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Introduction

This paper presents the constructions found in Wolof (Niger-Congo, Atlantic group) in the domain of predication, that is for expressing the various relationships between a predicate and its participants. Construction is understood here in the sense of Construction grammar (Goldberg 1995) as a form-meaning pairing. As a contribution to the CorTypo project (http://cortypo.huma-num.fr), this work is based on an annotated sound-indexed corpus from which the various constructions have been extracted and organized into a functional database. Following an inductive method, the different predications have been selected as ‘constructions’ when a meaning, regularly associated with specific coding means, could be defined and contrasted with that of other constructions. These different types of predications are called here ‘functions’. In this view, the intransitive, transitive and ditransitive syntactic constructions, which exist in Wolof, have not been selected as functions in this language, since no regular form-meaning pairing and coding means could be defined. Moreover, the existential construction (with the verb am ‘to have’) was not retained as a function in this project because I was not able to formulate a query for automatic retrieving of the construction in the corpus, eliminating the cases where the same verb is used with its lexical meaning. I may also have overlooked some functions that were not present in my corpus. So, the results presented here are a first overview of the functional domain of predication in Wolof, consisting of twenty seven functions identified in this work.

The CorTypo database contains complex information about the functions grammaticalized in each language and the forms which code those functions, allowing cross-linguistic comparison of languages. This database is linked to the corpus through a query engine so that constructions, and ultimately contextualized examples, can be retrieved.

This paper is organized as follows: in the first section (Language information), general information about Wolof is given, then the various constructions pertaining to the functional domain of predication are listed, defined, contrasted and illustrated by examples (Functions in the domain of Predication for the language Wolof). These examples are extracted from a 30mn corpus made of three narrations (recorded in 2015), one excerpt of a T.V. program (1985), and a conversation (2015). The few predications which are not found in this corpus linked to the database are given examples from other field data. The (phonological) official orthography for Wolof is used here. Glosses follow the standardized glossing rules elaborated within the project out of the Leipzig glossing rules. These first two parts are automatically generated from the online database, and appear as blocks. The synthesis then elaborates on the characterization of the domain of predication in Wolof and ends up with an overview of the predicative inflections involved in those constructions.

Language information
Name and ISO code: Wolof (WOL) (WOF for Gambian Wolof), alternatively called Olof by speakers, and Walaf, Oulof or Volof in some ancient publications.

Speakers: probably over 5 million speakers (Wolof ethnic group) in Senegal, approximately 200,000 in Gambia and the same in Mauritania. Wolof is also used as a vehicular language in Senegal, and including the Wolof diaspora all over the world, the total amount of speakers might reach 10 million.

Classification: Wolof is a Niger-Congo language belonging to the Northern branch of the Atlantic group (The existence of the Atlantic group is currently under discussion).

Dialectology: language variation in Wolof is relatively weak. Local varieties have their particularities (mainly phonological and sometimes morphological), but it seems more appropriate to distinguish between varieties rather than dialects, except for the Lebu (lébou) variant spoken in the Cap-Vert peninsula of Senegal and the Petite Côte, and to a certain extent for the Wolof of Gambia. In Senegal, the Dakar variant has been gradually established as the standard contemporary Wolof, without formal recognition, because of the influence of the capital, of the radio and TV broadcasts. This urban Wolof is characterized by ‘interlarded codeswitching’ with French (for words, phrases or sentences), often criticized by purists.

Status: Wolof is the main vernacular language of Senegal, originally spoken in the ancient kingdoms of Baol, Walo, Kaajor, Jolof, and Saalum. It is nowadays the mother-tongue of more than 40% of the inhabitants of Senegal but has also been used, for a long time, as a vehicular language (estimated to be used by 83% of the population in 1983) all over the country (except in the Eastern part), in all domains, by all ages, in particular in urban centers. Language use is vigorous and expanding, even in Casamance (southern Senegal) and the Gambia where Mandinka used to prevail as a vehicular language. Most of the speakers are at least bi-lingual (with French in Senegal, English in the Gambia), and often multilingual for those who do not belong to the Wolof ethnic group. French is the official language of Senegal but Wolof was one of the first six languages of Senegal recognized as national languages, mentioned as such in the 2001 Constitution. It received an official orthography (using Latin script) in 1971 with several corrections afterwards. However, this official orthography is seldom used by the population since Wolof is not taught in the education system. Its main function is oral (including radio and TV programs) but since the 70’s, newspapers, websites and also a written literature (mostly novels) in Wolof have developed. A non-standardized notation using Arabic script, called Wolofal, still survives mostly in religious (Islamic) poetry.

Main typological features: Wolof is a non tonal language with accusative alignment, no case distinction between subjects and objects (except for clitics), an SVO basic word order (excepted in the case of clitic object pronouns or complement focusing), and a simplified noun class system (class prefixes have fused with the root and the belonging of a word to a class is visible only in the noun modifier’s agreement), with 8 classes for singular and 2 for plural. The verbal system is characterized by an inflectional morphology whereby modal specifications, and, more remarkably, grammaticalized focus and polarity distinctions have fused with personal and aspecurtual specifications. The unmarked paradigm has a present perfective (completive) value, from which imperfective (incompletive) and pasts are derived with suffixes or by an imperfective copula. Wolof has auxiliaries with various values, and a large set of derivational affixes (mainly suffixes), including suffixes coding valency changes (e.g. applicatives, antipassive). This language has no adjectives but two classes of adverbial ideophones. A remarkable triplet of spatial deictic suffixes (proximal, distal and not localized) pervades the whole language system and is used for definite articles, demonstratives, a verbal inflection (the Presentative), as well as for subordinating conjunctions (temporal and conditional). Wolof has a simple consonant inventory including prenasalized phonemes and geminates (whose phonological status remains controversial), 8 short vowels (i, e, a, a, o, u spelled i, e, é, ê, a, o, ò) and 7 long vowels (transcribed ii, ee, ée, aa, oo, óo) : the central vowel /ə/ does not have a long counterpart; /a:/ has an unusual open and
Functions in the domain of Predication for the language Wolof (Niger-Congo)

reflexive

**Definition**
This construction marks the coreferentiality of the human Agent/Subject and the Patient/Object of a transitive event, and emphasizes the responsibility of the agent in the reflexive event. The coreferentiality with the Subject is not limited to the Object (core argument) and can be extended to the possessor in a genitival phrase, e.g. he has cows of himself, i.e. of its own.

