinct in terms of morpho-syntax and semantic and pragmatic functions. The most important of all is that Chang & Lee does not specify the relation between the derived form and the source verb. As pointed out by Zucchi (1993:2), the main task of a theory of nominalization is “to describe the relation between nouns and verbs, or more generally between nominal elements and their verbal counterparts.” By re-investigating the nominalization and relativization constructions in Kavalan, we hope to shed some light in this regard.

By re-investigating the so-called relativization and nominalization constructions in Kavalan, we intend to do the following:

(1) We will show that the so-called nominalization and relativization, i.e. =ay and –an constructions, are not clear-cut categories as such labeled;
(2) We will explicate the relations between the derived nominals and the source verbs by employing Croft’s (2001:92) theory of conceptual space for parts of speech;
(3) We will ultimately show that the grammatical relations/mechanisms are language-specific; in other words, nominalization and relativization are not universal mechanism. What the scholars have found in English does not guarantee the same findings in other languages.

Our paper is organized as follows. Section 1 give a brief introduction to Croft’s
(2001:92) theory of conceptual space for parts of speech, as shown in Figure 1, with an attempt to not only specify the interrelation between the \textit{=ay} construction and \textit{–an} construction, but also depict the intra-relation of each construction. In Section 2, we identify three types of \textit{=ay} constructions. The \textit{–an} constructions will be discussed in Section 3. Some concluding remarks will be given in Section 4.


Every linguist recognizes that it is a hot and difficult issue to identify the parts of speech in a particular language. As pointed out in Anward (2000:3), no matter which criterion we take, “the relationship between particular criteria and particular parts of speech is typically many-to-many.” Therefore, we adopt Croft’s (2001:92) theory of Conceptual Space for parts of speech with an attempt to explicate the many-to-many relationships between the form and function in each construction.

In Figure 1, a prototypical ‘noun’ is used to do object reference; nevertheless, it is not uncommon to find a noun to be used to do object modifier, as the word ‘conference’ in the phrase ‘conference room’. And in many Formosan languages, it is very often to find a noun to be used as predicate. A prototypical ‘adjective’ is used to do property modifier, such as color terms; again, it is common to use ‘red’, ‘white’ and ‘black’ to denote property reference. Also, ‘red’ can be used as a predicate as in ‘I want my hair red.’

2. The \textit{=ay} constructions

2.1. Functional definition of relative clauses:

Before we go any further in discussing the so-called relativization construction in Kavalan, we of course need to know what a relative clause is. According to Keenan (1985), a relative clause is defined as “one that functions as a nominal modifier” (Keenan 1985, cited in Payne 1997:325); in other words, the main function of a
relative clause is modification, i.e. to modify the head noun.

The parameter in identifying relative clause for typological studies is by investigating the position of the relative clause in relation to the head noun. According to Payne, there are four types of relative clauses in terms of the position where they occur: (1) pre-nominal (i.e. before the head noun), (2) post-nominal (i.e. after the head noun), (3) internally headed, and (4) headless relative clause.

2.2 Three Types of =ay Constructions

Pattern 1: Action/Event Modifier (=ay functioning like a relative clause)
The Characteristics of Pattern 1 are that:

1. The hosts that =ay can enclitic to are mostly action verbs,
   (a) which carry focus markers in morphology,
   (b) which can take another NP as their complements in the embedded clause.
2. The =ay clause can occur either in pre-nominal (as in Figure 2) or post-nominal (as in Fire 3) position.
3. The =ay clause denoting an event/action whose main function is to provide an event background information for the head noun.

Figure 2 The =ay clause occurs in pre-nominal position.

Figure 3 The =ay clause occurs in post-nominal position.

(1) kav-ngengi-051019

1 The Abbreviations used in this study are listed below:
(a) special phonological symbols:
   - glottal stop
(b) AF: Agent Focus; LF: Patient Focus /Locative Focus;
   NOM: Nominative Case; ACC: Accusative Case; GEN: Genitive Case; OBL: Oblique Case;
   LOC: Locative Case; ASP: Aspectual marker; PFV: Perfective; PART: Particle; IRR: Irrealis;
   NEG: Negation; PN: Proper Noun/Personal Name; CAU: Causative Prefix; RED: Reduplication;
Pattern 2: Entity/Property Modifier (=ay in NP)

Pattern 2 differs from Pattern 1 in that, first, the intrinsic characteristics of the
owns that can be encliticized to. In Pattern 2, the hosts are stative predicates, usually
those belonging to functional categories, and, the most important of all, they do not
carry any focus markers. Second, the syntactic behavior is different: in Pattern 2, the
=ay encliticized form can occur only before the modified, i.e. the head noun, as
shown in Figure 4. Third, in Pattern 2, the syntactic structure of the =ay forms are not
clausal: the modifier, i.e. the =ay encliticized form, and the modified, i.e. the head,
form an NP, which can take case markers in accordance with the syntactic relation this NP assumes in the clause. And fourth, the semantic relation between the modifier and the modified is different, too. In other words, the =ay clause does not provide an event background information for the head noun; rather, it is used to do an entity or property modification, such as colors or numbers.

As shown in the example (4a) and (4b), different word orders result in different syntactic structures and different readings in these two sentences accordingly. The syntactic structure of (4a) is a NP, whereas that in (4b) is a sentence (an equational sentence with the noun baut serving as the predicate). When we put them into another sentence, we will get a better picture. In (4c) Raya=ay baut takes the oblique case marker and serves as an object argument of the verb m-lizaq ‘to like’, while baut Raya=ay is not an acceptable NP candidate in (4d).

(4a) Raya=ay baut
    big=AY fish
    ‘big fish’
(4b) baut unay Raya=ay
    fish that big=REL
    ‘The fish is big (one).’
(4c) m-lizaq=iku tu Raya=ay baut
    AF-like=1SG.NOM OBL big=AY fish
    ‘I like big fish.’
*(4d) m-lizaq=iku tu baut Raya=ay

Figure 4 The =ay clause in Pattern 2

(5) numbers
   a. kin-tulu=ay sunis
       CLF.HUM-three=AY child
       ‘three children’
   b. (u-)tulu=ay wasu
       (CLF.NHUM-)three=AY dog
       ‘three dogs’

(6) quantitifier
   a. mazmun=ay sunis
       CLF.HUM.many=AY child
       ‘many children’
   b. mwaza=ay wasu
       CLF.NHUM.many=AY dog
       ‘many dogs’
(7) dimension
Kavalan Data: (kav-051013-ngengi)
a. m-Rasa aiku tu Raya=ay baut
   AF-buy 1SG.NOM OBL big=AY fish
b. kitut=ay baut
   small=AY fish

(8) attribute: color, property, physical characteristics
a. suqaw=ay Raya=ay tbaRi=ay semaRu
   bad=REL big=AY red=AY flower
   naRin m-ala qa-patay=ti=isu
do.not AF-take QA-die=PFV=2SG.NOM
   ‘This (kind of) big, red flower is poisonous. Don’t take (them), (or) you will (soon)
die.’
b. KavCon-earthquake
   309...zana 'nay nani
      that that DM
   310...zana=ti zana== maq zuma= ay lawlaw a
      that=PFV that from other=AY country INT
   311...s<en>angi-na=ti
      <NMZ>do>3PL.GEN=PFV
   ‘From the written records of other countries.’
c. KavCon-earthquake
   312...aita maqezaq=ay kebalan niana ya==
      1IPL.NOM genuine=AY Kavalan what INT
   ‘What do we real Kavalan have?’