**Construction**
it is coded by the use of a nominal phrase, made of the word ‘bopp’ (head) with a possessive determiner, in object position or in a genitival phrase. The noun ‘bopp’ is coded in this function as PR.REFL in rx

**Constraints**
Restricted to highly transitive activities with a human agent and typically other-oriented (to love, to betray, to accuse, to kill...). Impossible with some verbs expressing actions involving the body, e.g. to land, to live it up, to be careless (which are possible with the Middle construction)

**Contrasts**
contrast with MIDDLE (while possible as a variant for several verbs, REFLEXIVE contrasts with MIDDLE first because here the syntactic transitivity is preserved, then because the reflexive construction is used only for verbs expressing typically other-directed actions, and finally because reflexive construction does not have decausative uses but rather emphasizes the responsibility of the agent in the transitive process); it contrasts with the use of the same nominal phrase (head+possessive determiner) after a distinct patient/object, to emphasize the responsibility the agent on acting on his own belonging (e.g. ‘he broke car his-head’ = ‘he broke his car himself’); it also contrasts with the topicalizing uses of the same nominal phrase when ‘bopp’ (head) is introduced by the locative preposition (i.e. ‘in his head’ meaning ‘as for him’)

middle

**Definition**
Middle construction in Wolof is used (1) to indicate that the Subject is both Agent and Patient of the action (auto-causative function restricted to situations implying an intrinsic coreference of the two, that is with a weak elaboration of the participants, e.g. actions affecting the body), or (2) to reduce the agentive role of the subject, that is to present the event as more or less spontaneous by shading the initiator (causer/controller) of the action or to insist on the predisposition of the subject to undergo this process (decausative function, rather than strict anticausative), for details, see Nouguier Voisin (2002 : 111sqq). In this last case the Middle predication functions as a quasi-passive although it can not be strictly identified with a passive (which is not coded as such in Wolof) because no distinct agent can be expressed. Furthermore Middle derivation does not code reflexivity in the narrowest sense of this term (e.g. for typically other-directed actions). The homophonic verbalizer -u suffix (coded here PRT/DER.VBLZ), used for BEHAVIOR predication indicating that a subject behave like a person having the property expressed by the nominal stem, might be a specific use of this middle -u suffix, extended to non-verbal stems, e.g. jaam-u ‘to worship someone’, i.e. ‘to behave like a slave’, from jaam ‘slave’. Etymologically, the middle suffix, as well as the genitive linker, could originate from the third (homophonic) spatial deictic (-u), indicating the absence of localization of an entity in the speaker’s sphere (Robert 2006).

**Construction**
Middle is coded by verbal derivation with a -u (variant -ku or -eku) verbal suffix, and, possibly, also with a -tu variant lexicalized in many verb stems

**Constraints**
No syntactic transitivity (no object/patient argument), except for a few verbs of cognition expressing a complex event (Nouguier Voisin 2002: 124), such as fàttaliku ´to remember´ derived from the ditransitive verb fàttali ´to remind´. Verbs of emotion (to love, to hate) are excluded from this middle derivation.

**Contrasts**
contrasts with the regular intransitive construction because of its decausative meaning; with the regular transitive construction because of its auto-causative meaning and the cancellation of syntactic transitivity; contrasts with REFLEXIVE (which has the sole reflexive meaning and conveys a clear elaboration of the patient vs. agent roles since the syntactic transitivity is preserved through the reflexive pronoun).

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

[ à laqusi // (WOL_SR_CONV_01_Sadda_SP1_343) ]

à laqusi //
à laq -u -si //
hide MID CTP //
V.DYN.TR DER.V DER.V //
and came to take refuge

[ à foofa nga bàyyeeko ? // (WOL_SR_CONV_01_Sadda_SP2_024) ]

à foofa nga bàyyeeko //
f_ -oo -f -a nga bàyyi -eku -e //
CLS.LOC DEM.ANAPH CLS.LOC DIST FOC.COMPL.2SG leave MID APPL.nHUM //
ADV DET ADV DEICT PRED V.DYN.TR DER.V DER.V //
was it from there that you left?
in addition to the many letters we’d already received.

**behavioral**

| Definition | The –u verbalizer suffix is used in a denominative predication indicating that a subject displays the typical property or behavior of the referent of the noun from which it is derived, e.g. yoxosu ‘to sneak, to come in surreptitiously’ from yoxos ‘oyster’. Most of the derived verbs are dynamic and transitive (sometimes ditransitive) processes with human subject and object. In this case, the Subject is an Agent adopting for himself the typical behavior of the referent of the derived noun in its relation to a Patient/Object, e.g. jaam-u ‘to behave like a slave towards somebody’, i.e. ‘to worship or adore somebody’, from the noun ‘jaam’ ‘slave’. With a human Patient/Object, the construction also often conveys a figurative meaning, e.g. ‘suuf-u’ ‘to supplant someone (transitive), to pinch something from somebody (ditransitive)’ vs. with a non-human object ‘to put oneself under something (for lifting the thing)’, from suuf ‘ground’. Applied to place nouns or to body parts, this construction gives rise to transitive or intransitive movement verbs, e.g. tefesu ‘to ride along the shore’ from tefes ‘shore’, or tànk ‘to walk’, i.e ‘to use oneself’s feet’ from tànk ‘foot’. In some rare cases, the resulting process is a stative intransitive verb indicating that the Subject displays the property expressed by the noun, e.g. taaaru ‘to be of a great beauty’ from taar ‘great beauty’, or bëccëgu ‘to be situated in the middle of the day’ from bëccëg ‘middle of the day’. One single case has been identified where this construction is used to derive a dynamic and transitive process from an adverb: rekku ‘to minimize something’ from rekk ‘only’.

**Construction**

- it is coded by the –u (PRT for Property) verbalizer suffix.
- the suffix cannot apply to a verbal stem
- with MIDDLE (although the two –u suffixes might be semantically belated, the middle suffix applies only to verb stems); contrasts with another denominative suffix -e in that –e is used to form only stative and intransitive processes (e.g. suuf-e ‘to be low’(intr) vs. suuf-u ‘to supplant someone or to put oneself under something’ (trans), from the noun suuf ‘ground’).

**Exemples:**

- My father is from a place called Gnendoul.

- She too was a native of Jolof, for her ancestors and her whole family.
you can get in under the tree.

**Possessed Object Qualifying Construction**

**Definition**
In Wolof, the possessive verbal suffix (POSSD) is used to transitivize quality verbs by incorporating a relation of possession between the subject and the (new) object of the verb in a synthetic construction (lit. ‘I am fast (regarding) my car’): the subject of an intransitive verb expressing a quality (e.g. ‘the car is fast’) is changed into an object having the quality expressed by the verb, the subject of the derived form being the possessor of this object: ‘I am fast-POSSD car’ meaning ‘I have a fast car’.

**Construction**
The possessed object qualifying construction is coded by a derivational verb suffix -le.

**Constraints**
This predication can apply only to intransitive verbs (action or more frequently stative verbs) with non-agentive subjects (cf Nouguier Voisin 2002: 317). There is apparently a tendency in Dakar Wolof to omit the object (implicit reference) as redundant with the derivational suffix.