(f) sex:
   ➔ Ronanay=ay wasu
      male=AY dog
      ‘dog’
   ➔ tina=ay wasu
      mother=AY dog
      ‘bitch’
   ➔ titu na wasu
      stock GEN dog
      ‘puppy’

(g) Physical characteristics
a. moRong=ay boqes na tazungan
   long=AY hair GEN female
   ‘girl with long hair’
b. tengen=ay moRong=ay boqes na tazungan
   black=AY long=AY hair GEN female
   ‘girl with long, black hair’

(9) Human possessor
a. tiana=ay sunis Rubatang
   who=AY child beautiful
   ‘Whose child is (more) beautiful?’
b. zaku=ay sunis zau
   1SG.POSS=AY child this
   ‘This is my child.’

(10) Temporal adverbial
a. KavCon-earthquake
   4.. ngid=iku ipil tu masang=ay utuz zin-na nani
      want-1SG.NOM hear OBL before=AY earthquake say-3SG.GEN DM
‘He (an NTU student) said, “I want to hear something about the earthquake in the past.’

b. KavCon-Earthquake

192...zuma nani
other DM

193...tangi=ay ti tasaw ... ‘nay
today=AY FS year that

‘In addition, this year...’

194... A: wama ‘nay Raw tasaw Raya=ay
only that INT year big=REL

‘(The earthquake) was the strongest only in that year.’

(11) **material**

a. sapaR=ay inep na lepaw
wooden.plank=AY entrance GEN house
‘wooden door’

b. betu=ay lepaw
stone=AY house
‘house made of stone’

**Pattern 3: Entity Reference (=ay in headless relative clause)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>V / Predicate=ay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 5 The =ay construction in Pattern 3.

In Pattern 3, the =ay encliticized form syntactically serves as a lexical nominal, and semantically and pragmatically is used to do entity reference. This is exactly the headless relative clause. According to parameter and definition proposed by Payne, headless relative clauses are “those clauses which themselves refer to the noun that they modify, usually when the head noun is non-specific” (Payne 1997:328).

(12) yau=ti si-kubu=ay
EXIST=PFV wear-hat=REL
‘Here comes the police officer.’
‘Here comes the one who wears a hat.’

(13)

a. s<em>inap=ay
<AF>sweep=REL
‘servant; sweeper; the one who sweeps’

b. s<em>inap=ay-ku
<AF>sweep= REL-1SG.GEN
‘my servant’

c. mai=pama mawtu seminap=ay-ku
NEG=YET AF.come servant=REL-1SG.GEN
‘My servant has not come yet.’

Examples (12) and (13) are the only two cases we have found so far where the =ay
forms can be used to denote specific entities. Mostly, they are used to denote non-specific entities, as shown below.

(14) KavCon-earthquake
294... mai nayau si
    NEG that.way if
295... taRni-ta azu tangi=ay tu zana masang=ay si
    how.to.know=1IPL.GEN like now=REL TU that past=REL si
    ‘If it isn’t like that, how can we know the things in the present and in the past?’
...
353... A: anu mai=ita nazawana na ‘daq
    if NEG=1IPL.NOM this.way GEN others
<em>aqsi=ay</em> nani
<AF>study=REL DM
354... qawman [mai=ti]
    definitely NEG=PFV
355.. R: [mai=ti]
    NEG=PFV
356... [mai=ita qasianem] pa-zukat tu nangan-ta
    NEG=1IPL.NOM think CAU-out OBL name-1 IPL.GEN
357... R: [XXX]
    ‘If it were not for those who studied, we would not have thought about re-designating our tribe.’
(15) m-susup aizipna masang, iwaliw tangi aizipna si-kelisiw =ay
    AF-poor 3SG.NOM before, instead now 3SG.NOM have-money=REL
    ‘He was poor before; (unexpectedly) now he became a rich(man).’
(16) KavCon-earthquake
395... A: tinu pakunku <em>tu senazau=ay</em>
    who AF.tell.story OBL this.way=REL
    ‘Who told this kind of story?’