**Contrasts**
Contrasts with possession expressed with possessive nominal determiners, which has no restrictions and does not change the valency of the verb; contrasts also semantically and syntactically with CAUSATIVE_ASSISTIVE marked by an homophonic suffix -le

**Exemples:** cliquez sur la référence d'un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

---

**Antipassive**

**Definition**
Although Wolof is not an ergative language, it has an antipassive derivation which makes it possible to omit the object (mostly patient, sometimes recipient) of some transitive verbs, or the recipient of ditransitive verbs, without modifying the semantic role assigned to the subject. The omitted object is still present in the semantics of the verb but backgrounded and with a weak referential value: it is not identifiable, hence the affinity of this construction with generic statements. The antipassive suffix can combine with the applicative_human suffix (-al).

**Construction**
Antipassive predication is coded by verbal derivation with an –e suffix (ANTIP) or its rare variant -te.

**Constraints**
Labile verbs (i.e. verbs which can be used transitively or intransitively without any formal change) can not receive the antipassive suffix. The omitted object can not appear as an adjunct. The omission of a recipient with the antipassive suffix (-e) is possible only with a limited number of transitive verbs constructed with a single object, but is fully productive with ditransitive verbs, in particular with ditransitive verbs derived by means of the applicative marker –al (see Creissels and Voisin 2008 and Nouguier Voisin 2002: 311).

**Contrasts**
with transitive or ditransitive uses of the non-derived verbs with overt patient or recipient objects;

**Exemples:** cliquez sur la référence d'un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus
"Your wife, you ask where she is, listen to the song of the hen!"

**human applicative**

**Definition**
This applicative derivation is used to add a human argument to intransitive, transitive or ditransitive verbs, as an object with a semantic role of recipient (do to someone), beneficiary (do for someone), or comitative (do with someone). These semantic roles correspond to components for which, to which or with which the process is realized (that is end-oriented components to which the process leads). This construction is the only way to express the semantic role of beneficiary in Wolof (no alternative preposition). The patient-object may not be expressed: in this case, derived transitive verbs remain transitive (instead of becoming ditransitive) but the semantic role of the object is changed from that of a patient to a recipient (Nouguier Voisin 2002: 217 sqq).

NB. This derivation is used both for a positively (benefactive) or adversely (malefactive) affected person.

**Construction**
It is coded by a verbal derivation with an -al suffix (APPL.HUM) : Look for APPL.HUM in GE

**Constraints**
This derivation does not apply to quality verbs, unless they have received the causative derivation. Applicative objects with a comitative semantic role appear only in constructions with the Complement Focus inflection or in relative clauses (for the relativization of the object). Moreover, this comitative meaning implies that the two participants are both involved in performing the action (co-agent). This (human) applicative suffix can not combine with the other (non human) applicative.

**Contrasts**
contrasts with APPLICATIVE_NON-HUMAN (in which the added object has different ´source-oriented´ semantic roles); contrasts, to a certain extent, with the construction using prepositional phrases to encode the same semantic roles as this one, in so far as the applicative construction allows emphasis and relativization of the added argument.

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

- moom la bokkal // (WOL_SR_CONV_01_Sadda_SP1_455)
  - moom la bokkal //
  - moom la bokk -al //
  - PRO.3SG FOC.CMPL.3SG be_part APPL.HUM //
  - PRO.IDP PRED V.STAT.LAB DER.V //
  - It's this village that Mbësin has links with;

- Ndekete ŋaari jabar yi juboo nañu ne kii dañu koy gasal benn leeñ / (WOL_SR_NARR_02_King-Spouses_036)
When no one expected it, the two wives agreed to dig an enormous hole in Cimbeyaan's path.

non-human applicative

Definition
This applicative derivation licenses objects with a semantic role of instrument, manner, or (spatial or temporal) location. These semantic roles correspond to that of components from which or by/through which the process is realized (that is ‘source-oriented’ components enabling the process). That is why the locative complement may express the origin, the location or the path but not the goal of a movement. The added argument is prototypically non human, except for a few verbs like 'jël' (to take) for which it is possible to indicate, with this derivation, from whom something has been taken (origin), or like ‘bàyyi’ (to leave, abandon) to indicate under the care of whom somebody has been left (apparent comitative meaning involving actually location, and maybe also manner and instrument or means). This applicative derivation is possible with all verb types: intransitive, transitive as well as ditransitive verbs (which have then 4 arguments, including subject). This derivation is also optionally used, with or without the locative preposition, to emphasize the locative complement along with the complement focus inflection (Nouguier Voisin 2002: 226 sqq).

Construction
It is coded by an -e (APPL.nHUM) derivational suffix on the verb.

Constraints
Some posture verbs do not allow this applicative derivation. Action verbs do not take this applicative derivation for locative complements implying a movement (goal or destination).

Contrasts
It contrasts with APPLICATIVE_HUMAN construction (in which the added object has semantically ‘end-oriented’ roles), in particular in the rare cases where this applicative introduces a human participant: the possible comitative meaning here is not that of APPLICATIVE_HUMAN which implies co-agentive participants. It contrasts to a certain extent with the construction using prepositional phrases to encode the same semantic roles as this one: actually the semantics is the same, but with the applicative predication emphasis is often laid on the argument introduced by the applicative derivation.

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d'un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

Sama baay laa ko tudde // (WOL_SR_CONV_01_Sadda_SP1_104)

Sama baay laa ko tudde //

Sama baay laa ko tudd -e //

POSS.1SG father FOC.CML.PRS =OBJ.3SG be_named APPL.nHUM //

DET N PRED PRO.CL V.LAB.ALTN.FN DER.V //

I gave him my father's name.

Paskë noo ko waxe rek / (WOL_SR_CONV_01_Sadda_SP1_151)
paskë
because
noo
because, no matter how you say it,
bala muy génne waañ wi, dina wax: “ñówleen ŋu añ” /  (WOL_SR_NARR_02_King-Spouses_063)
bala muy génne waañ wi dina
before come out APPL.nHUM kitchen CLSw PROX FUT.3SG
wax ñówleen ñu añ /
wax ñów -leen ñu añ /
speak come IMP.2PL AOR.1PL have_lunch /
V.DYN.DITR V.DYN.INTR PRED PRED V.DYN.INTR /
before she comes out of the kitchen, Cimbeyaan will say "Come and eat lunch!"

**direct causative**

**Definition**
This direct causative construction applies mostly to quality verbs (e.g. to be white, which is a stative verb, there are no adjectives in Wolof) and to some movement verbs. It transivitizes these intransitive verbs and changes their diathesis by introducing a new argument in Subject position (and role), as a causer/controller of a process involving a causee (the former subject of the non derived form) in Object position (and role). The causer actively participates in the caused event, acting on the causee in order to get the process expressed by the verb realized (direct causation). The Object/causee has a reduced agentivity (affected object): it is most of the time inanimate and is the seat of the transformation process initiated by the causer (direct causation): e.g. ‘to whiten something’ (i.e. to make something become white) as causative for ‘to be white’; when the Object is animate, the causative verb indicates a joint action (e.g. to have someone seated by seating oneself as an invitation for the other to seat).

**Construction**
it is marked by the -al variant -ale (CAUS1) derivational suffix on the verb or, for a handful of intransitive verbs, by the -e (CAUS2) derivational suffix. Both suffixes appear on some (rare) nominal stems as causative verbalizers.

**Constraints**
Applies only to intransitive verbs. While -al is fully productive, the -e suffix is restricted to a handful of verbs (lexicalization), corresponding mostly but not exclusively to movement verbs (to go out, to go down, to arrive but also to be named, to be forbidden...). The two suffixes are in complementary distribution

**Contrasts**
Contrasts with CAUSATIVE_INDIRECT; CAUSATIVE_ASSISTIVE; CAUSATIVE_NO-CAUSEE; CAUSATIVE_COMPLETING; CAUSATIVE_UNCOMPLETED

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d'un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

di ŋu xamal it ne /
(di ŋu xamal it ne)  (WOL_SR_NARR_01_HorizA-1_116)
di ŋu xamal it ne /
COP\IPFV =OBJ.1PL know -CAUS1 as_well COMP /
PRED PRO.CL V.STAT.TR -DER.V PTCL.TOP.POSTP CONJ.SUBORD /
she also lets us know that

sama ŋaari jabar yii, ŋoo ma fi dugal //  (WOL_SR_NARR_02_King-Spouses_127)
sama ŋaari jabar yii ŋoo ma
sama ŋaar -i jabar y_ -ii ŋoo ma
POSS.1SG two GEN.PL wife CLSy.PL DEM.PROX FOC.SBJ.3PL. =OBJ.1SG
DET N.NUM SUFX.N N DET DEICT PRED PRO.CL
fi dugal //
fi dugg -al //
=CLS.LOC\PROX enter CAUS1 //
ADV.CL V.DYN.LAB DER.V //
my wives [co-wives], it was they who put me in here.

di màggal garab gi //  (WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_441)
di màggal garab gi //
COP\IPFV grow_up CAUS1 tree CLSg PROX //
PRED V.DYN.INTR.ALTN.FN DER.V N DET DEICT //
to make the tree grow.

assistive causative

Definition
this assistive causative construction adds a new argument in Subject position taking on the role of a ‘causer’ helping or assisting the agent (which is in Object position) in accomplishing the action. The Subject can participate in the joint action (e.g. to help someone pulling a boat) or simply help the agent to carry out its action (to help a baby eating). As in other causative constructions, the agent/causee is in Object syntactic role (and position) while the S is demoted from its agentive role of the (caused) action.

Construction
it is marked by a -le (CAUS3) derivational suffix on the verb

Constraints
May apply to dynamic transitive or intransitive verbs but apparently not to stative verbs such as quality verbs

Contrasts
contrasts with SOCIATIVE (here the S of the non-derived form is not maintained as a subject in the derived form); with CAUSATIVE_COMPLETING; CAUSATIVE_DIRECT; CAUSATIVE_INDIRECT; CAUSATIVE_NO-CAUSEE; CAUSATIVE_UNCOMPLETED (because of its assistive component)

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d'un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

dañu koo séddale woon ci ŋaarì ponk yu ndaw. // (WOL_SR_NARR_01_HorizA-1_042)
dañu koo séddale woon ci ŋaarì ponk yu ndaw //
dañu ko -a sédd -aat -le -oon c -i
FOC.V.1PL =OBJ.3SG -LINK give_a_share -ITER -CAUS3 PST LOC PROX
PRED PRO.CL -SUFX.V V.DYN.TR -DER.V -DER.V TAM PREP DEICT
ŋaarì ponk yu ndaw //
ŋaar -i ponk y -u ndaw //
two -GEN.PL topic CLSy.PL DEICT.UNSPECD be_small //
N.NUM -SUFX.N N REL DEICT V.STAT.INTR //
we divided it into two points.

Te waxoon na, yégle ne fum ko tègge rek, mooy : "Ku ŋeme, ŋówal xeex !" /
(WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_246)
tè waxoon na yégle ne
and speak PST PRF.3SG be_aware_of CAUS3 COMP
CONJ.COORD.V V.DYN.DITR TAM PRED V.STAT.TR DER.V CONJ.SUBORD
fum ko tègge rek mooy
CLS.LOC DEICT.UNSPECD AOR.3SG =OBJ.3SG beat APPL.nHUM only FOC.SBJ.3SG IPFV
ADV.REL DEICT PRED PRO.CL V.DYN.TR DER.V ADV PRED TAM
ku ŋème ŋówal xeex //
k_ ŋème ŋówal -al xeex //
CLK DEICT.UNSPECD be_brave come IMP fight //
REL DEICT V.STAT.LAB V.DYN.INTR DER.V V.DYN.TR. //
Before, he said that every time he beat his drum, it meant: "Who dares, come and fight."

omitted causee causative

Definition
This causative construction remarkably does not increase the valency of the derived verbs because the causee/agent is not mentioned (it is unknown or not important): the semantic role of the Subject is changed into to that of a causer/controller having another participant (not mentioned in the construction) acting as the immediate agent, the Object remains a patient e.g. I had a dress sewed (cf Nouguier Voisin 2002,Creissels & Voisin 2008)

Construction
it is marker by a -lu (CAUS4) derivational suffix on the verb

Constraints
applies only to transitive dynamic verbs
indirect causative

Definition

This causative derivation increases the valency of the verb by distinguishing a causer/controller (in Subject position) and a causee/agent (in Object position) for the caused action. It expresses indirect causation in which the Subject/causer does not participate directly in the accomplishment of the action (he is a mere instigator): the causee is the real agent of the process (e.g. he made the audience laugh). If the non-derived verb had an Object as a Patient (transitive construction) is remains as such with the same role (ditransitive construction), e.g. ‘he made him fell the tree’.

Construction

It is marked by a -loo (CAUS5) derivational suffix on the verb

Contrasts

contrasts with the ditransitive construction using underived verbs (lacking of causative component); with causative construction expressing direct causation that is CAUSATIVE_DIRECT (which applies to stative verbs and indicates a reduced agentivity of the object); CAUSATIVE_UNCOMPLETED; CAUSATIVE_COMPLETING; contrasts also with CAUSATIVE_ASSISTIVE; with CAUSATIVE_NO-Causee (which implies an implicit causee distinct from S and O)