Saying that =ay is a relativizer and involved in relativization in fact does not say much in depicting a whole picture of the =ay constructions. We employ Croft’s theory of conceptual maps for parts of speech as a framework to pinpoint the distribution and function of the =ay constructions in Kavalan, as shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6 Semantic Map for the =ay constructions in Kavalan
3. The –an Constructions

3.1 Definition:
Nominalizations are morphological operations that derive nouns from some other lexical category, typically a verb or adjective, by modifying the root (cf. Comrie and Thompson 1985; Payne 1997:223). We may schematize these operations as:

\[ V \rightarrow [V]_N, \quad ADJ \rightarrow [ADJ]_N, \quad V \rightarrow N, \quad \text{or} \quad ADJ \rightarrow N \]

3.2 Chang & Lee’s (2002) analysis
In Chang & Lee’s (2002) analysis, the -an derived nominals (qena-...-an) are essentially treated as lexical nominalization, (a) which cannot take another NP (usually tu marked NPs) as its objects, and (b) whose main function is to generate an argument in the clause. The following examples are taken from Chang & Lee (2002:356-357, 11a & 13b).

(17)
\begin{align*}
a. \text{nengi sanu-an na sunis a yau} & \quad \text{good educate-NMZ 3SG.GEN child LNK that} \\
& \quad \text{‘That child’s education is good.’} \\
b. \text{mai tu qena-siqaz-an lazat a yau} & \quad \text{NEG OBL NMZ-polite-NMZ person LNK that} \\
& \quad \text{‘That person has no polite/shame.’}
\end{align*}

While reading these two sentences, we are led to interpret the verb sanu as ‘to educate’ and the derived noun saun-an as ‘education’ and the verb siqaz as ‘polite’ and the derived noun qena-siqaz-an as ‘polite or shame’. Thus, we are made to believe that the relation between the derived noun and the source verb patterns with those attested in English pairs (e.g. perform → performance, fear → fear), which can be seen from the translation they give in (17a) and (17b).

(18)
\begin{align*}
a. \text{nengi sanu-an-na sunis a yau} & \quad \text{good instruct-NMZ-3SG.GEN child LNK that} \\
& \quad \text{‘It is easy (good for other person) to instruct the child (to tell the child to do some work).’} \\
b. \text{nengi sanu-an-na ti-utay a yau} & \quad \text{good instruct-NMZ-3SG.GEN NCM-PN LNK that} \\
& \quad \text{‘It is easy (good) to instruct the child.’} \\
c. \text{nengi sanu-an-su sunis-ku a yau} & \quad \text{good instruct-NMZ-2SG.GEN child-1SG.GEN LNK that} \\
& \quad \text{‘It is easy (good) for you to instruct my child.’} \\
*d. \text{mai tu sanu-an razat ‘nay} & \quad \text{NEG OBL NMZ-NMZ LNK that}
\end{align*}
3.3 Our analysis: The –an Constructions are clausal nominals

In our analysis, we regard the ni-...-an, sa-...-an, qa-...-an, gena-...-an, and <en>...-an all as the so-called nominalization constructions, since the morphological marking (all are marked by the suffix –an), the syntactic distribution, and semantic/pragmatic functions are similar. Also, in our analysis, the -an constructions in Kavalan are not lexical, but clausal instead, which we will illustrate in details below. So far, we tentatively identify them as internally headed relative clauses, as we found that (a) q<en>atis-an-ku does not refer to ‘my fear’, but ‘the thing that I fear’, instead; and (b) –an derived forms are clausal, which can take tu marked argument as its complement and na/ni marked argument as its agent.

(19) pear-imui
11... mu-zaqis pa-zaqis ta-==zitinsya-an.\AF-take take LOC-bicycle-LOC
(He) took the bicycle around the trunk.