uncompleted causative

Definition

The -antal verbal suffix is used to express a direct causation with an uncompleted result. This (rare) causative suffix applies essentially to stative intransitive verbs (e.g. set ‘to be clean’), possibly also to nouns as a causative verbalizer (e.g. baax-antal ‘to commemorate a tradition’ from baax ‘tradition’), and often in lexicalized verbal forms for which the underived stem does not exist anymore or can not easily be identified (e.g. fenantal ‘to digress’). It is used to form deverbal nouns (e.g mjuj-antal ‘finishing stage or touch’ from mjuj ‘to be the last one’) as well as verbs (e.g. sëtt-antal ‘to purge something’ from sëtt ‘to be clean’). For its causative component, this (-antal) construction is very similar to the direct causative construction with the (-al) suffix: it transitivizes the intransitive (stative) verbs and changes their diathesis by introducing a new argument in Subject position (and role), as a causer of a process involving involving a causee (the former subject of the non derived form) in Object position (and role), e.g. sëtt-antal ‘to purge or clean something’ as a causative from set ‘to be clean’. The causer actively participates in the caused event, acting on the causee in order to get the process expressed by the verb realized (direct causation). The Object/causee has a reduced agentivity (affected object) and is the seat of the transformation process initiated by the causer, cf ‘to purge something’. However, this construction indicates that the transformation is not a completed process, be it in time (frequentative meaning) or in quality (incomplete result), e.g. baax-antal ‘to commemorate something’ i.e. ‘to make something become a celebrated tradition to repeat’ or jëem-antal ‘to train somebody’ from jëem ‘to try’. The Object/causee can be inanimate but is mostly animate. In this case, this causative construction often indicates an incomplete transformation slightly affecting the object; e.g reew-antal ‘to spoil a little bit a child’ as an uncompleted causative for reew ‘to be impolite’. Sometimes when both direct (-al) and uncompleted (-antal) causative constructions are possible, the latter is used only with a human causee whereas the former is used for inanimate objects, e.g. suufeental ‘to put down somebody’ vs. suufeel ‘to lower something’ as a causatives for suufe ‘to be low’.

Construction

it is marked by a -antal (CAUS6) derivational suffix on the verb

Constraints

May apply only to stative verbs

Contrasts

contrasts with CAUSATIVE_COMPLETING (for its uncompleted aspect); with CAUSATIVE_DIRECT (for its uncompleted aspect and preferentially human causee/object); constrasts also with CAUSATIVE_ASSISTIVE (no assistive component); with CAUSATIVE_NO-Causee (causee is not omitted and causation is direct and not assistive); with CAUSATIVE INDIRECT (causation is direct).

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

[F] Man fàllu siise laa tudd, ñu di ma dàkkantale / (WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_001)

man Fàllu Siise laa tudd ñu di ma
man Fàllu Siise laa tudd ñu di ma
PRO.1SG Fàllu Siise FOC.CMPL.1SG be_named AOR.3PL COP\IPFV =OBJ.1SG
PRO.IDP N.PROP N.PROP PRED V.LAB.ALTN.FN PRED PRED PRO.CL
dàkkantale / sëtu maam
dakk -antal -e / sët -u maam
be_brief CAUS6 APPL.nHUM / grandson GEN.SG grandparent
V.STAT.INTR DER.V DER.V / N SUFX.N N

My name is Falou Cissé, I am nicknamed

completing causative
This construction is used to express a direct causation for completing a process. It indicates that a human causer/controller (in subject position and role) is acting on a causee/patient (in object position and role) in order to complete a process or to lead it towards its qualitative endpoint (e.g. jekk-ali ‘to finish off something’ as a completive causative for jekk ‘to be all right’). This construction increases the verbal valence by adding a new argument to intransitive verbs (becoming transitive), or to transitive verbs (becoming ditransitive). With intransitive verbs, the new argument, in subject position, takes on the role of a ‘causer’ for finalizing a process involving a causee (the former subject of the non derived form now in object role) undergoing the transformation. The derived intransitive verbs are mostly stative quality verbs (e.g. fees ‘to be filled in’, feccali ‘to complete filling something’; saf ‘to be tasty’, sàppali ‘to increase or restore the taste of something’) but sometimes also dynamic verbs (e.g. àgg ‘to arrive’, ággali ‘to lead something to completion’). With (dynamic) transitive verbs, this construction adds a beneficiary for the completed process in a ditransitive construction (e.g. jottali ‘to fully transmit or report something to someone’, i.e. ‘to cause someone to fully get something’ as a completing causative for jot ‘to get something’).

**Construction**

It is marked by the -ali (CAUS7) derivational suffix on the verb and by the (final) consonant alternation of the verb stem (sometimes involving also modification of the stem vowel).

**Constraints**

No clearly identified constraints except that this construction can not apply to ditransitive verbs.

**Contrasts**

Contrasts with CAUSATIVE_UNCOMPLETED; CAUSATIVE_DIRECT; CAUSATIVE_INDIRECT; CAUSATIVE_NO-CAUSEE; CAUSATIVE_ASSISTIVE.

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

### Jű jagleel ko /  (WOL_SR_NARR_01_HorizA-1_071)

**Definition**

This derivational construction indicates that an action is performed simultaneously and conversely by at least two different participants on one another (simultaneous co-participation), e.g. gis ‘to see’, gis-e ‘to see each other, to meet’. It is used with verbs corresponding to naturally reciprocal events, e.g. embracing, bumping, greeting… (Nouguier Voisin 2002).

**Construction**

Coded by an -e (RECP1) derivational suffix on the verb.

**Constraints**

Only with verbs corresponding to naturally reciprocal events (Kemmer 1993: 93-127). The different participants can be encoded together as a plural subject or divided into a singular subject and a “with” prepositional phrase following the verb (‘he met-RECP with the king’).

**Contrasts**

Contrasts with RECIPROCAL_ALTERNATING (the latter is not restricted to naturally reciprocal events, does not necessarily implies simultaneous and converse actions from the different participants, and might refer to sequential actions performed by alternating agents); with RECIPROCAL_INTIMATE (the latter might refer to parallel coparticipation as well as to reciprocal events implying also inanimate subjects).

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

### Jarul ma di leen xamaleek ŋoom /  (WOL_SR_NARR_01_HorizA-1_013)

**Definition**

This derivation indicates that an action is performed simultaneously and conversely by two different participants on one another (simultaneous co-participation), e.g. gis ‘to see’, gis-e ‘to see each other, to meet’. It is used with verbs corresponding to naturally reciprocal events, e.g. embracing, bumping, greeting… (Nouguier Voisin 2002).

**Construction**

Coded by an -e (RECP1) derivational suffix on the verb.

**Constraints**

Only with verbs corresponding to naturally reciprocal events (Kemmer 1993: 93-127). The different participants can be encoded together as a plural subject or divided into a singular subject and a “with” prepositional phrase following the verb (‘he met-RECP with the king’).

**Contrasts**

Contrasts with RECIPROCAL_ALTERNATING (the latter is not restricted to naturally reciprocal events, does not necessarily implies simultaneous and converse actions from the different participants, and might refer to sequential actions performed by alternating agents); with RECIPROCAL_INTIMATE (the latter might refer to parallel coparticipation as well as to reciprocal events implying also inanimate subjects).

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

### Jű ngi ci waxtaane woon /  (WOL_SR_NARR_01_HorizA-1_028)

I don’t need to introduce them to you,
we discussed [the following questions]:

**boo dajeek**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>boo</th>
<th>dajeek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b_</td>
<td>-oo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

when -AOR.2SG\DEICT.UNSPECD meet RECP1 with V.DYN.TR DER.V PREP

when you [sic] met

**alternating reciprocal**

**Definition**
The alternating reciprocal derivation indicates that an action is performed by at least 2 different participants on one another (e.g. ‘they killed each other’) or one with the other (successive co-participation). The interaction or the actions performed by the different participants can be but are not necessary converse (exchange of agent/patient roles is not obligatory) nor necessarily simultaneous (e.g. for to hear-RECP2: ‘they heared from one another’ i.e. ‘they received news from one another’): the action can also be performed in a coordinate manner by alternating agents, e.g ‘to grind in time with each other’. The reciprocal 2 verbal derivation is the most productive way to express reciprocal in Wolof. It is not restricted to naturally reciprocal events. Naturally reciprocal events (e.g. nuyu ‘to great someone’) can receive the symmetrical reciprocal derivation (‘we greeted each other’) as well as the alternating reciprocal derivation (‘Men created one another successively”).

**Construction** coded by an -ante (RECP2) derivational suffix on the verb

**Constraints** As long as the semantics of the verb is compatible with reciprocal situations, there seems to be no constraints. As for the other reciprocal predications, the different participants can be encoded together as a plural Subject or divided into a singular Subject and a “with” prepositional phrase following the verb (e.g. ‘I refuse to act-RECP with him’ meaning ‘I refuse to collaborate with him’).

**Contrasts** Contrasts with the RECIPROCAL_SYMETRICAL (because it is not restricted to naturally reciprocal events and does not necessary refers to simultaneous and converse actions); it also contrasts with RECIPROCAL_INTIMATE (because the latter might refer to parallel coparticipation as well as to reciprocal events implying also inanimate subjects).

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

**Léeg-léeg ŋu xamante noonu rekk waaye bokkuñ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>léeg-léeg</th>
<th>ŋu</th>
<th>xamante</th>
<th>noonu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

sometimes\RDP AOR.3PL know RECP2 CLS.MNR DEM.ANAPH CLS.MNR DEICT.UNSPECD ADV.TEMP PRED V.STAT.TR DER.V ADV DET ADV DEICT

rekk waaye bokkuñ //
rekk waaye bokk -uňu //
only but be_part NEG.3PL //
ADV CONJ.COORD V.STAT.LAB PRED //

Some of them know each other but they’re not relatives.

**Dañu ėppante doole**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dañu</th>
<th>ėppante</th>
<th>doole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

dañu ėpp -ante doole //
FOC.V.3PL surpass_in RECP2 strength //
PRED V.STAT.DITR.CMPR DER.V N //

The two are just different in degree.

**Ñu gisante, bëggante**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ñu</th>
<th>gisante</th>
<th>bëggante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ñu</td>
<td>gis -ante bëgg -ante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR.3PL see RECP2 want RECP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRED V.STAT.TR DER.V V.STAT.TR DER.V //

They saw each other and loved each other,

**intimate reciprocal**
### Definition

This construction indicates that two or more participants (not necessarily animate) are mutually and equally interacting in the same situation (plural co-participation) and are intimately united by this interaction, physically (e.g., daj ‘to come across someone’, daj-oo ‘to collide’) or abstractly (e.g., diis ‘to confide, to tell’, diis-oo ‘to put heads together’). This reciprocal derivation is often synonymous to the alternate reciprocal (-ante) but implies a more intimate interaction resulting in a qualitatively different situation, cf dégg ‘to hear’, déggoo ‘to get along one with each other, to live together in good terms’ vs. déggante (alternate reciprocal) ‘to receive news one from another’.

### Construction

Coded by an -oo (RECP3) derivational suffix on the verb.

### Constraints

No identified constraints as long as the semantics of the verb is compatible with reciprocal situations: subjects are not necessary animate (e.g., ‘Your declarations are contradictory’ lit. betray one another’); non-derived verb might be intransitive stative verbs (e.g., jub ‘to be straight’, jub-oo ‘to be in harmony one with the other’). As for the symmetrical reciprocal derivation, the different participants can be encoded together as a plural Subject or divided into a singular Subject and a “with” prepositional phrase following the verb.

### Contrasts

Contrasts with RECIPROCAL_SYMETRICAL (by the intimate union created by the reciprocity here); with RECIPROCAL_ALTERNATING (because it cannot refer to situations with alternating agents).

### Exemples

- **Ndekte n’aari jabar yi juboo nañu ne kii dañu koy gasal benn leeñ** / (WOL_SR_NARR_02_King-Spouses_036)

- **Maanaam, dégg ak lu dul dégg bu ŋu jaxasoo, moom la olof di wax** / (WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_177)

- **Dañoo digëloo woon tool daan naa ko gis** / (WOL_SR_NARR_04_Fallu-stick_130)
we had neighbouring fields, I could see her,

### Sociative

**Definition**
The sociative derivation is used to express a parallel co-participation: it implies a plurality of participants involved simultaneously in the same event with the same role (agent, affected subject or patient). In the case of a plurality of agentive subjects, the coparticipation is not necessarily intentional; e.g. ‘they both sat on the bed together/at the same time’ (agents); ‘she became pregnant at the same time as (with) the other’ (affected subjects); ‘you will cut the three limes together’ (patients).

**Construction**
coded by an -andoo (SOC) derivational suffix on the verb

**Constraints**
The event might cover a plurality of identical actions performed or undergone by different participants at the same time but conceived of as a single event. As for the reciprocal derivations, the different participants can be encoded together as a plural Subject or divided into a singular Subject and a “with” prepositional phrase following the verb.

**Contrasts**
It contrasts with the RECIPROCAL_ALTERNATING (first no alternating agents interpretation here, moreover the reciprocal construction expresses intentionally coordinated actions, and lastly in its simultaneous interpretation, it expresses reciprocity); contrasts with RECIPROCAL_SYMETRICAL (here the coparticipation can bear on the object/patient); contrasts with CAUSATIVE_ASSISTIVE (here the Subject of the non-derived form is maintained as a Subject in the derived form and is a full agent, not an helping controller); it contrasts with CAUSATIVE_DIRECT in its joint action interpretation with animate objects (because here there is no distinction between a causee and a causer).

### Unspecified Human Subject

**Definition**
This impersonal predication in Wolof indicates that the subject of the verb is an unspecified human. The expression of the subject argument is blocked by the presence of a specific suffix.

**Construction**
It is marked by an atypical suffix (-ees) which can be suffixed to the verb stem as a derivational suffix, but also to the relativizers (instead of the spatial deictic suffix) or to the complement focus morpheme.

**Constraints**
no noun (N) in the subject position

**Contrasts**
contrasts with all “personal” predications for which the subject has a specific referent, including those using an indefinite pronoun (e.g. someone) in which the subject has an explicit referent although it is indefinite; contrasts with the impersonal use of the verb ´xam´ (to have) followed by a direct object, used to predicate the presence of non-human entities in the situation of speech.