(20) The relationship between the emotion verbs and the derived nominals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion Verb</th>
<th>Derived Nominal</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m-lizaq</td>
<td>qena-lizaq(-an)-ku</td>
<td>‘be happy’</td>
<td>‘AF-be.happy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q&lt;en&gt;aytis</td>
<td>qena-qnut(-an)-ku</td>
<td>‘the thing that I fear’</td>
<td>‘&lt;AF&gt;be.angry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maytis</td>
<td>q&lt;en&gt;aytis(-an)-ku</td>
<td>‘the thing that I fear’</td>
<td>‘AF.fear’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We take emotion verbs as an example. The derived forms do not refer to the mental state of the experiencer, but rather to the emotion event / emotional process that the experiencer undergoes. Thus, the derived forms qena-lizaq, qena-qnut, and q<en>aytis of emotion verbs m-lizaq ‘be happy’, q<m>nut ‘be angry’, maytis ‘to fear’, and so on, are not those equivalent to the English emotion nouns, ‘happiness’, ‘anger’, and ‘fear’ and so on, as illustrated in (20).
(21) (kav-040528-abad)
a. mwaza q<en>at(p(-an))-ku many.NHUM <EN>fear(-NMZ)-1SG.GEN
   ‘The things/objects that I fear are many.’
b. mwaza q<en>a<en><en>aytis(-an)-ku tu siqay many.NHUM <EN>fear(-NMZ)-1SG.GEN OBL snake
   ‘(The kinds of) snakes that I feared are many. I am extremely afraid of snakes.’

(22) kav-051230-ngengi
a. mwaza qena-lizaq-an-ku many.NHUM QENA-happy-NMZ-1SG.GEN
   ‘What I like are many.’
b. mwaza qena-lizaq-an-ku tu kulus a zau many.NHUM QENA-happy-NMZ-1SG.GEN OBL clothes LNK this
   ‘The clothes that I like are many.’

In this regards, the –an construction is quite similar to internally headed relative clauses, with the tu marked argument as a default head noun. When there is no tu marked argument in the embedded clause, the whole clause refers to a non-specific object/entity that the verb acts on, as shown in (21a) and (22a). However, the specific reference of the –an clause depends on the context, as shown in (23) and (24) and (25a) and (25b) below. The –an clause can also denote to the place where the event takes place.

(23) Pear-buya
1. yau baqi-an ‘nay usiq._
   EXIST elder.male-AN that one
2. ...(2.4) matiw ta ni-paluma-an-na tu sinsuli.
   AF.go LOC NI-plant-NMZ-3SG.GEN OBL plum
   There was an old man who went to the place where he grew plums.

(24). m-patatay=ti ni-paluma-an-na tu sinsuli
   AF-die=PFV NI-plant-NMZ-3SG.GEN OBL plum
   ‘The plums that he planted are dead.’

(25)
a. matiw ta (=tu) ni-kiala-an na tama-na tu biabas
   AF.go LOC (=OBL) NI-pick-NMZ GEN father-3SG.GEN OBL guava
   ‘He went to (the place) where his father picked guavas.’
b. m-niz=ita q<m>an tu ni-kiala-an na tama-na tu biabas
   AF-all=1IPL.NOM <AF>eat OBL NI-pick-NMZ GEN father-3SG.GEN OBL guava
   ‘We all ate the guavas that his father picked.’
c. niz-an-ta q<m>an tu ni-kiala-an na tama-na tu biabas
   all-LF-1IPL.GEN <AF>eat OBL NI-pick-NMZ GEN father-3SG.GEN OBL guava
   ‘We ate all of the guavas that his father picked.’
3.4. Lexical nominals (agent nominalization)

As observed by Chang & Lee (2002:363), in Kavalan, an agentive noun is formed by attaching the affixal complex pa-...-an to a source verb, as shown below.