### Intensive Appreciative

**Definition**
The intensive appreciative construction is a verbal exclamatory predication expressing intensity (or high degree) of the predicate, beyond the speaker’s expectation. It expresses the speaker’s appreciation of the relation between the subject and the predicate to an indefinable or hyperbolic degree, e.g. ‘how long is this rope!’.

**Construction**
The coding means are the Subject focus inflection combined with a specific prosodic contour corresponding to an ‘intensive/exclamatory intonation’, and characterized by two variants: a high plateau for the overall contour of the clause or a local peak of emphasis in the verb (cf Rialland & Robert 2001).

**Constraints**
This predication implies a transfer of the semantic specifications of the subject (subject focus) to the verb (high degree of the predicate). It is restricted to verbs expressing a measurable quality, essentially scalar stative verbs (such as ‘to be long’, ‘to be agreeable…’). It is also possible for scalar dynamic verbs but requires then an indefinite relative clause expressing an indefinite quantity or (long) duration, in the form of indefinite relative marker lu followed by a verb bari (‘to be numerous’) or yàgg (‘to last for long time’).

**Contrasts**
This intensive predication contrasts with the subject focus predication, coded by the same Subject focus inflection but with an assertive prosodic contour, and expressing properly subject focus (i.e. contrastive identification of a subject). Prosody works as a distinctive feature for this intensive meaning.

### Locative Question

**Definition**
This locative question is a non verbal predication used to ask where is an entity.

**Construction**
It is coded by the use of the interrogative-locative copula ‘ana´ meaning ‘where is?’, followed by a subject belonging to a limited set of possible categories (cf constraints). This copula (ana) is not used in other pattern.
### Constraints

The locative question follows a unique pattern (it excludes the use of a verb lexeme) and it makes use of a specific form for locative interrogative, ‘ana’ which is used exclusively in the following pattern: , where the subject can be a noun, a pronoun from the Aorist inflection or a locative relative clause.

### Contrasts

contrasts with the locative questions using the regular wh-question words for ‘where’ (fu or fan for place) and inflected verbs.

---

### Exemples

cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

- **ñaar yépp, mu ngi nekk Jolof** // (WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_319)

  - **ñaar** y_ -épp
  - **mu** ng_ -i nekk
  - **Jolof** //

  - two CLSy.PL all PRST.3SG =PRST PROX be_located Diolof //
  - N.NUM DET INDF.QNT PRED PRED.CL DEICT V.LAB N.TPN //

  **on both sides is from Jolof.**

---

### Locative

#### Definition

the locative predication is a verbal or non verbal predication used to encode the presence of an entity or an event at a place X close to (-i proximal suffix) vs. remote (-a distal suffix) from the place of speech, at the time of speech

#### Construction

The clause contains a Presentative inflection (PRST) and a locative prepositional phrase or a locative adverb.

#### Constraints

PRST must be followed by a LOC element in ge or PREP.SPC in rx

#### Contrasts

contrasts with PRESENTATIVE (formed with the same Presentative inflexion but with a single argument and without a locative marker, and used not to locate an entity but to introduce it in the discourse).

---

### Exemples

cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

- **ñaar yépp, mu ngi nekk Jolof** // (WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_319)

  - **ñaar** y_ -épp
  - **mu** ng_ -i nekk
  - **Jolof** //

  - two CLSy.PL all PRST.3SG =PRST PROX be_located Diolof //
  - N.NUM DET INDF.QNT PRED PRED.CL DEICT V.LAB N.TPN //

  **on both sides is from Jolof.**

---

### Presentative

---
**Definition**
The presentative construction is a non verbal predication with a single argument (the Subject), used to introduce this argument as a new entity appearing in the situation of speech or in discourse.

**Construction**
The predicate has a single argument (namely the Subject which might be only indexed in the predicative marker) and is marked by the mere Presentative inflection with no word after, or immediately followed by a manner adverb. In the latter case, the presentative construction can be complemented by a verbal component introduced by the imperfective copula and indicating a concomitant process. NB. Presentative inflection (PRST) is a discontinuous morpheme with a first inflectional component followed by a second morpheme suffixed with (deictic or anaphoric) spatial suffixes.

**Constraints**
Beside its own deictic suffixes, the Presentative inflection cannot be followed by anything (no verb, no noun, no prepositional phrase), it has to be the end of the sentence, unless it is immediately followed by a manner adverb.

**Contrasts**
although morphologically and semantically related, it contrasts with LOCATIVE (because it has a single argument, is a strictly nominal predication and here emphasis is laid on the appearing of an entity in the current situation or in the discourse, whereas with LOCATIVE emphasis is laid on the localization of the subject)

### ascriptive

**Definition**
Ascriptive predication is a nominal equational predication used for indicating that an entity (N1) is defined/characterized as being a N(2), e.g. Samba is a farmer. N2 is the predicate. NB. There is no adjectives in Wolof

**Construction**
It is coded by the use of the Complement Focus inflection (FOC.CMPL in ge, PRED in rx) in the perfective form (no IPFV suffix) in a non verbal structure with at least one NP preceding the predicative marker. Autonomous noun subject (N1) is not necessary: by default, the referred entity is the entity we are seeing or talking about (indexed in the predicative marker). The word order is as follows: (N1 or DEM or PRO), N2 FOC.CMPL. Requête: Look for FOC.CMPL in ge and PRED in rx with no V at a distance of 1 “word” from PRED in rx.

**Constraints**
no V at a distance of 2 “words” from PRED in rx (corresponding to FOC.CMPL in ge) (only object pronouns can be inserted between FOC.CMPL inflectional marker and verb)

**Contrasts**
Distinct from verbal predication using the same inflection (FOC.CMPL); contrasts with IDENTIFICATIONAL; with EQUATIONAL_CHAINED_CLAUSE; with EQUATIONAL_EXPLANATORY_CLAUSE; with EQUATIONAL_NEG; with LOCATIVE

---

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d'un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

1. **Kajoor-kajoor lanu** // (WOL_SR_CONV_01_Sadda_SP1_542)
   
   **Kajoor-kajoor lanu** //
   
   **Kajoor-kajoor lanú** //
   
   **Citizen_of_Cayor FOC.COMPL.1PL //**
   
   **N PRED //**
   
   we are Cayorians.

2. **Naari doomi-baay lañu woon** // (WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_076)
   
   **Naari -i doomi-baay lañu woon** //
   
   **Naari -i doomi-baay lañu -oon** //
   
   **Two GEN.PL half_brother\father FOC.COMPL.3PL PST //**
   
   **N.NUM SUFX.N N.CPD PRED TAM //**
   
   They were two half-brothers of the same father.

### identificational

**Definition**
Identificational(aka equational) predication in Wolof is a nominal predication used for indicating that, among a set of other possibilities, an entity (N1) is identified as being a/the (real) N2 (N2 being the predicate). When used for an element already identified in the discourse context and pointed to by a demonstrative this predication conveys an intensive value (e.g. this one is really my friend), as the Subject Focus does in verbal predication in specific contexts

**Construction**
It is coded by the use of the Subject Focus inflection in the imperfective form (FOC.SBJ-IPV) in a non verbal structure with at least one N following this predicative marker. There might be no explicit Subject noun (or pronoun) in subject position: by default, the referred entity is the entity we are seeing or talking about (indexed in the predicative marker)

**Constraints**
no V at a distance of 1 “word” from PRED in rx; at least one N after PRED
Contrasts
Form and meaning distinct from the verbal predication using the same inflection (FOC.SBJ); contrasts with other non verbal predications, that is ASSCRIPTIVE; EQUATIONAL_CHAINED_CLAUSE; EQUATIONAL_EXPLANATORY_CLAUSE; EQUATIONAL_NEG

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d'un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

Léegi Mbësiin mooy sun dëkk nun // (WOL_SR_CONV_01_Sadda_SP1_330)
leegi Mbësiin mooy sun dëkk nun //
leegi Mbasiin moo -y sunu dëkk nun //
now Mbasiin FOC.SBJ.3SG IPFV POSS.1PL village PRO.1PL //
ADV.DM N.TPN PRED TAM DET N PRO.IDP //
So, Mbësiin really is our village.

Mooy li ma la wax leegi // (WOL_SR_CONV_01_Sadda_SP1_501)
mooy li ma la wax leegi //
mooy -y l_ -i ma la wax leegi //
FOC.SBJ.3SG IPFV CLSl GEN.PL AOR.1SG =OBJ.2SG speak now //
PRED TAM REL SUFX.N PRED PRO.CL V.DYN.DITR ADV.TEMP //
That's what I told you just now.

fajkati cosaan yi ñooy ñan, / (WOL_SR_NARR_01_HorizA-1_030)
fajkati cosaan yi ñooy ñan, /
faj -kat -i cosaan y_ -i ñoo -y ñ_ -an /
cure -AGT -GEN.PL tradition CLSy.PL PROX FOC.SBJ.3PL IPFV CLSñ.PL -which /
V.DYN.TR -DER.N -SUFX.N N DET DEICT PRED TAM PRO -Q /
Who are the traditional healers?

equational chained clause

Definition
Equational chained clause predication in Wolof is a nominal predication used in a chained clause (i.e an independent chained clause coming second in a narrative, or a dependent clause, or a modally marked answer in dialogue refuting disbelief) for indicating a relation of identity between a subject and a new argument. This new argument can be a noun (it was my brother) or a headless relative clause (e.g. it is what pleases me)

Construction
It is coded by the use of the Aorist inflection (AOR in ge, PRED in rx) in the imperfective form (IPFV suffix) in a non verbal structure, with at least one nominal element (a noun or a relative clause) following the AOR predicative marker. There might be no explicit noun in subject position: by default, the referred entity is the indexed in the predicative marker. Requête: Look for AOR followed by -IPFV in ge with no V at a distance of "one word" from AOR-IPVF

Constraints
no V at a distance of 1 "word" from PRED in rx; at least one N or one REL after PRED

Contrasts
Form and meaning distinct from the verbal predication using the same inflection (AOR); contrasts with other non verbal predications that is with ASSCRIPTIVE; IDENTIFICATIONAL; EQUATIONAL_EXPLANATORY_CLAUSE; EQUATIONAL_NEG; LOCATIVE

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d'un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

te muy sunu ndono / (WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_009)
te muy sunu ndono /
te mu -y sunu ndono /
and AOR.3SG IPFV POSS.1PL legacy /
CONJ.COORD.V PRED TAM DET N /
whereas it's our heritage,

Muy Kanhan // (WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_026)
muy Kanhan //
mu -y Kanhan //
AOR.3SG IPFV Canaan //
PRED TAM N.PROP //
It was Canaan.
When the water came, it was a flood;

**equational explanatory clause**

**Definition**
This explanatory predication is a non verbal predication used for indicating that an entity has the quality of being X (=N) as an explanation of a situation. When there is no explicit subject noun, the referred entity is the entity we are seeing or talking about (indexed in the predicative marker).

**Construction**
It is coded by the use of the Verb Focus inflection in the imperfective form, in a non verbal structure with at least one N following the predicative marker: FOC.V-IPFV

**Constraints**
no V at a distance of 2 “words” from PRED in rx (corresponding to FOC.V in ge)

**Contrasts**
Distinct from verbal predication using the same inflection (FOC.V) because the verbal predication does not necessary has an explanatory value, nor does it require the imperfective suffix for this. Contrasts with other non verbal predication used in the same discourse context with the same meaning, that is with ASCRIPTIVE; IDENTIFICATIONAL; EQUATIONAL_CHAINED_CLAUSE; EQUATIONAL_NEG; LOCATIVE

**negative equational**

**Definition**
Negative equational predication is a nominal predication used for indicating that an entity (N1) is not a N(2). In the negative there is no distinction between ascriptive and identificational predication

**Construction**
It is coded by the use of the Negative Imperfective inflection (NEG.IPFV) in ge, PRED in rx) in the perfective form (no IPFV suffix) in a non verbal structure with at least one N following the predicative marker. There might be no DEM or PRO in subject position: by default, the referred entity is the entity we are seeing or talking about (indexed in the predicative marker. The clause structure is (N1 or DEM or PRO) NEG.FOC N(2)

**Constraints**
no V at a distance of 2 “words” from PRED in rx (corresponding to NEG.FOC in ge)

**Contrasts**
Distinct from verbal predication using the same inflection (NEG.FOC). Contrasts with affirmative equational predications, that is ASCRIPTIVE; IDENTIFICATIONAL

Exemples: cliquez sur la référence d’un exemple pour élargir son contexte dans le corpus

**Waaye ñoom duñuy lébu, ay Kajoor lañu / (WOL_SR_CONV_01_Sadda_SP1_541)**

**waaye** ñoom duñuy lébu ay Kajoor lañu /

waaye ñoom duñuy -y lébu a_ -y Kajoor lañu /

but PRO.3PL NEG.IPFV.3PL CLSy.PL lébu INDF CLSy.PL Cayor FOC.COMPL.3PL /

**CONJ.COORD PRO.IDP PRED DET N DET DET N.TPN PRED /**

But they’re not Lebous, they are Cayor people;

**du saay mbokk a ma ko wax / (WOL_SR_NARR_03_Fallu_044)**

**du** saay mbokk a ma ko wax /

du sama -y mbokk a ma ko wax /

COP.NEG.IPFV POSS.1SG CLSy.PL relative FOC =OBJ.1SG =OBJ.3SG speak /

**PRED DET DET N.ALTN.IN PRED PRO.CL PRO.CL V.DYN.DITR /**

it was not my parents who told me,
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