(26)
a. pa-Ribaut-an ‘fisherman’
b. pa-taqsi-an ‘student’
c. pa-klawklaway-an ‘worker’

While this is true, this is not the only way to form an agentive noun in Kavalan. Another possible way to derive an agentive noun is by encliticizing =ay to the source verb as shown by the following example:

(27) qay-Roziq=ay aisu
    QAY-steal=AY 2SG.NOM
    ‘You (are the one who) stole (my thing). You are a thief.’

(28) a. sinap=ay
    <AF>sweep=REL
    ‘servant; sweeper; the one who sweeps’
b. sinap=ay-ku
    <AF>sweep= REL-1SG.GEN
    ‘my servant’
c. mai=pama mautu seminap=ay-ku
    NEG=YET AF .come sweep=REL-1SG.GEN
    ‘My servant has not come yet.’

As we described in the previous section, the =ay derived noun (one kind of headless relative clause) is usually used when the head noun is non-specific. The difference between the pa-...-an derived agentive noun and =ay derived agentive noun is that the former denotes a habitual agent while the latter refers to someone who does the action occasionally or just once in a while.

(29) salekiaw → pa-salekiaw-an ‘dancer’
salekiaw=ay ‘the one who dances’

satezay → pa-satezay-an ‘singer’
satezay=ay ‘the one who sings’

sa’may → pa-sa’may-an ‘servant’
sa’may=ay ‘the one who cooks’

sudad → pa-sudad-an ‘office-worker’
sudad=ay ‘the one who writes’

Another important point we would like to point out is that again, the noun-verb boundary in this type of derived nominal construction is not clear-cut. While English (in other languages as well) uses an entity nominal (uses an object-reference), Kavalan uses an event nominal (an action-reference) to encode the concept ‘teacher;
the one who teaches’. As shown in the following examples, the concept ‘teacher’ can be coded as ‘the one who teaches student’; and ‘I am a teacher’ is encoded as ‘I am the one who teaches students.’

(30)  
a. pa-tud-an tu pa-taqsian ‘teacher’  
b. pa-tud-an=iku tu pa-taqsian  
 ‘I am a teacher.’  
=pa-tud-an=ay aiku  
c. pa-tud-an timaiku mai mawtu taqsian  
 ‘My teacher did not come to school.’

(31)  
a. pa-tud-an timaiku m-taRaw aizipna mai mawtu tangi  
 CAU-teach-LF 1SG.ACC AF-sick 3SG.NOM NEG AF.come today  
 ‘My teacher is sick. (He) did not come to school today. (Lit.: (The one who) teaches me (he) is sick. (He) did not come to school today.’

b. m-taRaw pa-tud-an-ku mai mawtu tangi  
 AF-sick CAU-teach-NMZ-1SG.GEN NEG AF.come today  
 ‘My teacher is sick. (He) did not come to school today.’

4. Conclusions

In this paper, we have demonstrated that =ay constructions and –an constructions are not two distinct operations in syntactic levels, nor do they display single, clear-cut categorical differences in terms of semantic or/and pragmatic functions. Of course, we have not solved all the problems. For example, what is the grammatical status of the suffix –an? Is it a verbalizer or the so-called ‘noun-deriving’ suffix (SPR 1982)? Also, the internal syntactic structure of the –an construction is not clear yet: how do we interpret the tu marked NP, which is assumed to occur in AF constructions, in the –an clause? Third, regarding the –an constructions, there seems to be two pairs of prefixes: (a) sa- vs. qa- and (b) ni- vs. qena-. Pair (a) seem to
denote the future while the pair (b) non-future; however, the exact relation between each construction within each pair is not clear yet.

At last, we would like to point out that the categorical boundary among the parts of speech and the conceptual mapping in each particular language will never be the same; for example, what concepts can be encoded as an adjective or as a verb in a particular language. It is consequently dangerous to investigate the grammatical relations in a particular language by means of cross-linguistic terms, presuming that each cross-linguistic notion can be found instantiation in a particular language.
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